

Communiqué

SOCIÉTÉ CANADIENNE D'HISTOIRE ET DE PHILOSOPHIE DES SCIENCES

CANADIAN SOCIETY FOR THE HISTORY AND PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE

N° 92

Winter/Hiver 2016

CSHPS President's Report

Lesley Cormack, December 2015

It's been a very interesting year for Canada and for the post-secondary sector. We all watched the 78-day (!) election campaign with interest, since it had implications for us as Canadians and as scholars. Given the resolution we passed as our Annual Meeting last year, protesting the silencing of federal scientists, it was gratifying to see that the Liberal Government seems to have overturned this concerning policy. It also appears that there should be no cutbacks to the tri-council funding agency and that we might see some increases. The federal government, as well as most of the provincial governments, have publicly acknowledged the importance of climate science and environmental discussions to the wellbeing of Canadians and the larger world. This could have important implications for philosophers and historians of science. We can and should be part of these discussions. I would urge you all (as appropriate) to get involved.

As our last meeting we talked about a couple of items that we will want to move forward this year. First, given that we have now moved the CSHPS Archives to York University, we will need to establish an official position for an archivist. This will require a change to our Constitution. You will see the notice of this vote in this issue of Communiqué. Second, we need to have a discussion about whether we should move to an electronic-only version of Communiqué. We should have a robust conversation about this at our AGM

continued on page 3

Obituary: John Farley Canadian historian of science

April 23, 1936-November 10, 2015

Born in Leicester, UK, in 1936, John Farley joined Dalhousie University's Biology Department as an Assistant Professor in 1964. Although trained as a parasitologist, and a teacher of invertebrate biology, John took a sabbatical leave at Harvard University in 1970-71 where he began his transformation into a leading historian of science. He soon turned his teaching to the history of science and the history of medicine in classes cross-listed across Biology, History, and Medicine at Dalhousie and at King's College. His passion for teaching – his way of bringing history alive – was reflected in the huge popularity of his classes. In his well-subscribed History of Medicine classes, for example, he took his biology, history and pre-med students into the lives and mindsets of medical practitioners and patients of various ages – pressing them to abandon our present knowledge and imagine how they would experience disease and health. On his own account, his irreverent lectures on Darwin and the history of science delivered in the King's venerable “great books” Foundation Year Programme (FYP) got him repeatedly kicked out of the FYP lecture line-up (only to be asked to return again and again). His energy and total dedication to making history of science an essential part of the curriculum for both arts and science students became a catalyst for establishing the History of Science and Technology Programme at the University of King's College,

continued on page 3

Communiqué

Newsletter of the
Société canadienne d'histoire et de philosophie des
sciences/Canadian Society for the History and
Philosophy of Science

N° 92
Winter/Hiver
2016

www.cshps.ca www.schps.ca

Please direct submissions and inquiries to Vincent Guillin or Eleanor Louson, preferably by email (details below). Please note that submissions can be sent in both official languages. The editors are grateful to York University for assistance in printing and mailing costs, and to the University of Guelph for providing the necessary software.

Co-editors:

VINCENT GUILLIN

Philosophy Department
Université du Québec à Montréal
guillin.vincent_philippe@uqam.ca

ELEANOR LOUSON

STS Graduate Program
York University
elouson@yorku.ca

CSHPS-SCHPS Executive:

President: Lesley Cormack (SFU)
Past-President: Kathleen Okruhlik (UWO)
First Vice-President: Frédéric Bouchard
(Université de Montréal)
Second Vice-President and Corresponding
Secretary: Joan Steigerwald (York)
Secretary-Treasurer: Conor Burns (Ryerson)

Editors' Message

We can't believe it's time for the Winter Issue already. As this is traditionally the members' update issue, we're glad so many of you sent in your individual notices and summaries of some great workshops from your departments. Jaipreet Viridi-Dhesi spoke to us about her experiences sharing research online, and Jonathan Turner shares his best résumé tips in Career Corner. We also fondly remember John Farley's remarkable life and career.

After a brief but lively discussion at last year's AGM, we're ready to start resolving Communiqué's format issues, once and for all. Please stay tuned in the new year for a survey about your newsletter preferences. We hope that eventually, you will no longer hear anything from us about paper vs. digital, ever again.

See you in Calgary & Edmonton this summer!
Eleanor and Vincent

ISSUE CONTENTS

President's Report (cont'd from cover)	...3
Obituary: John Farley (cont'd from cover)	...3-4
Notice of Amendment for 2016 AGM	...4
Calls for Papers	
CSHPS/SCHPS Annual Meeting	...5-6
3 Societies Meeting	...7
FAQ	...7-8
Career Corner	...8
Interview with Jaipreet Viridi-Dhesi	...9-12
Announcements	
Fellowships/Grants	...12-14
Workshop Reports	...14-18
Member Updates	...19-22

President's Message

(cont'd from p.1)

in Calgary this May, so give it some thought.

We are hard at work planning not one but two conferences to take place in the spring and early summer of 2016. First, our Annual Meeting will be held at the Congress in Calgary, May 27-30, 2016. Second, CSHPS will be hosting the British Society for the History of Science and the History of Science Society at the 8th meeting of the Three Societies, in Edmonton June 22-25, 2016. Come to both! We have an energetic western welcome for you all!

Lesley Cormack,
CSHPS President

John Farley

(cont'd from p.1)

although by the time the programme came into being in 2000 he had retired.

John's first forays into the history of science resulted in a collaboration with Gerald Gieson producing one of the iconic contextual studies in the history of science: "Science, Politics and Spontaneous Generation in Nineteenth-Century France: The Pasteur-Pouchet Debate," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 48 (1974), pp. 161-198. John and Gerald took a classic case study of an experimental success (one of the key textbook examples of good science triumphing over darkness), namely Pasteur's defeat of Pouchet, and they completely dismantled it, revealing the formative political, social, philosophical and metaphysical underworkings of the debate. It was very radical for its time, and remains so, used as a classic case of the "indeterminacy of theory by data" thesis in the philosophy of science. This was expanded in his first book *The Spontaneous Generation Controversy from Descartes to Oparin* (Johns Hopkins, 1977), which remains the best treatment of

what John liked to call "Life Without Parents." His second book, *Gametes and Spores: Ideas about Sexual Reproduction, 1750-1914* (Johns Hopkins, 1982), contained important insights for biologists and historians into how our approach to and understanding of reproduction has changed over time.

After generation, John turned to the history of medicine, especially tropical diseases, starting with *Bilharzia: A History of Imperial Tropical Medicine* (Cambridge University Press, 1991). In 1995 John took early retirement to concentrate on writing but continued to teach. From his 'retirement' two further books emerged: *To cast out disease: A History of the International Health Division of Rockefeller Foundation* (Cambridge University Press, 2004) and a biography of the Canadian Brock Chisholm: *Brock Chisholm, the World Health Organization & the Cold War* (UBC Press, 2008), establishing his importance in the history of medicine and the developing interest in globalised history of health.

No mere one-sided academic, John continued his passion for competitive "master swimming" past retirement, winning numerous local and national awards and, in his last years, setting provincial records in the 100 and 200m freestyle, the 50 and 100m breaststroke and the 100 and 200m individual medley in the 70-74 age group. He continued to be active teaching English as a second language at the Halifax Public Library, and as a volunteer patient at the Faculty of Medicine at Dalhousie. In his last year John was developing a class for seniors on the history of medicine. John could be seen at his weekly gatherings at the "Henry House Pub" with his beloved wife, Grace, friends and family holding court about rugby, beer, politics, and the ridiculousness of academic life.

Although one of the key figures in our field, John was an immensely humble and self-effacing man. He never lost his playful side, nor his deflationary tactics in the face of pretention. John had little patience with abstract discussions of historiography or philosophy of science, and also his dislike of history of science meetings. It was always frustrating for our more theoretically smitten students when they would fail to drag him into debates over his views of this or that methodological turn in the historiography or sociology of

science. In light of this it is perhaps ironic that his early work became so important in support of the “Strong Programme” in the sociology of scientific knowledge, which didn’t interest him at all. He thought it was too abstract and maybe just too pretentious. He prided himself on his hard empirical work, and the importance of taking seriously the intricacies of the subjects he studied (albeit, of course, with a bit of a twinkle in his eye, perhaps knowing that what he said would have large theoretical consequences).

