In the early New Year of 2017, student groups at Princeton and MIT asked faculty, staff, students, and university affiliates to suspend normal activities on March 8 and April 18, respectively. Organizers asked university communities to participate in inclusive, intensive dialogue about urgent matters of social, political, economic, and environmental concerns. Self-consciously modeled on the 1969 March 4th movement, which started at MIT before spreading across university campuses, event organizers proposed a work stoppage as both a symbolic and practical occasion to renew the communities’ commitments to civic engagement. Organizers asked members of the Princeton and MIT communities to host and participate in dynamic and open fora organized around the themes of human dignity, promoting critical awareness of government policy, and the ways in which university expertise and research may be used to address pressing social, economic, and environmental issues. Both events earned impressive support, with dozens of teach-ins, workshops, and other events, as well as hundreds of attendees, an excess of one thousand supporting signatures, and healthy press coverage, including an article in the Washington Post.

At Princeton, following a suggestion forwarded by Professor D. Graham Burnett, the participants of the History of Science (HOS) Program Seminar hosted a knowledge fair under the banner, “Understanding Science and Anti-Science.” Occupying a public throughway in the First Student Center, presenters activated some aspect of their research as a gambit for drawing passersby into spontaneous, informal conversations about knowledge production and its contexts and implications, both positive and negative.

Continued on Page 2
Days of Engagement and Action, cont.

The encounters, which threatened public awkwardness and tasked presenters with the cunning of conversational salesmanship, were meant to be more dialogical and mutual than strictly didactic. The ambition was not simply to impart information but to prompt interactions that would provoke unexpected conversational spaces or ask members of the history of science community to approach their subject matter and methods afresh. Both faculty members and graduate students from History and HOS hosted tables bedecked with videos, games, provocations and other lures. Others acted as carnival barkers, enticing onlookers to pass the threshold from bystander to fair-goer. On the whole, the event was well attended by friends, colleagues, and, most of all, perfect strangers.

Over a period of four hours, twelve presenters took turns engaging fair-goers. David Dunning, a graduate student in HOS and among the first presenters of the day, attracted interlocutors with a placard asking, “Is counting political?” David used images from New Math textbooks to spark conversation about the politics of grade-school pedagogy, even of something as seemingly benign as elementary arithmetic.

Taylor Zajicek, a graduate student in history, shared a slide show about his research on seismology and earthquakes in nineteenth-century Russian-controlled Turkestan. Taylor asked his visitors to question the supposed naturalness of natural disasters that, while perhaps a convenient refrain for political leaders, elides the ways in which environmental and social vulnerabilities hang on a range of human decisions and changes in the physical landscape.

Richard Spiegel, a graduate student in HOS, asked participants to join him in a comparative graphic analysis of two images of telescopes from the seventeenth century to consider how different forms of visual description imply different hierarchies of labor in research.

Anthony (Tony) Grafton, faculty in History and associated with the HOS program, sat behind a sign that read, “Anti-Science (then and now).” His neighbor, Charles Kollmer, a graduate student in HOS, overheard Tony draw in conversation with the alluring provocation, “Science, what’s there not to like?” Next to Tony, Charles engrossed faculty, graduate students and undergraduates using a presentation on how heredity has been deployed in scientific and political contexts. Discussing how eugenics and genetics parted ways in the middle of the twentieth century, Charles suggested how ideas about heredity continue to serve political functions, in, for instance, justifying inequality.

On the theme of internationalism in science, Emily Kern, a graduate student in HOS, hosted "Continued on Page 3"
conversations about how proposals for visa and immigration restrictions impact scientific activity.

Michael Gordin, a faculty member in HOS, asked participants to choose between three objects: a bottle of vodka, a statuette of Krishna, and a pack of Zener cards. Choosing one of the objects prompted a conversation about, respectively, science advice and the state (with reference to Dmitrii Mendeleev and the Russian vodka monopoly), the Manhattan Project (with reference to J.R. Oppenheimer’s “shatterer of worlds” comment), or the demarcation problem (with reference to ESP testing).

Sitting nearby with an impressively constructed, interactive poster board, Caitlin Harvey, a graduate student in history, asked her participants to play a game about the concept of “limits to growth.” Caitlin’s game led players to think about different examples of when individuals have proposed ecological limits to demographic or economic expansion.

Keith Wailoo, a faculty member in HOS and the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, used a PowerPoint presentation about the long history of opioid and drug abuse to place the recent rise of opioid- and heroin-related deaths in historical perspective. Looking at the economic, political, and social contexts of drug use Keith revealed patterns in how drug “epidemics” begin, the ways they are managed, and how they end.

Similar to Keith, Felix Rietmann, a graduate student in HOS, asked passersby to think about how historically contextualized thinking shapes our understanding of contemporary issues. Taking three examples from the history of child care—the use of psychotropic drugs (amphetamines) in children, advice concerning the virtues and vices of thumb sucking, and the diagnosis and assessment of autism—Felix discussed how thinking historically can serve the ways we address problems that are both medical and political.

Jenne O’Brien, a graduate student in HOS, presented on Albrecht Dürer’s treatises on
geometry and human proportions. Setting Dürer’s work in the context of Reformation iconoclasm, Jenne asked her participants to question whether we might think of Dürer’s work as “propaganda” and whether we should think of Dürer’s work as a justified or unjustified political repurposing of mathematical knowledge.

Katja Guenther, faculty in HOS, compared Cesare Lombroso’s criminal anthropology with “Neuroprediction of future rearrest” to demonstrate the ways in which studies of the human body inform legal and governmental practices. Katja used both cases to consider how scientific work has served to muddy the line between culpability and innocence.