John passed away on November 10 at the age of 79. As per his final wishes, John’s body was accepted into Body Donation Programme at Dalhousie Medical School. He is survived by his loving family, wife Grace, children Gael, Gyneth, James and Gilmour and his five grandchildren, and his colleagues and friends in Halifax, Canada and the history of science community worldwide. Our community has lost a great friend, colleague and inspiration.

November 18, 2015

G. McOuat, the History of Science and Technology Programme, University of King’s College/Dalhousie, with material from the Dalhousie Department of Biology, the Chronicle Herald, and reminiscences from friends and family.

NOTICE of Amendment to CSHPS Constitution.

French version follows / La version française suit

According to Article IX, Amendments to the Constitution of the Society, copies of proposed amendments shall be distributed to all Members not less than three weeks before the Annual General Meeting.

I therefore present to the Members this proposed amendment, which will be voted on at the AGM in Calgary in May, 2016.

Under Article IV. Officers and Executive Council

Insert new clause:

(c) The Second Vice-President shall be charged with maintaining a liaison with the Clara Thomas Archives and Special Collections at York University, the repository for the Society’s archives, to ensure that all significant CSHPS records relating to the Society’s governance and activities are ultimately deposited with the archives.

The remaining clauses would be renumbered as clauses d to j.

Lesley Cormack, President

Conor Burns, Secretary

AVIS de modification aux statuts de la SCHPS

En vertu de l’article IX, Modifications aux Statuts de la Société, des copies des modifications proposées devront être distribuées à tous les Membres au minimum trois semaines avant l’Assemblée générale annuelle.

Je présente par conséquent aux membres la proposition de modification suivante, qui fera l’objet d’un vote à l’AG annuelle de Calgary, en mai 2016.

A l’article IV. Officiers et comité exécutif

Insérer la nouvelle clause :

(c) Le Deuxième Vice-Président sera chargé d’assurer le lien avec les Archives Clara Thomas et le service des Livres rares de l’université de York, dépositaire des archives de la Société, pour s’assurer que tous les documents importants de la SCHPS relatifs à la gouvernance et aux activités de la Société soient bien ultimement confiés aux archives.

Les clauses subséquentes seraient renumérotées clauses d à j.

La Présidente, Lesley Cormack

Le Secrétaire, Conor Burns

CSHPS Annual Conference 2016

French version follows / La version française suit

The Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science (CSHPS) is holding its annual conference as part of the Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences (CFHSS congress2016.ca) in Calgary, Alberta, May 28-30, 2016.

The program committee invites scholars working on the history and philosophy of science to submit abstracts for individual papers or proposals for sessions. Proposals for sessions (3 and 4 papers) are particularly encouraged.

Meeting languages: The CSHPS is a bilingual society. Individual papers may be given in English or French, but efforts to broaden participation are appreciated (e.g. a presentation in English could be accompanied by a PowerPoint in French, and vice versa). Similarly, sessions can be presented in either English or French, but bilingual sessions are especially welcomed.

Joint sessions: The CSHPS meeting overlaps with the meeting dates of a number of other member societies of the CFHSS, including the Canadian Historical Association, Canadian Philosophical Association, Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Mathematics, Canadian Sociological Association, Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes, Canadian Society for the History of Medicine and the Environmental Studies Association of Canada. We welcome proposals for joint sessions with these and other societies (please mention this specifically in your session proposal). However, no talk will be accepted for presentation at more than one society.

Number of submissions: Individuals can only submit one abstract for the CSHPS meeting (i.e. either an abstract for an individual paper or and abstract part of a session proposal).

Submissions: In order to preserve the anonymity of authors, it is important that contact information and other identifying information be excluded from the file containing the abstract.

Individual paper submissions should consist of a title, a brief abstract (150-250 words), a list of keywords, and—in the accompanying email—the author's name and contact information.

Session proposals should consist of a session title, titles and brief abstracts (150-250 words) for each paper, a list of keywords, and—in the accompanying email—the names and contact information of the presenters and session organizer.

Proposals should be in MS Word, pdf, odt or rtf format.

Deadline: January 15th, 2016

Submission email address: program.cshps@gmail.com

Presenters: All presenters must be members of the CSHPS at the time of the meeting. For more information about CSHPS membership, consult: <http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/join.html>.

Student Prize: The CSHPS offers the Richard Hadden Award, a book prize for the best student paper presented at the meeting. To be considered for the award, students should submit a copy of their paper by e-mail by May 5, 2016). Details of this prize can be found at: <http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/HaddenPrize.html>

Travel Grant: Given for travel to the CSHPS Annual Meeting (http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/pdf/travel_grant.pdf)

CFHSS: Information about Congress registration and accommodation will be available at the CFHSS congress website: congress2016.ca.

Program Committee (2015-2016)
Christophe Malaterre, Chair (UQAM)
malaterre.christophe@uqam.ca

Delia Gavrus (Winnipeg) d.gavrus@uwinnipeg.ca

Yves Gingras (UQAM) gingras.yves@uqam.ca

Ken Waters (Calgary) ckwaters@ucalgary.ca

Local Arrangements: Megan Delehanty (Calgary)

mdelehan@ucalgary.ca

Congès Annuel SCHPS 2016

La Société canadienne d'histoire et de philosophie des sciences (SCHPS) tiendra son congrès annuel dans le cadre du Congrès des sciences humaines (FCSH congress2016.ca), Calgary, Alberta, 28-30 mai 2016. Le comité de programme invite les historiens et philosophes des sciences à soumettre un résumé pour une communication individuelle ou une proposition de séance pour le congrès. Les propositions de séances pour 3 ou 4 communications seront particulièrement bienvenues.

Langues du congrès: La SCHPS est une société bilingue. Les communications individuelles peuvent être en français ou en anglais mais les efforts pour faciliter une participation diversifiée sont encouragés (par exemple, une communication en français accompagnée d'une présentation PowerPoint en anglais, ou vice-versa). De façon similaire, les séances peuvent être en anglais ou en français, mais les sessions bilingues sont particulièrement appréciées.

Séances conjointes: Le congrès de la SCHPS se déroule en même temps que ceux de plusieurs autres sociétés membres de la FCSH, comme la Société historique du Canada, l'Association canadienne de philosophie, La Société Canadienne d'Histoire et de Philosophie des Mathématiques, la Société canadienne de sociologie, Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes, la Société canadienne d'histoire de la médecine, et l'Association canadienne d'études environnementales. Nous encourageons les propositions de séances conjointes avec d'autres sociétés (merci de bien préciser cela dans votre proposition). Cependant, aucune communication ne peut être présentée à plus d'une société.

Nombre de soumissions: Une personne ne peut soumettre qu'un résumé de communication (c.-à-d. soit pour une communication individuelle soit pour une communication faisant partie d'une séance).

Soumissions: afin de préserver l'anonymat des auteurs, aucune coordonnée personnelle ne doit être incluse dans le fichier contenant une proposition de communication.

Les propositions de communication individuelle doivent comprendre un titre, un résumé (entre 150 et 250 mots), une liste de mots clés, et, dans le courriel les accompagnant, les coordonnées de l'auteur. Les propositions de séance doivent comprendre le titre de la séance, les titres et résumés (entre 150 et 250 mots) de chaque contribution, une liste de mots clés, et, dans le courriel les accompagnant, les noms et coordonnées des auteurs et de l'organisateur de la séance. Les propositions doivent être soumises dans des fichiers de format MS Word, pdf, odt ou rtf.

Date limite de soumission: 15 janvier 2016.

Adresse courriel pour les soumissions: program.cshps@gmail.com

Présentateurs: Tous les présentateurs doivent être membres de la SCHPS au moment du congrès. Pour plus d'information sur l'inscription à la SCHPS, consulter le site : <http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/join.html>

Prix étudiant: La SCHPS décerne le prix Richard Hadden pour le meilleur texte étudiant présenté lors du congrès. Les candidats qui souhaitent concourir devront envoyer par courriel une copie de leur article avant le 5 mai 2016). Pour plus d'information sur le prix, voir : <http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/HaddenPrize.htm>

Aide à la mobilité: attribuée pour se rendre à la Conférence annuelle de la SCHPS (http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1/pdf/travel_grant.pdf)

Les informations concernant l'inscription et les possibilités d'hébergement pour le congrès se trouveront sur le site Internet du congrès de la FCSH: congress2016.ca.

Comité de programme (2015-2016)

Christophe Malaterre, Président (UQAM) :

malaterre.christophe@uqam.ca

Delia Gavrus (Winnipeg) d.gavrus@uwinnipeg.ca

Yves Gingras (UQAM) gingras.yves@uqam.ca

Ken Waters (Calgary) ckwaters@ucalgary.ca

Organisation locale: Megan Delehanty (Calgary)

mdelehan@ucalgary.ca

Eighth Joint Meeting of the BSHS, CSHPS, and HSS

22-25 June 2016

University of Alberta
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 successful meetings were in Philadelphia (2012), Oxford (2008), Halifax, Nova Scotia (2004), St Louis (2000), Edinburgh (1996), Toronto (1992), and Manchester (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 programme 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, 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. Accommodation will be available on campus and near campus.

The Programme 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 organising 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 10 December 2015.

Full details of how to submit your session or abstract can be found at: www.uab.ca/3societies

Enquiries concerning the program should be directed to aede@ualberta.ca

Enquiries concerning the conference should be directed to: threesocieties2016@ualberta.ca

3 SOCIETIES MEETING FAQ

CSHPS is hosting the 3 Societies Meeting in Edmonton this June. Many people have been asking about this meeting; here are some of the most frequently asked questions.

1. What is the 3 Societies meeting? What is its connection to CSHPS?

The three societies are: the British Society for the History of Science, the History of Science Society, and CSHPS. Since 1988, these three societies have been meeting every 4 years in the summer, as a chance for a trans-Atlantic exchange. The conference moves from country to country. 2016 is Canada's turn. Previous Canadian meetings were in Toronto (1992) and Halifax (2004), both of which were a great success. The most recent meeting was in Philadelphia (2012).

2. Why is CSHPS having two meetings in 2016?

CSHPS holds its own annual meeting every year in conjunction with the Congress for the Humanities and Social Sciences. This is our chance to interact with

our sister societies (e.g. CPA, CSHM, CSHPMath) and remains the most important venue in Canada for philosophers of science. Philosophers of science are more than welcome to attend the 3 Societies meeting, but should probably present their papers at our annual meeting in Calgary, May 27-30.

3. Can I give a paper at both conferences?

Yes you can. There will be no cross checking, and you are more than welcome to present at both conferences.

4. How do I submit papers for each?

If you have any other questions about the 3 Societies meeting, feel free to email threesocieties2016@ualberta.ca or check out the website at <https://uofa.ualberta.ca/arts/research/3-societies-meeting>. Abstracts are due December 10, 2015. For submissions for the CSHPs Annual Meeting in Calgary, submit at program.cshps@gmail.com

Lesley Cormack, President

Career Corner

Given the recent report from the Conference Board of Canada (<http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=7564>), we know that parallel planning for flexible futures is absolutely essential if PhDs are to continue to have the highest rates of employment in the country. The document you need for every job except faculty jobs is a résumé, and it's a very concise document (1 page is normal in finance, consulting, and engineering; 2 pages most other places). Like your academic application I wrote about last time, you have to customize your résumé to demonstrate you fit the needs of the hiring department. The most important sections of the résumé are experience and education. If the position requires the highest degree you have, there is good reason to put your education section first. If you are worried that your highest degree makes you overqualified, put your education section last.

Within the experience section, employers need to be persuaded that you are competent at using the skills they want. The way to do this is with accomplishment

skill statements. For instance, my own résumé contains a line under the job experience of "Researcher, author, and presenter at the University of Toronto" that says "Presented at 1 international, 4 national, and 8 regional conferences on the topic of defence science in Cold War Canada, and won the Royal Society of Canada award for best student presentation at the most recent national conference attended." That's a significant chunk of CV condensed to a single sentence fragment, which is effective because it demonstrates the frequency of presentations, diversity of audiences, and my proficiency. The only time when the titles of your talks and papers matter, is when your subject matter expertise is a job requirement. Otherwise, focus on transferable skills like oral and written communication and research.

For more help with your résumé, my favourite guide is the Ontario Public Service "Writing a Cover Letter and Résumé: Tips, Tools and Resources" Guide, available here: <http://bit.ly/1QitGTr>

About the author: Jonathan Turner has a PhD in the History of Science from the University of Toronto. If you have questions for an upcoming Career Corner, you can tweet @jonrturner or email jonathan.turner@utoronto.ca.

CSHPS is now on social media!

You can find our Twitter feed @CSHPSnews and our Facebook group "CSHPS - SCHPS" at facebook.com/groups/cshps.schps/ If you'd like us to promote any announcements, updates or events on our social media pages, please email Eleanor at elouson@yorku.ca Please join the conversation and share your updates; we'd love to hear from you and promote your research, outreach, conferences, or whatever you're working on.



Interview with Jaipreet Virdi-Dhesi

Following our list of HPS online resources in the last issue, we are happy to present this interview with Jaipreet Virdi-Dhesi, HPS social media maven, who spoke with us about the ins and outs of sharing your research online.

Communiqué: What's your educational background and current affiliation?

My BA was in Philosophy of Science, York University. I did my MA & PhD History of Science & Technology, University of Toronto. I'm currently a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow at Brock University.

What was the subject of your dissertation?

History of the formation of aural surgery as a surgical speciality in 19th century Britain

What are your current research topics & projects?

My SSHRC project, 'Objects of Disability,' examines the history of disability in Canadian history through the lens of material culture. At the moment I'm collaborating with libraries, archives, and museums across Ontario to develop a database that catalogues accessibility technologies, medical objects, and other historical artefacts relating to disability in these collections. The database and eventual website will likely go live sometime late in 2016.

More broadly, my research focuses on the history of hearing loss and medical health. I'm working on two book-length projects: 1) on the history of medical quackery in deafness cures, and 2) the role of women scientists in developing audiometric testing for the deaf and hard-of-hearing.

Where are you active online/on social media with regard to your research? How did you get started sharing your research online?

Since 2011, I've kept a blog, *From the Hands of Quacks* (fromthehandsofquacks.com), which I launched when I started my PhD project. Initially, the blog was started as an outlet for me to improve my writing: imagining I had hundreds of readers forced me to think about my target audience and how well I could articulate



Jaipreet Virdi-Dhesi

complex arguments that would later form my dissertation. My blog was the extent of my social media activity, until I opened up a twitter account and became connected to a group of prominent HPS bloggers, who invited me to participate in *The Giant's Shoulders*, a monthly HoS round-up/carnival of the best blog posts and other content online. Hosting the carnival on my blog exposed me to an abundance of readers, some of whom ended up browsing old posts.

From then on, FTTHOQ became a platform for me to share troublesome aspects of my dissertation, unique sources I came across during many excursions at the British Library, and humorous stories of medical quackery. Nearly all my posts are original research, which proved challenging in maintaining the fine line between overexposing my research and wanting to retain it for future publications. Yet I never experienced any problems with content, particularly since I treated my blogging as another research output. Over the years, as my audience base has changed—roughly 50/50 general and academic—so too, has my content. I write more general posts, though with carefully researched historical facts that are properly cited. I've also been doing book reviews.