All in all, the range of presentations, and a fluid cycle of fair goers passing through, ensured numerous generative conversations. Emily Kern remarked with surprise on “how good the Day of Action was for making friends with grad students in the sciences who didn’t even know HOS existed.” Charles Kollmer noted that it was refreshing to try and straightforwardly address weighty problems with non-specialists in HOS. And Keith Wailloo shared a moment in which, after his presentation on the sometimes-alarming patterns in the history of drug epidemics, he was asked the simple but striking question, “doesn’t this make you angry?” The question was a disarming reminder of how disciplinary practices can sometimes obscure one’s affective relationship with his or her subject matter.

In addition to the knowledge fair, Princeton History of Science ran a special session of Program Seminar on March 8 aimed at engaging the wider university community. The session attracted over 50 attendees, making for rather tight quarters and even spilling into an anteroom. The discussion was adroitly moderated by D. Graham Burnett, who after asking the day’s presenters to reprise their material, opened a general discussion about what historians of science do and how they use their craft to understand knowledge production, knowledge claims, and their manifold entanglements of society, politics and science.

For students in the History, Anthropology, Science, Technology, and Society (HASTS) program, the MIT Day of Engagement and Action was a time to talk more about what exactly HASTS does, realizing that many fellow colleagues might not even know how the humanities and social sciences fit into MIT as an institution. Students set up in the lobby of a central building on campus, positioned to interact with people walking in and out of different sessions being held in surrounding classrooms. Styling the table as a “Science and Society Carnival,” many students found the “carnavalesque” a surprisingly adaptable theme for their ends. Students handed out carnival food like popcorn and candy, but also used the food as an opportunity to start conversations about the role of scientific research in forming policies and practices around the environment and food production. It was an interesting, and, we hope, instructive exercise in irony, to hand out candy hand-in-hand with an op-ed from HASTS alum David Singerman about the history of sugar research in the United States. HASTS students Michelle Spektor and Erik Stayton took a creative spin on the carnival theme by using a mask-making activity to think about identification. In addition to a mask, passersby could also take facts, tips, and fortunes discussing surveillance, cybersecurity, privacy, and biometrics.

The day of action was a relevant time to revisit MIT’s history and scrutinize anew the funding structure of research. The politics of research funding is not a new theme in MIT’s history; for example, the March 4, 1969 “day of reflection” mentioned earlier urged serious re-examination of military-driven research at MIT and MIT-affiliated “special laboratories.” HASTS students Rodrigo Ochigame, Nadia Christidi, and Richard Fadok highlighted this part of MIT’s history with an art installation and handouts. Titled simply “Drone,” the art installation combined words, images, and sound to prompt reflection.
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on connections between artificial intelligence and robotics research and its military uses. Passersby could also take a bookmark that outlined a timeline, from 1862 to 2017, of funding history at MIT. Current faculty and students were invited to situate themselves in this history by thinking about questions like, “how is my laboratory/department/fellowship funded? Is the funding corporate? federal? philanthropic? How does this system of funding affect my day-to-day experience in the laboratory? Who benefits from my research? What are the implications of my work?”

The urgency of such questions is increasingly complicated by the challenge of maintaining a critical and interrogative orientation towards science and technology in a political situation where several major funding agencies are being cut at the federal level. The question of what kinds of research are worth supporting is underlined by the increasing ambivalence in current politics about science and truth claims. With this in mind, HASTS students Ellie Immerman and Claire Webb put together an interactive poster that displayed different examples of science and pseudoscience. Framed theoretically by brief introductions to Popper, Fleck, Merton, and Mulkay, the poster presented a wide range of historical case studies involving ruptures of knowledge, from 15th century astrology to phrenology and neuroimaging. Passersby could also learn more about citizen science and Public Lab, an organization co-founded by HASTS alum Sara Wylie that facilitates DIY air, water, and land testing through open source and collaborative data practices. Looking at Public Lab’s methods offered a way to think through the conjunction of environmental justice and data justice, and what it means to build up a public capacity for expertise and critique.

In addition to student-led Science and Society Carnival, HASTS faculty led various presentations that drew audiences that might not typically sit in a history, anthropology, or STS class. Members of the history faculty spoke about crisis and resistance in “illiberal democracies” across the globe, and anthropology faculty also hosted a session on the continuing legacy of eugenics. Beyond the day of action, HASTS faculty and students have been holding meetings organized around variously themed “micro-talks” that address how the roles of scholar and citizen are intersecting in newly challenging ways. Topics so far have included twitter and political speech, immigration and law, data concerns, gender and race in coal country, environmental justice, class politics and economic inequality, and academic research funding cuts. The day of action was an opportunity to extend some of this ongoing internal dialogue outwards. The process of planning the day of action encouraged everyone involved to think more deeply about how a program like HASTS is equipped to provide conscientious critique within MIT as an institution, and how the questions that drive our research translate into broader dialogues beyond our own fieldsites, archives, and day-to-day lives. The hope is that visitors to the day of action left with new tools and resources for thinking about science and society and for evaluating debates about science occurring around us today.

Our thanks go to the organizers of the Princeton Day of Action and the MIT Day of Engagement and Action for their vision and superb execution, and to all of those who participated in the events of March 8 and April 18. Thanks to the History, Anthropology, and STS departments for enthusiastically supporting the MIT Day of Action. Thanks, too, to the members of the organizing committee for the Princeton History of Science Knowledge Fair, Megan Baumhammer, D. Graham Burnett, Caitlin Harvey, and Felix Rietmann, as well as Coralie Lamotte and Felice Physioc for their help with making posters.
The study of the human material past has not received as much attention from historians of science and science studies scholars as has natural history. But recent work within the history of archaeology and related fields suggests that science studies would strongly benefit from a more genuine engagement with the recent “material turn” in relation to the study of collecting, and of the ancient past. Not easily classified as “scientific” or “humanities” approaches, the material practices of studying the human past escape a problematization along the traditional lines of disciplinary distinctions that have dominated 20th-century historiography. Engagement with these practices raises questions regarding the reliance on historical methods such as archival research, and on empirical methods, e.g. anthropological field-work and oral histories, as well as the integration of scientifically produced data with historical modes of inquiry.