Sometime around 2012, I expanded my social media strategy. There were large chunks of time where I would go without posting any blog content, owing to several factors: a demanding teaching load, stress over completing chapter drafts of my dissertation, or lack of original content. So I turned to twitter (and later Facebook and tumblr) to continue my academic outreach. I had a hefty file of images in my desktop that I had

(Viridi-Dhesi Interview, cont'd)

collected while putting together my history of medicine course; I ended up sharing the images with my twitter followers, sometimes with brief explanations of the historical value of the images. Then later, as I expanded to Facebook and Tumblr, I would post larger descriptions of the images and their sources.

The sharing of these images are carefully curated. I am sensitive to content, avoiding overexposed, gruesome images that may victimize or be perceived as inappropriate. I've even written a blog post on some of my reasoning behind sharing these images, including how setting them in context allows me (and other) to address their historical place and value. These images also spark some of the most inquisitive and interesting discussions I've had online, and at times I've attracted large audiences for small or upcoming digital repositories that are overlooked (<http://fromthehandsofquacks.com/2014/06/16/on-sharing-histmed-images/>)

In addition to FTTHOQ, I've participated in another online project, Nineteenth-Century Disability: Cultures & Contexts, which incorporates sources in disability history in short blog posts as a pedagogical tool. In addition to writing blog posts on hearing artefacts, I've been responsible for promoting the site through social media by keeping the site's twitter account (@19cDisability), writing a review for an online academic journal (<http://blogs.tandf.co.uk/jvc/2014/06/21/a-digital-reader-19th-century-disability-cultures-contexts/>) and participating in an interview in Collectors' Weekly, on the broader history of disability in Victorian history (<http://www.collectorsweekly.com/articles/healing-spas-and-ugly-clubs-how-victorians-taught-us-to-treat-people-with-disabilities/>)

How does an active online presence affect your research?/ What are the benefits to your social media efforts? Were any unexpected?

For one thing, it's given me a platform to not only share my work, but for others to learn about my research projects. As I actively engaged with Twitter, a steady increase of followers made me aware I was neglecting a tremendous portion of my audience who were interested in my work and its implications, namely, scholars of disability history and d/Deaf in-

dividuals. Conversations with them forced me to address pivotal historical narratives that I might otherwise have ignored, forcing me to incorporate a more interdisciplinary stance in my dissertation by merging disability history with medical history. Taking into account historical and contemporary conceptions of deafness (and disability more broadly) as an impact on identity-formation have guided how I approached my sources and the kind of arguments I wanted to make. Rather than being a distraction to my dissertation, social media engagement actually broadened my scope of historical research, challenging me to become a better scholar and historian.

An active social media presence has also revealed some unexpected benefits:

- Descendants of some of the minor historical figures I've included in my dissertation and wrote short blog posts on, reached out to me. They generously shared stories of their ancestors and even sources that I haven't found elsewhere. So historical actors who figured only in a minor role in my argument ended up taking a more significant place—further, these sources forced me to address relevant topics that had merit on the arguments I was making. For instance, one descendant shared documents relating to a great-great aunt, revealing she was actually the one behind a patent for a hearing device, rather than her husband. While I already knew this, the documents shared with me led me to incorporate a more compelling argument on gender and the role of women in patenting history.
- Invitations to present at academic conversations, particularly those outside the HoS network. One invitation for a conference on Victorian disability introduced me to a large body of scholars, not only expanding my academic network, but gave me new options for graduate funding, two publication invitations, membership in new societies, and collaborations for future conferences and monographs.
- Invitation to deliver a public lecture to a general audience—at a bar!
- Gifts: including books, historical sources, unpublished materials, and, at one time, a lovely promotional swag from the producers of *The Knick* (a monogrammed surgical case with faux instru-

ments & “medicines”)

- Interview for a fashion magazine (*Elle India*) on “Women in STEM”
- Aspects of my blog have been used in undergraduate classrooms as reading examples of digital curatorship/scholarship.

Have there been any responses to your online research persona been from your colleagues (& from professors when you were a student)?

Students and professors alike have asked me for advice in boosting their online research persona/presence. I’ve contributed in hefty conversations on the value of social media, participating in a HSS roundtable in 2013 and written about it as well:

<http://pubmedcentralcanada.ca/pmcc/articles/PMC4176269/>

<http://hssonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/October2010Newsletter.pdf>

Here’s a summary of the HSS 2013 roundtable on the Pleasures and Dangers of Social Media: <https://storify.com/heidiknoblauch/the-pleasures-and-dangers-of-social-media>

How much time do you devote to your academic life online?

Now, I usually write one new blog post a month, but I tweet every day—or every other day. I don’t keep a schedule anymore since my postdoctoral project takes up much of my time. Yet what time I do devote to my online presence, it’s done during my downtime, and rather than feeling a sense of obligation, I enjoy it.

What does the online HPS landscape look like? Are HPS scholars active on social media?

There’s been a lot of discussion on the HPS landscape and the value of social media, conversations I doubt will disappear anytime soon. I think it’s important for academics to assess the merits of their work for a larger audience, especially when it seems to contradict our notions of traditional scholarly work and research output. For instance, while there’s been a growth of live-tweeting during conferences, one of the most troubling objections is that live-tweeting only benefits those whose work is being tweeted and for the most part, that depends on the audience. So poorly attended sessions will not get any virtual attention, while others will get

perspectives from multiple tweeters. There’s also the question of what (or who?) are we live-tweeting for—for people who wished to attend the conferences but couldn’t? For a broad audience? For ourselves? These are questions that were also addressed at the 2013 iCHSTM meeting in Manchester in a live-streamed panel, “Social media, public engagement, and the history of science, technology and medicine” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IZxfUCdvy4I>)

Are we creating new knowledge or contextualizing anything that’s been heard in a 20 minute conference presentation reduced to a bunch of 140-character tweets? It’s hard to tell, but this is an important discussion, particularly as in recent years there’s been a lot of encouragement from conference organizers for attendees to live-tweet sessions with conference hashtags. The 2015 HSS meeting additionally introduced a meeting app on Guidebook that had a twitter page that curated all tweets tagged #hss15 so that even people who weren’t on twitter could follow conversations.

There are many HPS scholars on social media. A partial list can be found here: https://thedispersalofdarwin.wordpress.com/2010/08/04/hos_blogs/

And a more extensive list here: <http://www.activehistory.co.uk/historians-on-twitter/> and <http://www.mu-seion.ku.dk/2011/07/history-of-science-blogs-and-twitter-accounts/>

The weekly roundup on Whewell’s Ghost blog further gives you a sense of the extent of HPS presence online: <https://whewellsghost.wordpress.com/>

What do you think faculty members in general think about mixing research and social media? What advice do you have for graduate students interested in crafting an academic presence online? For faculty members? For departments?

Everyone has their personal preferences. I know faculty members who enthusiastically launched their social media presence only to wane after a period of time because of obligations and/or disinterest. There’s others who post regularly, either on twitter or on their facebook pages. It’s a lot of work to actively participate in social media engagement on a public level and difficult to balance with a full academic workload. That’s not to say it’s impossible, but the extent of participation depends on the individual.

(Viridi-Dhesi Interview, cont'd)

I'm a supporter of the use of social media to bolster one's profile, as it provides a platform for scholars to present their work and for others to find them. Many scholars use academia.edu to share their work and keep others updated on their research output, but this largely confined to the academic community. (Side note: there's been plenty of discussion on the merits of blogging and whether it "counts" as academic scholarship: <https://storify.com/michaelhattem/aha2015-s99-blogging-and-the-future-of-scholarship>)

My advice to faculty and graduate students is simple: have some sort of presence online. It can be as simple as a detailed overview of your research and background on a department website, a personal website with your CV and other relevant information on your research, or simply a twitter handle. For graduate students particularly facing a difficult job market, an online presence can provide selection committees a way of learning more about you and your work.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Two Postdoctoral Fellowships in History and/or Philosophy of Science at the University of Notre Dame

The University of Notre Dame History and Philosophy of Science Graduate Program seeks to appoint two Postdoctoral Fellows in history and/or philosophy of science. Appointments begin August 2016 for one year, and are renewable for a second year.

Applications are welcome from scholars working in any area of history and/or philosophy of science, technology and/or medicine, including the human, physical and social sciences. In addition to pursuing their research and participating actively in the intellectual life of the program, the ND HPS Postdoctoral Fellows teach one course per semester, which may be either

graduate or undergraduate. ND HPS Postdoctoral Fellows are strongly encouraged to teach a graduate seminar in their area of specialization.

The annual stipend is \$48,000 in the first year, rising to \$50,000 in the second year. In addition to the stipend, the package includes health insurance, \$4000 per year of research and conference travel funds, and up to \$3000 in relocation expenses. Office space, which may accommodate up to two postdoctoral fellows, will also be provided.

Applicants must have completed all requirements for the doctoral degree by **June 30, 2016**.

Applicants should send the following materials in electronic form only, as PDF files by email attachment, to Tori Davies (tdavies@nd.edu), with "HPS postdoc" as the subject line.

1. Cover letter giving a brief summary of your primary field of expertise and specific qualifications for the fellowship.
2. Two-page summary of your dissertation, which must be blinded for review.
3. Two-page plan of research to be undertaken during a two-year fellowship period, which must be blinded for review.
4. Writing sample not exceeding 25 pages, which must be blinded for review.
5. One-page proposal for a graduate seminar in your area of research specialization.
6. Full curriculum vitae.
7. Names and affiliations of three referees whom you have asked to write to us directly.

Please note applications which are printed and received via mail or courier will not be accepted and processed.

In addition, three letters of reference should be sent separately, either electronically or by mail, to arrive by the application deadline. Applicants should confirm that all three letters have in fact arrived.

Deadline for receipt of ALL application materials is: **January 20th, 2016.**

Enquiries may be addressed to Katherine Brading (kbrading@nd.edu), Director, History and Philosophy of Science Graduate Program, University of Notre Dame.

The ND HPS Graduate Program is housed in the Reilly Center for Science, Technology and Values, and draws faculty from a variety of departments including History, Philosophy, the Program of Liberal Studies, Theology, and English. The University serves as the host for the History of Science Society. For further information about the Reilly Center and the ND HPS program please visit <http://reilly.nd.edu/>. The HPS Postdoctoral Fellowships are funded by the College of Arts and Letters, with support from the American Council of Learned Societies through funds provided by The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

The University of Notre Dame seeks to attract, develop, and retain the highest quality faculty, staff and administration. The University is an Equal Opportunity Employer, and is committed to building a culturally diverse workplace. We strongly encourage applications from female and minority candidates and others that will enhance our community. Moreover, Notre Dame prohibits discrimination against veterans or disabled qualified individuals, and requires affirmative action by covered contractors to employ and advance veterans and qualified individuals with disabilities in compliance with 41 CFR 60-741.5(a) and 41 CFR 60-300.5(a).

This appointment is also contingent upon the successful completion of a background check. Applicants will be asked to identify all felony convictions and/or pending felony charges. Felony convictions do not automatically bar an individual from employment. Each case will be examined separately to determine the appropriateness of employment in the particular position. Failure to be forthcoming or dishonesty with respect to felony disclosures can result in the disqualification of a candidate. The full procedure can be viewed at <http://facultyhandbook.nd.edu/university-policies/background-check-procedure-for-prospective-faculty/>.

Appel à candidatures pour une bourse doctorale en philosophie des sciences à l'UQAM, Canada (date limite 6 janvier 2016)

English version follows; la version anglaise suit

La Chaire de recherche UQAM en philosophie des sciences lance un appel à candidatures pour une bourse doctorale de 15 000 \$ CAD.

Cet appel s'adresse tout particulièrement aux étudiant-e-s qui terminent actuellement une maîtrise en philosophie des sciences et souhaiteraient poursuivre par un doctorat à l'UQAM dès la rentrée de septembre 2016.

Les projets de recherche des candidat-e-s devront s'inscrire dans le domaine de la philosophie des sciences, de préférence sur des thématiques de philosophie générale des sciences ou de philosophie de la biologie, et si possible en rapport avec les axes de recherche de la Chaire (e.g. épistémologie des origines de la vie, explication en biologie). Le-la candidat-e retenu-e effectuera sa thèse sous la direction de Christophe Malaterre, professeur au département de philosophie de l'UQAM et titulaire de la Chaire de recherche UQAM en philosophie des sciences.

L'attribution de la bourse est conditionnelle à l'admission au programme de doctorat en philosophie de l'UQAM (Voir <http://www.etudier.uqam.ca/programme?code=3433> – attention, la date limite des inscriptions à ce programme est le 31 janvier 2016). La bourse sera versée 1/3 en début de scolarité, 1/3 à la réussite de l'examen doctoral, 1/3 au dépôt de la thèse. Elle doit être considérée comme un complément à d'autres sources de rémunération (e.g. bourses d'excellences du Québec et du Canada).

Les candidat-e-s intéressé-e-s enverront un dossier de candidature par courriel (chaire.philosciences@uqam.ca) comprenant :

- Une lettre de motivation (2 pages, avec mention des intérêts de recherche)
- Un CV

- Une lettre de recommandation

Date limite de candidature : **6 janvier 2016**

Call for applications – Doctoral grant in philosophy of science (deadline : Jan 6th, 2016)

UQAM Research Chair in Philosophy of Science offers a CAD\$ 15 000 doctoral grant.

The call concerns students who are currently completing an MA in philosophy and who wish to pursue doctoral studies in philosophy of science at UQAM starting September 6th, 2016.

The research projects of the applicants are expected to be in general philosophy of science or in philosophy of biology, and especially in relationship with the research themes of the Chair (epistemology of origins of life research, scientific explanation in the biological sciences). The successful applicant will conduct his/her research under the supervision of professor Christophe Malaterre, Philosophy department, UQAM.

The grant is conditional upon admission to the philosophy doctoral program (see <http://www.etudier.uqam.ca/programme?code=3433> – application deadline for the doctoral program is January 30th, 2016). Note that UQAM is a French speaking university. The grant will be paid 1/3 at start of studies, 1/3 upon success at the doctoral exam, 1/3 upon dissertation acceptance. This grant should be considered as a complement to other sources of funding (e.g. SSHRC or FRQSC fellowships).

Applications should be sent by email (chaire.philosciences@uqam.ca) and should include:

- A cover letter (2 pages, in French, mentioning your research interests)
- A CV (in French or in English)
- A recommendation letter (in French or in English)

Grant application deadline : **January 6th, 2016**

WORKSHOP REPORTS

Science in the Developing World: Workshop Results

For two days (Sep. 17-18, 2015), over 70 researchers and students from a wide range of disciplines (including anthropologists, economists, engineers, epidemiologists, geographers, philosophers, physicists, sociologists, STS scholars, and political scientists) gathered at BSIA to discuss how to enhance research capacity in the developing world, with an eye toward enhancing research that will improve lives in the developing world. Speakers presented challenges to doing such work (from conceptual disagreements over the more productive direction of research to institutional challenges such work faces) as well as opportunities for, and success stories of, doing such work.

We are well past the point where researchers can presume that research conducted on public health, medicine, agriculture, and new technologies in the developed world will be either sufficient or provide clear indication of how science and technology will be relevant to people in other cultures and contexts. Further, it is generally understood that research must be informed by the needs of people whom it aims to help, rather than being pursued solely for internal disciplinary reasons. All the researchers at the conference recognized the power and importance of paying attention to local contexts, even while utilizing international scientific research efforts and findings. But even within a conceptual framework where attention to the local is presumed to matter, there remain important issues unresolved.