As part of this emerging conversation, a workshop hosted by the Unit for History and Philosophy of Science at Sydney University in October 2016 brought together participants from archaeology and science studies, archivists and museum curators. The workshop built upon recent work by the conveners, Daniela Helbig (Sydney) in conjunction with Mirjam Brusius (Oxford), and benefited greatly from the participation of distinguished local scholars such as art historian Kitty Hauser, who has written extensively on aerial photography and archaeology, archaeologist Roland Fletcher, head of the Sydney Angkor project remapping the site of Angkor through laser-based surveillance technologies, archivist, curator and historian of science Katrina Dean (University Archives Melbourne/University Library Cambridge), historian of science and museum studies scholar Roy MacLeod, and historian of medicine Warwick Anderson who has insisted on the pertinence of the materiality of objects in current debates about objectivity.

One focus of the workshop was the changing role of remote-sensing technologies in archaeology,
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from aerial photography around the First World War to LIDAR (Light Detection and Ranging), a laser-based mapping of ground features that has recently begun to be used by archaeologists. In those studies, the archaeologist’s primary object is a complex construction rather different from the excavated objects often associated with archaeological practice: a photograph, or a computer-generated visualization of ground features. The production of these epistemic image-objects involves aesthetic choices in the service of a broader argument, embodied in the resulting object itself. In contrast to the frequent association of 1930s aerial photography with a positivist image of a past to be literally uncovered, the relation between remote sensing data, excavated or otherwise collected artifacts, and other types of evidence in present-day archaeology offers rich examples of how scientific and hermeneutic-historical styles of argument interact.

The relation between the production of scientific objects and archaeological artifacts also informed the workshop’s second focal theme: the role of material artifacts in the context of heritage and preservation practices, in an Australian, and in a European and Middle Eastern geographical setting. Mirjam Brusius emphasized the diversity of practices of studying, curating, preserving and sometimes burying objects, and the connections

Photographic plate from Antoine Poidebard’s 1934 book *La Trace de Rome dans le désert de Syrie*, showing the Harbaqa dam in present-day Syria. Combining military aerial surveillance technologies with archaeology, Poidebard’s aerial photographs are both a unique archive of the Syrian steppe, and artifacts documenting its colonial history. In the political context of the French Mandate to Syria and Lebanon, Poidebard’s visual technology reconstructed notions of space, and took part in the formation of political identities.
between the preservation of objects and self-preservation. Going beyond normative narratives of archaeology and “heritage,” constructs that emerged out of imperial projects in the 19th and 20th centuries, her contribution questioned approaches that solely rely on institutionalized scholarship and Western ideals of modernity and progress. In her paper on the Australian naturalists Harriet and Helena Scott, Vanessa Finney, Manager of Archives at the Australian museum, problematized the active role of archivists in knowledge storage and retrieval, evoking further questions which also concern the institutions’ role in perpetuating or undermining colonial legacies.

The investigation of these practices served as a reminder that knowledge about the past is in itself a construct, highly determined by the technologies and scholarly practices put into play. Historians of science should not shy away from these topics; they could in fact make this point strongly. At the same time the field could benefit from a deeper engagement with the material past. As Warwick Anderson pointed out in his concluding comments, the questions raised during the workshop lend themselves to a variety of theorizations, some of which have been prefigured by histories of scientific field work; others open up new perspectives for science studies too. To conclude with one example, the various modes of sacralization of the object, and its moral economies of exchange have long been discussed extensively with regard to traditional archaeological artifacts. Archaeology’s new image-objects connect this emphasis with epistemically oriented analyses of scientific objectivity and research on visualization and photography, which has increasingly gained currency in the field. The archaeology of knowledge, in a Foucaultian sense, has more layers to be uncovered. We are planning to continue the discussion in the context of upcoming HSS meetings and are keen to hear from scholars interested in those questions.

A longer version of this report will be submitted to the journal *History and Technology*.

**Further reading:**

DePauw Hosts First Undergraduate Research Conference on Science, Technology, Medicine and Society

by Nahyan Fancy

Between March 10 and March 12, 2017, DePauw University (Greencastle, Indiana) welcomed ten students from across the country to present their engaging work on topics as diverse as debates in the Early American Republic over science and religion, to ethical concerns raised by cyberattacks such as Stuxnet—the computer worm that attacked Iranian nuclear enrichment centrifuges. The theme for this first, (and it is hoped, annual) undergraduate conference on Science, Technology, Medicine and Society was “Transcending Disciplinary, Temporal and Regional Boundaries.” We received approximately three dozen submissions from institutions across the United States, including Gonzaga, Arizona State, Notre Dame, Princeton, Rutgers and Wesleyan. Many of the submissions were from students enrolled in traditional disciplinary programs (e.g. Biochemistry, History, Mathematics), but who were introduced to history of science, philosophy of science, STS and/or history of medicine in courses outside of their majors and/or in the process of pursuing research for their senior theses. The conference thus was an excellent way to introduce these students to the exciting work being done in these fields by engaging with each other’s papers, and through conversations with faculty discussants and our keynote speaker, the distinguished historian of science and medicine, Monica Green (Arizona State University).