Key crystallizations over the course of the two days include the following:

1) *The importance of social science needs to be bolstered:* There is still an imbalance of respect for “hard” vs. “soft” science, despite the widespread recognition of the importance of social science for assessing and shaping impacts on the ground. Including social scientists is often an afterthought to particular projects, even though such research can uncover important aspects of societal impact that researchers generally really want to know. For example, Isaac Luginah spoke of both the success of the “yogurt mama” project (which helped women produce probiotic yogurt, particularly for HIV patients) in improving health, but it was social science that documented the need for additional education efforts, as many participants in the project felt so much better with the nutritional supplement of the yogurt that they stopped taking crucial medication, believing themselves cured. Without social science to uncover such aspects of the impact of research on the ground, what appear to be success stories in the short term can turn into failures in the long term. Integrating social science into efforts like environmental impacts assessments is crucial if we want to actually assess all the important impacts of a particular activity (as Craig Janes emphasized). Further, social science can enrich our understanding of how science interacts with culture in different societies, and thus should be pursued for this reason as well.

2) *Colonial tendencies still persist:*

When donor agencies and countries come into developing world contexts, they still tend to have preconceptions about what is needed in particular locations, which bound what they are willing to do and what they are willing to fund. It is still hard to get such international actors to pay attention to local needs and priorities, whether the issue is the specifics of the research or the treatment of local research capacity. This can be egregious, in the form of the KEMRI 6, where local researchers were systematically slighted and kept from opportunities and resources reserved for developed world researchers, despite commensurate training and expertise (as Denielle Elliot discussed). This can be more subtle, where local priorities are neglected by donor agencies (in part depending on whether civil

society is seen as robust, as Gemma Oberth presented). In either case, actually respecting the expertise and insight available within a context is crucial for doing science well.



3) *New institutional models should be sought:*

While it is rarer today that researchers will presume scientific findings and technologies will automatically travel and be readily implemented (with successful positive impact) in the diverse contexts in the developing world, there is still a presumption that the social institutions of the developed world, particularly around research, should be imitated and replicated within the developing world. As the academy in the developed world experiences unprecedented strain, it is entirely unclear that the model of academic science, with scientists housed in disciplinary departments and publishing in specialist journals, is a suitable one to replicate across the developing world. Yet, if we do not perform such a replication, it will be even more difficult for the developed world to recognize the expertise that exists in the developing world (without the badges of certification, such as disciplinary PhD's and the requisite publications on CVs). Nevertheless, new collaborative forms and institutional mechanisms for supporting research and generating accountability among researchers can be pursued and experimented with in the developing world. Indeed, such efforts may discover lessons for research practices in the developed world.

4) *Collaborative and participatory research practices are crucial:*

Apparent throughout the workshop was the importance of collaborative and participatory research. Not only was it important to include natural and social scientists in projects, but it was also apparent that it

is extremely important to include local expertise (including from nonscientists) in projects. Relevant local knowledge concerns not only local physical conditions (weather conditions, plant and animal communities, seasonal variations), but also expertise regarding the local cultural practices and institutional forms that can support or thwart research efforts. The breadth of actors and locations needed to produce successful outcomes will vary, and this creates both a challenge and a tension. It is always a challenge to know how broad one must cast one's net (even using "snowball techniques", which can be overly dependent on one's starting location) in order to not leave anything crucial out. But coordination problems increase as collaborations grow (particularly when collaborations cross institutional boundaries and forms, and include both academics and citizens). At what point does addition to the collaboration detract from its effectiveness, because coordination becomes unwieldy? This practical judgment, at the heart of collaborative projects, is central to a research project's success.

5) *Institutional barriers need to be overcome:*

Throughout the two days, researchers noted barriers to doing good collaborative research in the developing world. Home institutions are leery of developing partnerships with universities in the developing world, as doing so will rarely help the home institution's perceived "standing" in a competitive academic market.



Visas for researchers from the developing world can be difficult to get. Funding agencies can be focused on disciplinary efforts (either natural science or social science or health research, but not a mix of all three), making the home for interdisciplinary research unclear. Funding agencies can also have priorities that run askew to

the interests in a particular context. Finally, lessons learned in one context often are not remembered in another (as Ross Upshur noted). Even though the local matters, some knowledge does travel across contexts well, but if we forget the "lessons learned" completely, we will not be able to note where general lessons (or methods or practices) do translate well. Because of the imbalance of resources (and power) between the developed and developing world, leaders within research communities need to identify and seek to redress institutional barriers.



The workshop made palpable:

- 1) the need for science in the interest of publics in the developing world for humanitarian and justice reasons
- 2) the presence of capacity for such research in the developing world, albeit incomplete and under-supported
- 3) the success of genuinely collaborative research efforts in the developing world, which marshal existing capacity in the developing world and in the developed world (esp. resources) and enhance capacity in the developing world (while focusing capacity in the developed world for such work)
- 4) the need for further institutional change in the developed world to make such collaborations less difficult to achieve

Pursuing this agenda will require leadership, energy, creativity, and judgment. Being strategic is obviously needed, but how in practice to create the changes needed at the institutional level remains unclear. There are resource and power imbalances that need to be addressed. But where the levers are to address them may be a matter of local strategy rather than general statement.

Most talk slides are available here:
<https://scienceinthedevelopingworld.wordpress.com/abstracts/>

*Heather Douglas, Waterloo Chair in Science and Society
 University of Waterloo*

Historical Investigations in Science: Workshop Report

The University of Calgary held an interdisciplinary workshop ‘Historical Investigations in Science’ on October 23-24, 2015. Five speakers gave presentations: John Beatty (Philosophy, University of British Columbia), Eric Desjardins (Philosophy, Western University), Paul Roth (Philosophy, University of California, Santa Cruz), Jessica Theodor (Biology, University of Calgary), and Michael Travisano (Biology, University of Minnesota).

This workshop focused on the nuanced ways that scientists and others come to understand the past.

Paul Roth discussed the relation between the philosophy of science and the philosophy of history. He focused on how differing histories of science exert an influence on how philosophers of science understand science. He suggested that philosophers of science need to better understand the nature of the historical narratives, that there can be multiple narratives for a particular episode in science, to better appreciate how their choice of historical assumptions affects their philosophies.



John Beatty (UBC) discussing his presentation

John Beatty drew on work on narratives in literary theory to explore how narratives give us an understanding of the past. A narrative, he suggested, informs us by highlighting a past branching tree of possibilities, and pointing out which path on that tree is actually taken. Eric Desjardins discussed a path dependency framework for understanding historical contingency. He highlighted how that framework has significant consequences for interventions on systems whose properties highly depend on a system’s historical path, such as ecosystems.

Jessica Theodor discussed how some historical scientists mitigate their lack of access to events in the past by the rich set of tools that palaeontologists use in the field and in comparative biology. Mike Travisano described how work in the lab can inform us about biological events in the deep past. He discussed his research using lab-reared bacteria to reveal how multicellularity might have evolved.

All in all, much was learned in this congenial and engaging workshop.

*Marc Ereshefsky
 Department of Philosophy, University of Calgary*

The Collaboration Conundrum Conference at the Reilly Center

On November 5 and 6, the Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values at the University of Notre Dame convened philosophers, scientists, and industry representatives to work toward solving the Collaboration Conundrum. These two days were devoted to answering questions of how to bring the public and industry together to do research for the common good, especially as universities find themselves relying more on industry funding to conduct their research.

The conference’s Keynote Speaker was Nicholas Ashford, PhD, Director of the Technology and Law Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, whose talk, “Industry Funding of Academic Re-

search,” argued that the changing economic climate in the United States contributed to a greater need for industry-funded research, and contributed to potential pitfalls for technological innovation. Universities receiving funding from institutions can steer the research products toward commercial needs, and according to Ashford, can jeopardize research integrity.



Keynote and Panelists (L to R) Nicholas Ashford, Kristin Shrader-Frechette, Sainath Suryanarayanan, Mary Galvin, Paul Thompson

Dr. Ashford’s talk was followed by a panel of experts who responded to his keynote and brought their own experiences: Mary Galvin, PhD, the William K. Warren Foundation Dean of the College of Science at the University of Notre Dame; Paul Thompson, PhD, the W. K. Kellogg Chair in Agricultural, Food, and Community Ethics at the Michigan State University; Sainath Suryanarayanan, PhD, of the Department of Community and Environmental Sociology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Kristin Shrader-Frechette, PhD, the O’Neill Family Professor of Philosophy and Concurrent Professor of Biological Sciences at the University of Notre Dame.

Dr. Shrader-Frechette echoed Dr. Ashford’s sentiments, urging for minimal industry influence on university research, and encouraging academics to remain skeptical of industry’s ultimate motivations for funding their research. Dr. Galvin provided the panel’s counterpoint, delivering an impassioned plea for mutual respect between academicians and industry scientists, noting that in most cases, their end goals are similar. She argued that these dilemmas often come from a lack of understanding, and urged for a reconsideration of the way these two groups talk to each other, beginning with the use of shared language. Dr. Thompson and Dr. Suryanarayanan both presented their own sci-

entific research, which relied on industry funding, but also remained critical of the motives that may sometimes come with industry funds.

The panel was followed by a lively discussion from conference participants representing different stakeholder interests, which was then followed by research presentations over the next day and a half on modified organisms (GMOs), pollution and toxic chemicals, biomedical research, agricultural practices, and animal welfare.

The conference ended with a discussion led by Kevin Elliott, PhD, conference co-chair and Associate Professor in Lyman Briggs College at Michigan State University, which established the following key points for successful collaborations between the academy and industry.

The most successful collaborations:

- Begin as early as possible; it is better to work together to spur more socially and environmentally beneficial products and methods, rather than testing, regulating, and correcting already-established products.
- Involve situations with a greater confluence of interests and good will among partners, including in epistemic matters. Presenters indicated that this problem may be remedied with adequate incentives, including government regulation.
- Include participants willing to conceptualize differently about different sorts of industries and civil society organizations. New industries, which may come from these innovative collaborations, often have very different concerns than established power industries; adaptation is necessary.
- Foster mutual trust and respect through providing enough time to establish relationships, using universally understood language, and transparency at all stages.

The Reilly Center is currently developing follow-up materials for the continued discussion of these topics.

Jessica Nickrand, Assistant Director for Research, Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values

MEMBER NOTICES

McMaster University

Ric Arthur's (Department of Philosophy) intro logic textbook *Natural Deduction* (Broadview, 2011), got a nice review in *Dialogue* by Nic Fillion and Brad Zurcher (do take a look at it if you teach logic!!). His latest book, *Leibniz*, was published by Polity Press in August 2014, and received favourable reviews in the *Leibniz Review*, the *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, and the *Time Literary Supplement*. He presented two papers at international conferences, "Spacetime in Leibniz's Analysis Situs" at the 42nd Annual Philosophy of Science Conference in Dubrovnik, Croatia, in April, and "Leibniz, Organic Matter and Astrobiology" at an international conference at the Lampeter Campus of the University of Wales in July. He is currently completing a major new interpretation of Leibniz's metaphysics, Ariadnean Threads, and has just completed a joint article with Nicholas Griffin and Jolen Galaugher, "Marginalia in Russell's Copy of Gerhardt's edition of Leibniz's *Philosophische Schriften*" (103 pp), which has been accepted for the journal *Russell*. Together with an edition of Russell's notes on Leibniz in preparation for his lectures, and Moore's notes on Russell's lectures, edited by the same three, it will form one complete issue of the journal. For 2016 Arthur has been invited to lecture on Leibniz in Tokyo and to take part in a workshop on early European atomism in Toyama (February), to lecture and research on seventeenth century mathematics in Paris (May), and on Leibniz and the sciences in Leipzig (November), and has co-organized a session on the Law of Continuity at the Leibniz Kongress in Hanover (July).

Michigan State University

Isaac Record, formerly at the University of Toronto, is now an Academic Specialist at Michigan State University, where he teaches Technology and Culture, Introduction to HPS, and Wearables and Wellness. He also advises a student group dedicated to Making in the Humanities and is currently planning a summer course for international students on Making the Future.

Queen's University

Members who have enjoyed the works of Michel Morange, Matthew Cobb and Michael Ruse, may, despite its forbidding title, like the third edition of *Evolutionary Bioinformatics* (Springer 2016) by *Donald Forsdyke*. Chock full of history – based on his works on William Bateson, George Romanes and Samuel Butler – plus some philosophical splashes that include Wittgenstein, the new edition has an expanded section on brain informatics, and is backed by online videos for high school students and others new to the field. The previous edition may be viewed at: <http://post.queensu.ca/~forsdyke/book05.htm>

Université de Montréal

Frédéric Bouchard (Département de philosophie, & CIRST) poursuit toujours ses recherches en philosophie de la biologie et en philosophie des sciences, mais ses fonctions administratives ont changé de formes. Depuis novembre Frédéric est vice-recteur associé à la recherche, à la découverte, à la création et à l'innovation à l'Université de Montréal, dans une nouvelle structure de trio à la direction au vice-rectorat. Cette nouvelle fonction a malheureusement forcé Frédéric à abandonner la direction du CIRST (Centre interuniversitaire de recherche sur la science et la technologie), mais nous avons la chance que le philosophe de l'UQAM Mathieu Marion ait accepté d'assurer la relève.

Yvon Gauthier (Department of Philosophy) announces the publication of his latest book *Towards an Arithmetical Logic. Arithmetical Foundations of Logic*, Birkhäuser/Springer, 2015. The book is intended as a foundational constructivist framework not only for logic, but also for mathematics and physics. Constructivist foundations rest here on the Fermat-Kronecker (F-K) arithmetic with infinite descent and homogeneous polynomials for which an internal consistency proof is provided. Professor Gauthier is also working on a new book in French, *Nouveaux Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes. Cosmologie sauvage pour profanes*, an essay in cosmology after the manner of Fontenelle's 1686 *Entretiens sur la pluralité des mondes*, with an update on contemporary cosmology for a large audience.

Université du Québec à Montréal

Vincent Guillin (Philosophie, & CIRST) a présenté une communication intitulée «The Normative Structure of Science and the Moral Regulation of Scientists» au DEMOCRASCI - Values in Science Workshop qui s'est déroulé les 3 et 4 décembre 2015, à l'Université de Durham (Grande-Bretagne). Vincent a aussi récemment publié plusieurs contributions: «Études Milliennes», *Revue européenne des sciences sociales*, 2015, 53:2, p.245-258; «“Descartes à travers mes âges”». Retour sur quelques lectures cartésiennes de Canguilhem», *Revue de métaphysique et de morale*, 2015, 3, 307-237; «The Rule of Sociological Method: Auguste Comte's Positive Politics before the Système de Politique Positive», in K. N. Demetriou & A. Loizides (eds.), *Scientific Statesmanship, Governance, and the History of Political Philosophy*, New York: Routledge, 226-41.

Christophe Malaterre (Philosophie, & CIRST) vient de se voir attribuer la Chaire de Recherche du Canada en Philosophie des sciences de la vie, dont le programme consiste en un ensemble d'études philosophiques du concept d' "évolution chimique". Ce concept, qui fait l'objet de nombreuses controverses, est mobilisé en science pour expliquer l'évolution de "matière inerte" en "matière vivante" sur la Terre primitive, avant l'apparition de l'évolution biologique darwinienne. L'objectif est d'entreprendre des analyses historiques, conceptuelles et critiques de l' "évolution chimique" afin d'en éclairer les débats, de clarifier ses multiples acceptions en science et de contribuer ainsi à une meilleure compréhension des tout premiers mécanismes évolutifs conduisant à la vie. Christophe Malaterre vient aussi de publier, en collaboration avec P.-A. Braillard, un volume collectif intitulé *Explanation in Biology. An Enquiry into the Diversity of Explanatory Patterns in the Life Sciences*, Springer (2015)

University of Alberta

Robert Smith (Department of History and Classics) has been co-editing (with Kathleen Lowrey) a special issue of *Victorian Review* on Alfred Russel Wallace, to which he is also contributing a paper on "Alfred Russel Wallace, Extra-Terrestrials, Mars and the Nature of the Universe," and he is looking forward to teaching in Winter Term 2016 a senior undergraduate seminar on

the history of the extra-terrestrial life debate. The 2013 lectures that formed the starting points for the Wallace volume can be viewed at <http://www.historyandclassics.ualberta.ca/Videos.aspx>. Robert's *Hubble Cosmos* (co-authored with David DeVorkin) was published in October by National Geographic.