The eleven selected papers were broken up into three panels (unfortunately, one participant had to withdraw due to a medical emergency). The first panel on Saturday morning was on “Science, Religion and Ethics.” The Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Anne Harris, a medieval Art Historian with a strong scholarly interest in the Trotula texts and medieval women’s health. Midori Kawaue (DePauw) next presented work from her History senior thesis, which examines the relationship between Edward Hitchcock, the early American geologist, and his uncle, Epaphras Hoyt, using the latter’s newly-discovered notebooks. Kawaue highlighted the role played by natural theology and Scottish common-sense philosophy in the work of Hoyt and Hitchcock. Annica Balentine (Gonzaga) presented her preliminary findings on the gender biases implicit within OB/GYN textbooks that
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minimize the risks of contraceptive techniques for women while validating similar risks in the case of men. Aura Ochoa (Wesleyan) concluded the session by analyzing how women of color were used as experimental subjects for various invasive, reproductive techniques throughout the twentieth century. Her paper raised important questions on the ethics of experimental research, and how scientific racialization of pain helped erase the bodies and experiences of women of color from the dominant narratives of scientific progress. The discussant, Jeffrey Dunn (Philosophy, DePauw), responded to each of the papers and guided the students and audience in an energetic discussion on the nature of scientific research, the ethics of data collection and its use, and the social situatedness of science and its implications for our current political climate. The discussion got contentious at times, which was as much a testament to the diverse faculty and student perspectives present in the room as to the quality of the individual student presentations.

The second panel on Saturday afternoon was on “Science and Gender.” Alida Roorda (DePauw) presented work from her senior seminar paper analyzing medical debates at the turn of the twentieth century in Britain over women’s cycling. Julia Erdlen (Notre Dame) highlighted some preliminary findings on gender inequality in Nobel Prize distribution based on datasets that are now digitally available. Marisa Lucht (Notre Dame) complemented both presentations by examining the various factors that led to the disengagement of women from Computer Science after having been much more represented at the onset of computing. As the discussant, Tamara Beauboeuf (Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies, DePauw) pushed the students and audience to consider how social contexts, cultural expectations, ideologies and politics mutually inform science and scientists, she also encouraged students to reflect on how they may have overcome gender and/or racial biases and discrimination in their own lives, and how that has impacted their scholarly endeavors in terms of research questions, approaches, goals, etc.

Saturday’s events concluded with Monica Green’s keynote, “Bringing Disciplines, Eras, and Continents Together: Stories from the History of Medicine.” Green showed how in the process of constructing her courses, and in anticipating questions from her undergraduate students, she was led to expand her textual, theoretical, disciplinary and geographical scope over a long and productive career—one that started by examining the  *Trotula* texts and gynecological medicine in a small region of the Italian peninsula and has expanded now to incorporate the study of global pandemics, especially the Black Death, across Eurasia using tools from modern genomics, bioarchaeology, climate science and traditional history of medicine. Green encouraged students to continue to probe and ask questions, utilize what the various disciplines have to offer (their tools, methodologies and perspectives), and to think broadly across regions and time periods to gain a better understanding of contemporary public health concerns, such as Ebola or Zika.

The final panel on Sunday morning was on “Contemporary Issues.” Kaiyan Cai (Columbia/DePauw) presented her research on developing a statistical method with her Mathematics advisor for ranking US states on their release of recent toxic chemicals (based on data available through the EPA). Sarah Kang (Wesleyan University) presented her senior thesis work on the food choices that certain families are forced to make due to poverty. Her work was grounded in an ethnographic study of customers who shop for food items at the *Dollar Store*. She situated her study within the larger political machinations that permit the sale of foods with adverse health effects from which various industries profit. Eric Layne (Notre Dame) pushed the audience to engage with the tremendous ethical issues confronting cyberwarfare in an age when computer worms and viruses (e.g. Stuxnet) can damage physical structures (e.g. Iranian
nuclear enrichment centrifuges) across the globe. Finally, Christina Wells (Notre Dame) examined the scientific studies conducted by Glaxo Smith-Kline on a drug for adolescent depression, for which the company was later sued. Her presentation highlighted significant issues in how research findings are shared in for-profit corporate settings, the problem of pharmaceutical companies colluding with outside researchers to use their names for publication, and how pharmaceutical companies find ways to bypass FDA approval for contentious drugs. The conference ended with a discussion of these papers, led by Glen Kuecker (History & Urban Studies, DePauw), who built upon the discussion from the keynote and instilled in students the importance of research in an era of destabilized knowledge and the politicization of science.

In conclusion, as the post-conference surveys confirmed, the conference accomplished its goals of bringing together talented students working on topics from across the history of science and STS in order to learn from each other, receive valuable feedback on their work, and to instill in them the confidence to continue working on their projects, each of which can make valuable contributions to the contemporary public and scholarly discourse on science, technology and medicine in society.

Funding for the conference was provided by DePauw University, through the Asher Fund in Social Sciences, the Prindle Institute of Ethics and the Office of Academic Affairs. The conference is set to take place again next year at DePauw University, in Spring 2018. The call for papers will be circulated in the Fall and made available at the History of Science Society's meeting in Toronto. The keynote speaker for next year's conference will be Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra (University of Texas, Austin).

Teaching and Advising in Feminist Scholarship:
Why the Bra Makes Me Think that We Still Have a Long Way to Go
by Maria Rentetzi, Associate Professor, History and Sociology of Science and Technology, National Technical University of Athens, Greece

Although I am known for my work on the history of the natural sciences and gender, sometimes I like to escape from the “hard sciences” to work on the history of technology. As a friend once told me, this is something I do for my soul. I explored Greece’s historical passage from East to West at the turn of the 20th century by focusing on women’s hats as technologically sophisticated artifacts. I investigated the story of paper boxes as a way to talk about gender differences in the paper box industry during the interwar years and the rise of consumerism in the US. I studied the history of tobacco technologies in Greece through the gendered hierarchies in the tobacco warehouses of the early 1920s. I teach regularly an undergraduate course on gender and technology and introduced the field to my Greek students through my book The Technology of Gender and the Gender of Technology.

Not long ago, I was interviewed by a reporter for one of Greece’s most widely circulated newspapers. I wasn’t quite ready to believe its editor when he claimed that reader interest had pushed gender issues to the top of his agenda. Who, after all, cares about gender and technology today? The feeling that the topic is outdated is why I had changed the focus of my undergraduate course in the first place. Until recently, I was convinced that the basics, at least, were in place. Women continue to be underrepresented in engineering, discouraged from engaging in technological design, portrayed as unskilled users of technological systems, and exploited as industrial workers. Furthermore, historians of technology have been telling us that...
besides airplanes and spacecrafts, the kitchen and even the vibrator speak volumes about the socioeconomic contours of our everyday lives and our technological choices. What else could we ask for? Little did I know that a brassiere would shatter this tidy picture of progress.

Last semester, one of my graduate students, an enthusiastic young woman, began working on the history of the brassiere in Greece. Without doubt, the brassiere is a multi-layered artifact: made with the male gaze in mind, it is also a symbol of the feminist movement, a fashion-statement, a sign and reminder of female sexual pleasure, a passage to womanhood. It also serves as a mirror for cultural differences: Kaliroi Paren, the editor of the Ladies’ Newspaper in Greece, urged women almost a century ago to wear their bras throughout the day for comfort, while the US fashion industry favored boyish, androgynous looks.

But as a fashion accessory, today the bra is also a product of a multibillion-dollar industry controlled by multinational corporations. Its production is a highly specialized enterprise. It entails patenting, multiple designs, pattern cutting, sewing, and an exhaustive process of selecting fabrics and wires. According to Jane Farrell-Beck, author of *Uplift: The Bra in America,* "a bra design can pose engineering challenges as formidable as those encountered in building a bridge or a skyscraper."1 If historians of technology have looked closely at bridges and skyscrapers, why not brassieres?

The director of the interdepartmental MA program on History and Philosophy of Science and Technology in Athens, Greece, was not convinced.2 According to our program rules at the time, students ought first submit for approval the topic of their MA thesis before they actually invest time and effort on it. The director then passes the document to the administration without any further formalities and the student is ready to begin. There was no formal committee to decide on the appropriateness of topics since the supervisor is responsible for the entire academic process. Obviously, this holds in the case of skyscrapers and bridges but not brassieres.

When my student suggested working on the “The history of the brassieres in Greece” the director claimed that as a topic it was far too restricted for the program, adding during an informal discussion that the topic is not “serious enough.” The student was advised to submit a different topic. The issue remained for some time under consideration, trapped in a transition period of changing program directors. Finally, the topic was accepted, which led to the establishment of new institutional rules that now allow tighter control of MA topic assignments.

Suddenly it became clear to me that I needed to return to gender and technology. Maybe the magazine’s editor was right after all. Issues of gender remain at the top of our agendas because we still have a long way to go in this country, and perhaps elsewhere too.

Maria Rentetzi
Associate Professor
History and Sociology of Science and Technology
National Technical University of Athens, Greece
http://mariarentetzi.weebly.com/

---


2 The MA program has been running since 1996, in co-operation with the Division of Humanities, Social Sciences, and Law of the School of Applied Mathematical and Physical Sciences of the National Technical University of Athens (N.T.U.A.) and the Department of Methodology, History, and Theory of Sciences, of the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. [http://en.phs.uoa.gr/graduate-studies/graduate-programme-in-history-and-philosophy-of-science-and-technology.html](http://en.phs.uoa.gr/graduate-studies/graduate-programme-in-history-and-philosophy-of-science-and-technology.html)
Across the United States and around the globe, historians of science, medicine, and technology responded to the call to March for Science in Washington DC and in cities worldwide on Saturday, April 22, 2017. The March for Science emerged as a grassroots movement inspired by the Women’s March in Washington in January 2017. Numerous professional groups in the sciences and in many other disciplines supported the March for Science as a non-partisan protest against dismissal of the validity of scientific evidence and the severe reductions in resources for scientific work. The History of Science Society joined many sibling organizations in the humanities and social sciences to endorse this mass demonstration on behalf of the integrity and independence of scientific research.

The particular political circumstances are American, but the sense that scientific principles need defending spanned the globe. From the political firing of researchers in Turkey to the scrubbing of climate data from US government websites, from corporate shaping of agricultural research to the bland insistence on documented untruths by leaders of the US government, the free and open exchange of ideas and the nonpolitical exploration of scientific questions seems to many increasingly under threat.

So: historians of science marched!

Historians of science marched throughout the Washington DC event, variously estimated at 70,000-100,000 people. Once HSS officially endorsed the March, HSS Secretary Luis Campos organized a Facebook page to gather participants. A small group of HSS members, along with friends and family, met and marched
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through the DC downpour. HSS-ers pointed out their favorite placards, enjoyed sightings of Tyrannosaurus Rex in costume (“Even I know enough to support science, and I’m extinct”), and groaned together at terrible science puns. “Protest Sine” was popular, along with the occasional “Protest Cosine.” Several marchers let everyone know that “If you’re not part of the solution, you’re part of the precipitate.” Others, more obscure, wrote placards in code or spelled out messages using the periodic table. A theme beneath the tongue-in-cheek humor was the concern and anger of many scientific workers that they had to be making a public uproar to protect evidence-based rule-making, the worth of experimental data, and the credibility of scientific evidence. “Things must be bad if all these introverts are marching,” read one typical poster. “Why do I have to be here and not my lab bench?” read another, more plaintive.

In the DC March, there was a general sense of charming inexperience in the crowd. Some signs were written in very small font, and there were a few catchy chants or songs. A typically self-jesting crowd activity was a rousing call-and-response of “What Do We Want? Evidence-based science! When Do We Want It? After thorough peer review!”