University of British Columbia

Margaret Schabas (Philosophy Professor, UBC-Vancouver), received a UBC Killam Research award this past year. She also gave an invited lecture at the University of Aarhus (March 2015) and the keynote address to the Australian Society for the History of Economic Thought (July 2015). In the coming spring she will give invited talks at the University of Arizona and the University of San Francisco, as well as present a paper at the American Social Sciences Association annual meetings and another at the American Philosophical Association-Pacific Division annual meetings. She has recently published three articles, on Mandeville, Hume, and J.S. Mill. See her website for more details.

University of California, Santa Barbara

Henry Trim: First, I won the Social Science and Humanities Postdoctoral lottery. I am now a postdoctoral fellow at the the University of California, Santa Barbara. My postdoctoral research examines how Canadian and American environmentalists mobilized calculations of systemic risk to challenge energy policy and to pioneer sustainability in the 1970s. Second, and perhaps of greater interest to readers, I published "Planning the Future: The Conserver Society and Canadian Sustainability" in the *Canadian Historical Review*, vol.93, no.3 (Sep. 2015). My article examines the the Science Council of Canada's important role in creating Canada's first sustainable development programs.

University of Chicago

Greg Lusk (Post-doctoral Scholar, Department of Philosophy) successfully defended his dissertation, *Quantifying Nature: Epistemology for Climate Science*, in September. He spent the spring and summer semesters as an Honorary Fellow in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin Madison. Since defending, Greg has taken up a Postdoctoral Scholar posi-

tion at the University of Chicago in the Department of Philosophy and the Franke Institute for the Humanities. His paper “Computer Simulation and the Features of Novel Empirical Evidence” is forthcoming in *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*.

University of Guelph

Sofie Lachapelle's (History Department) monograph *Conjuring Science: A History of Scientific Entertainment and Stage Magic in Modern France* has just been published with Palgrave Macmillan. In July, Lachapelle received a Library Research Grant from the Getty Research Institute to study the colonial board games in their collection. In the past year, Lachapelle has also co-presented papers with musicologist Kimberly Francis on early laryngology and French Opera training at both the Society for French Historical Studies and the North American Conference on Nineteenth-Century Music.

Brooke Struck successfully defended his PhD in philosophy at the University of Guelph this past September. His thesis examined the relationship between Ernst Cassirer and Structural Scientific Realism, exploring the impact of Cassirer's arguments on the realist-empiricist dispute as a whole. With paperwork in hand and extra letters in tow, he is currently grazing in greener pastures, having transitioned to working in science policy analysis in the private sector, at Science-Metrix in Montreal. He also did a stint at Environment Canada, which was characterized by brevity and disruptiveness (the productive kind).

University of Pittsburgh

Agnes Bolinska: Last summer, I gave talks at CSHPS in Ottawa and the Society for the Philosophy of Science in Practice in Aarhus, Denmark. In September I began a postdoctoral fellowship at the Center for Philosophy of Science at the University of Pittsburgh. My paper “Successful visual epistemic representation” was recently accepted for publication in *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*.

University of Toronto

In 2015, *Joseph Berkovitz* (Philosophy Department & IHPST) co-edited with Philippe Huneman a special

issue on probability in biology and physics, which is forthcoming in *Erkenntnis* in December 2015. He also completed a paper on the propensity interpretation of probability, which is forthcoming in the same issue. Part of this paper was presented at the School of Advanced Study, University of London and the University of Lisbon. Joseph continued his work on Bruno de Finetti's philosophy of probability and presented this research at the Serious Metaphysics Group, Dept. of Philosophy, University of Cambridge, the Munich Center for Mathematical Philosophy, Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, and the 42nd Dubrovnik Philosophy of Science conference. He also continued to work on the mathematical explanations of physical facts and presented this work at the University of Lisbon.

Lucia Dacome (IHPST) presented her work at the conferences: “Vesalius and the Languages of Anatomy” at Duke University; Scientiae: “Disciplines of Knowing in the Early Modern World” at Victoria College, the University of Toronto; “Knowledge Transfer and Cultural Exchanges” at the University of Lisbon; and “Mediterranean Under Quarantine” at the University of Malta in Valletta. She completed her manuscript on *Malleable Anatomies*, which is forthcoming at Oxford University Press, a short article titled “A Crystal model”, which is forthcoming in Nick Hopwood, Rebecca Flemming, and Lauren Kassell (eds.) *Reproduction: Antiquity to the Present* (Cambridge University Press), and reviewed Sachiko Kusukawa's book *Picturing the Book of Nature*. She has started working on new projects that consider the relationship between locality and mobility in the eighteenth-century Mediterranean world, for which she carried out research in Bologna, Milan, Patras, and Valletta.

John Percy (Astronomy & Astrophysics) has recently published: “International Year of Astronomy 2009: Bringing Galileo to the World”, in a book of the same title (but based on a conference on Galileo: Science, Faith, and the Arts), ed. Domenico Pietropaolo, LEGAS (2015), 203-214; “Joseph Miller Barr Revisited”, in *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of Canada*, 109, 270-271 (2015) – Barr was a remarkable but enigmatic amateur astronomer from St. Catharines ON who, despite disability or chronic disease, published research papers which rivalled Einstein's in their citation rate. At a one-day symposium on June 13, 2015, in Rich-

mond Hill ON, marking the 80th anniversary of the David Dunlap Observatory, John gave an invited presentation on “Dunlap Observatory: The Pre-History”.

Paul Thompson has a recent book, *A Remarkable Journey: The Story of Evolution* (Reaktion Books). The University of Chicago Press is the North American distributor (<http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/author/T/R/au20174462.html>).

University of Western Ontario

Yann Benétreau-Dupin (Rotman Institute) recently graduated from his PhD program in Philosophy at Western, after he defended his thesis entitled “Probabilistic Reasoning in Cosmology” this past September 21. His thesis was supervised by Chris Smeenk.

Virginia Commonwealth University in Qatar

Jörg Matthias Determann (Assistant Professor of History) has published a book entitled *Researching Biology and Evolution in the Gulf States: Networks of Science in the Middle East* (London: I.B.Tauris, 2015).

York University

Eleanor Louson (Science & Technology Studies) presented her research on wildlife filmmakers, authenticity, storytelling, and science consulting at a whopping 5 conferences between March and July: Society for Cinema & Media Studies Conference in Montreal; “Faking It:” Counterfeits, Copies, and Uncertain Truths in Science, Technology, and Medicine Conference at CSTMS, UC Berkeley; CSHPS, University of Ottawa; Stories About Science: Exploring Science Communication and Entertainment Media Symposium, University of Manchester; and ISHPSSB, at UQAM.

Reminders from the Website & Listserv Manager

Members can share event announcements and other items of interest on our website, www.yorku.ca/cshps1, or via our members-only email listserv.

For the listserv, please send items to cshps@yorku.ca using the email you used to register for CSHPS.

Please note that replies to listserv messages are directed to the original sender. To reply to the entire list, please send your email to cshps@yorku.ca. To update or remove your email address, please email isaac.record@gmail.com.

For the website, please send items to isaac.record@gmail.com. To report problems with the website, please click “contact webmaster” on any page.

To join CSHPS, please visit <http://www.yorku.ca/cshps1> and click “Join.”



We look forward to seeing you in Calgary and Edmonton at our CSHPS conferences / Nous avons hâte de vous accueillir à Calgary et Edmonton pour nos congrès SCHPS.

GSHPs/SGHPs
STS Program
Division of Natural Science
Bethune College, Room 218
York University
Toronto ON M3J 1P3
Canada