In Washington and in many cities, participants talked as they walked, expressing their worry over attacks on the legitimacy of scientific explanations and feeling energized and supported by the shared concerns in the large crowd.

Ms. Frizzle, the dauntless elementary-school science teacher from the American book series and PBS children’s show, “Ms. Frizzle and the Magic School Bus,” became de facto patron saint of the March for Science. The fictional Ms. Frizzle transforms herself and her bus (and the class iguana) to help young people understand everything from undersea ecosystems to the vastness of interstellar space. Many Ms. Frizzles appeared in many marches, but the History of Science Society had clearly the most fabulous. Johns Hopkins grad student Joanna Behrman, who studies science education, appeared along with a Magic School Bus (and passenger) in full explanatory mode. She reported that many people on the march—especially women and children—flagged her down for photos. “I think
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Many attendees (myself included) connected with Ms. Frizzle in a way that they couldn’t with Bill Nye,” she commented, reflecting on the science educator and popularizer Bill Nye, who encouraged the March and was one of its honorary leaders. “Since the March,” she noted, “a lot more people are putting forward Ms. Frizzle as potentially a queer feminist icon for science. As Ms. Frizzle would say, “Wahoo!””

The March for Science took place in many parallel cities: a small group of well-bundled Arctic researchers and the sole inhabitant of a lonely island far north of Scotland who resolutely posted in social media solidarity while logging his research. Historians of science likewise marched in San Diego, in Chicago, in Boston, and in cities throughout the world.

In the lead-up to the March for Science, historian of science Naomi Oreskes provided a leading voice in articulating the historical basis for scientists’ advocacy. At the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meeting in February, historian of science
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Naomi was a main speaker in the energetic Stand Up for Science March. At the event, lab-coated researchers took to Boston streets to oppose science denial and speak up for credible scientific work and evidence-based policy decisions. Drawing in part on her book *Merchants of Doubt* (published with co-author and HSS member Erik M. Conway in 2010), Oreskes argued that the determinedly a-political stance of American science is both recent and, in certain respects, self-defeating. She urged colleagues throughout the sciences to speak up for the intellectual vigor and social value of independent scientific work. This and similar events fired up scientific researchers more accustomed to lab notebooks than political protest and swelled the March for Science into a worldwide phenomenon.

Vassiliki (Betty) Smocovitis, who was serving as the Kosciusko Foundation Visiting Professor at the University of Warsaw, during the March reported: “I was not plugged into any of the scientific organizations and didn’t know if anything was going to be done, but I did consult my colleague Thurston Cleveland Hicks who is an American primatologist on the faculty at the University of Warsaw. We arranged to have lunch together on that day and then to show up at the Copernicus Monument in front of the Polish Academy of Science. It seemed a logical place to go, and sure enough people began to come until we formed a small band of about 30…. I found it quite moving actually, especially since the history of modern science conventionally begins in 1543, with the publication of Copernicus’s *De Revolutionibus*. It was the perfect place to commemorate the occasion and to support science.”

Other far-field reports are more sobering. Central European University faculty and HSS member Karl Hall writes that there was little in the way of March for Science in Budapest—because of too many competing protests at the legislation passed at the urging of Hungarian prime minister

*Continued on Page 17*
Viktor Orban to close the university. As of now, CEU will be open next academic year, and there are efforts to shore it up solidly into the future—but the attacks on this well-regarded institution of higher education speak for the grim state of academic freedom and integrity in many parts of our world.

Many on the March for Science expect advocacy to be a long walk.

**Further resources:**
- HSS statement on the March for Science: [https://hssonline.org/hss-and-the-march-for-science/](https://hssonline.org/hss-and-the-march-for-science/)
- An excellent starting place on science denial is Naomi Oreskes and Erik M. Conway, *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming* (Bloomsbury Press, originally published in 2010), as well as the 2015 Robert Kenner documentary film *Merchants of Doubt*.
- Joel Achenbach’s “Why Do Many Reasonable People Doubt Science?” in *National Geographic* March 2015, is a well-balanced analysis that predates present US electoral politics.
- Many people debated the March for Science on many platforms: one succinct summary of criticisms of political statements by scientists, as well as of the historical basis for scientists’ advocacy outlined by Naomi Oreskes at her AAAS talk, is Evan Haddingham’s March 2017 article “Should Scientists March on Washington?” published by PBS NOVA.
- The American Association for the Advancement of Science has been updating information on proposed budget cuts to American science agencies: [the most recent article is here.](https://www.aaas.org/press-releases/AAAS-calls-study-deaths-in-biomedical-research-facilities)
- Check out Twitter feeds @ScienceMarchDC and the topic #MarchforScience for advocates’ perspectives on the April 2017 event as well as updates on topics such as reactions to US withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord.
The Arcadian Library’s History of Science and Medicine collection, the first module of the library, includes manuscripts, incunabula, early printed books, and monographs from the 10th to 20th centuries. The collection showcases the contribution of early Arab and Persian scientists, doctors and thinkers; their translation, reception and influence in Europe and their lasting influence on the development of Western scientific and medical knowledge. It also brings together 19th and 20th century records of science, medicine and natural history from across the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle Eastern regions.
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• Ibn Baklarish’s Kitab al-Musta’ini—Book of simple medicines
• Haly Abbas’s (Al Majusi) seminal 10th century medical text Liber Totius Medicine Necessaria Continens
• Liber de cirurgia by Albucasis (Al-Zahrawi)—a pivotal 15th century medical treatise detailing early Arab surgical practices and instruments
• An early edition of Serapion the Younger’s book of medical botany, Liber aggregatus in medicinis simplicibus
• Reports of European scientific explorations documenting the animals, plants and geology of countries including Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and Syria
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www.arcadianlibraryonline.com
**Member News**

**Warwick Anderson** (University of Sydney) has been appointed to the Gough Whitlam and Malcolm Fraser chair in Australian Studies at Harvard University for 2018-19, to be held in the Department of the History of Science.

**Theodore Arabatzis** (National and Kapodistrian University of Athens) received the 2017 IUHPST Essay Prize in History and Philosophy of Science for his paper “What’s in it for the historian of science? Reflections on the value of philosophy of science for history of science.”. View the announcement of the prize here. The paper will appear in *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*.

**Carin Berkowitz** (Chemical Heritage Foundation) served as co-editor (with Bernie Lightman) for the recently published *Science Museums in Transition: Cultures of Display in Nineteenth-Century Britain and America* (University of Pittsburgh Press).

**Laura Bland**, who received her PhD at the University of Notre Dame, has been appointed Visiting Assistant Professor of History and Liberal Studies in the Honors College at the University of Houston in Houston, Texas. Laura worked in the HSS Executive Office during her time at Notre Dame, and we are pleased with her appointment.

**Jimena Canales**, the Thomas M. Siebel Chair in the History of Science and professor of history at the University of Illinois, has been elected a member of the board of directors of the American Council of Learned Societies for a 4-year term. The ACLS board establishes overall direction and policy, allocates funds, oversees investments, and reports on all major decisions to the constituent societies. The HSS has been a constituent society of ACLS since 1927.

**Bruce Hunt** (University of Texas, Austin) will deliver the 2018 George Sarton Memorial Lecture in the History and Philosophy of Science at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The meeting is scheduled for 15-18 February.

**Gwen Kay** (SUNY Oswego) has been elected SUNY University Faculty Senate president, a two-year position to represent all faculty and staff in matters of shared governance on the system and campus levels.

**Melanie A. Kiechle**’s (Virginia Tech) first book, *Smell Detectives: An Olfactory History of Nineteenth-Century Urban America*, has been published as part of the Weyerhaeuser Environmental Books series with the University of Washington Press.


**Roy MacLeod** has been chosen by the Royal Society of New South Wales to receive the Society’s History and Philosophy of Science Medal for 2016. The presentation was scheduled to be made by the Governor of New South Wales in Sydney on May 3, 2017. The honor was awarded for Roy’s “significant contributions to the history and philosophy of science” in Australia and around the World, including his pioneering scholarship in the history of Australian colonial science and for the biography of Archibald Liversidge, FRS, entitled *Imperial Science under the Sun* (Sydney University Press, 2009).

Mary Mitchell, an indefatigable volunteer for the HSS whose work focuses on the intersections of nuclear science and technology with environmental law and social movements, will join the Purdue University faculty as an assistant professor in August (congratulations Mary!).

Gregg Mitman (University of Wisconsin, Madison) is one of 35 scholars selected for an Andrew Carnegie Fellowship. The fellowships recognize an exceptional group of both established and emerging scholars, journalists, and authors with the goal of strengthening U.S. democracy, driving technological and cultural creativity, exploring global connections and global ruptures, and improving both natural and human environments. View the announcement here.

Ainissa Ramirez, a new member of the society, received the Norm Augustine Award for Outstanding Achievement in Engineering Communications from the American Association of Engineering Societies (AAES). Past recipients of the award include: Neil Armstrong, Henry Petroski, and David Sadoway. You can find out more about Ainissa’s work at [http://www.aaes.org/awards](http://www.aaes.org/awards) or read the award announcement here.

Alain Touwaide’s recent interview with Routledge Press can be found here. In it he discusses his recent publication *A Census of Greek Medical Manuscripts: From Byzantium to the Renaissance*.

Tania Munz Moving to the National Humanities Center

The National Humanities Center (NHC), located in Durham, North Carolina in the U.S., has appointed Tania Munz as Vice President for Scholarly Programs, effective 1 August 2017. Dr. Munz comes to the Center having most recently served as Vice President for Research & Scholarship at the Linda Hall Library in Kansas City, MO, where she oversaw the library’s fellowship program and managed its collection of over half a million monograph volumes and more than 48,000 journal titles. She has previously held research and teaching positions at Northwestern University and the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin.

She holds a BA in the history of science and medicine from the University of Chicago, an MA in the history of science and technology from the University of Minnesota, and received her PhD in history from Princeton University. Prior to pursuing her graduate education, Munz taught biology and chemistry in Berne, Switzerland, and worked as a museum educator and exhibit developer at the Bakken Library and Museum in Minneapolis. She also served as a guest producer on National Public Radio’s popular Talk of the Nation “Science Friday” segment.

Munz’s scholarship has focused on the history of animal behavior studies, especially the work of Nobel laureate Karl von Frisch. Her book, *The Dancing Bees: Karl von Frisch and the Discovery of the Honeybee Language*, was published in 2016 by the University of Chicago Press. Munz is also a member of the History of Science Society where she served as a member of the society’s council and strategic planning committee.

Robert D. Newman, President and Director of the National Humanities Center, noted Munz’s experiences as a dedicated scholar and administrator as well as her experience as a public advocate as qualities that distinguished her to the selection committee. “Tania has a wonderful appreciation not only for how research is conducted and supported, but for how it must be championed,” he said. “Her scholarly
and administrative experience make her an ideal choice to sustain and broaden the Center’s status as the premiere destination in which to incubate and accomplish advanced research in the humanities.”

“I am delighted for the opportunity to oversee the Center’s scholarly programs,” said Munz. “Over the past forty years, the Center has established itself as an ideal place for pursuing humanities research, and I look forward to helping ensure that reputation continues for years to come.”

View the complete announcement here.

Sara Schechner Receives American Astronomical Society Prize

Dr. Sara Schechner, History of Science Department and Collection of Historical Science Instruments at Harvard University has been awarded the highly prestigious LeRoy E. Doggett Prize for Historical Astronomy from the Historical Astronomy Division (HAD) of the American Astronomical Society (AAS). The Doggett Prize is awarded biennially to an individual who has significantly influenced the field through a career-long effort. This award recognizes both her scholastic achievements and her service to HAD and to the study of astronomical history worldwide. Sara is the first woman to receive the award.

The announcement reads:

The HAD Prize Committee is pleased to announce that Dr. Sara J. Schechner will be the recipient of the 2018 award. Sara is a prominent member of the Historical Astronomy Division. She served as Vice Chair, Chair, and Past Chair during the period 2005-2011, and has served on numerous HAD committees. During 1990s she was an especially valuable member of the AAS Centennial Committee, and served as Chair of the Exhibit Subcommittee. She has also served on the Working Group on the Preservation of Astronomical Heritage since 2007.

Her influence upon the history of astronomy is felt worldwide. She received her PhD (supervised by Owen Gingerich and I. Bernard Cohen) in 1988, and since 2000 has been the David P. Wheatland Curator of the Collection of Historical Scientific Instruments at Harvard. There she acts as chief curator for early scientific instruments and related books and photographs. She is widely published; her two most recent volumes are *Sundials and Time: Finding Instruments of the Adler Planetarium* (Adler Planetarium, 2017) and *Tangible Things: Making History through Objects* (Oxford University Press, 2015; co-authored with Laurel Ulrich, Ivan Gaskell, and Sarah Carter). She has prepared numerous exhibitions and received many awards, including the Great Exhibitions Prize from the British Society for the History of Science in 2014 and the Joseph H. Hazen Education Prize from the History of Science Society in 2008.

The award will be presented at a plenary session of the 231st meeting of the American Astronomical Society, to be held next January in National Harbor, Maryland.

Londa Schiebinger Recognized by the American Medical Women’s Association as the Presidential Recognition Award Recipient

The American Medical Women’s Association (AMWA) honored Dr. Londa Schiebinger with the 2017 Presidential Recognition Award at its 102nd annual meeting award luncheon on April 1, 2017. This award is given by the AMWA President for excellence in science, medicine, clinical practice, leadership, humanitarianism, or philanthropy. Dr. Schiebinger was recognized for her inspiring work to raise awareness of the broad expanse of sex and gender differences and for launching the Gendered Innovations program at Stanford University.
Londa Schiebinger is the John L. Hinds Professor of History of Science at Stanford University. She currently directs the Gendered Innovations in Science, Health & Medicine, Engineering, and Environment project. She is a leading international expert on gender in science, and has addressed the United Nations on the topic of “Gender, Science, and Technology.” She is a member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and the recipient of numerous prizes and awards, including the prestigious Alexander von Humboldt Research Prize and Guggenheim Fellowship.


Call for Proposals: Osiris Volume #36

by Patrick McCray, Osiris Co-Editor

The Editorial Board of Osiris solicits proposals for Volume 36 which will appear in 2021. Osiris is an international research journal devoted to the history of science and its cultural influences and is a publication of the History of Science Society and the University of Chicago Press.

Osiris aims to connect the history of science with other areas of historical scholarship. Volumes of the journal are designed to explore how, where, and why science draws upon and contributes to society, culture, and politics. The journal’s editors and board members strongly encourage proposals that engage with and examine broad themes while aiming for diversity across time and space. The journal is also very interested in receiving proposals that assess the state of the history of science as a field, broadly construed, in both established and emerging areas of scholarship. Possible future issues, for example, might consider themes such as: Sexuality; Disability and Mobility; Science, Risk, and Disaster; Science in the Global South and/or Africa; Environments and Populations; Time, Temporality, and Periodization; Ontology and Materiality; and Integrating Histories of Science & Technology.

Proposals should include the following items:
1. A description of the topic and its significance (approximately 2000 words)
2. A list of 12 to 15 contributors along with a title and paragraph describing each contributor’s individual essay
3. A two-page c.v. of the guest editor(s)

The guest editor(s) and their contributors must be prepared to meet the Osiris publication schedule. Volume 36 (2021) will go to press—after refereeing, authors’ revisions, and copy-editing—in the fall of 2020. The guest editor(s) must therefore choose contributors who are able to submit their completed essays by the summer of 2019.

Proposals will be reviewed by the Osiris Editorial Board at the annual meeting of the History of Science Society in November 2017. The announcement of the next volume of Osiris will be made in January 2018.

Proposals and all supporting material should be sent in paper or electronic copy by 15 October 2017 to both:

W. Patrick McCray
Department of History
University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9410
pmccray@history.ucsb.edu

Suman Seth
321 Morrill Hall
Department of Science and Technology Studies
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853
ss536@cornell.edu
HSS Election Results

Council:
Paola Bertucci
Nathaniel Comfort
Jacob Darwin Hamlin
Elly Truitt
Olival Freire

Council Delegate:
Gabriela Soto Laveaga

Nominating Committee:
Jahnavi Phalkey
Jutta Schikore

Vice President
Jan Golinski

Our deep thanks to the nominating committee (chaired by Matthias Dorries, who was joined by Karine Chemla, Anita Guerrini, Asif Siddiqui, and Alex Wellerstein) and to the more than 330 members who voted. We are grateful for the Nominating Committee’s work, for the willingness of all nominees to put their names forward, and for those who volunteer their time for the HSS.

Come to Toronto.... Please

The 2017 HSS Annual meeting will be in the Sheraton Centre Hotel in downtown Toronto, 9-12 November. For registration and hotel reservations, please go to the meeting page at http://hssonline.org/meetings/2017-hss-annual-meeting/. Hotel rates are $169 CAD single/double. We will again offer discounted rooms for graduate students (preference going to HSS student members).

HSS and the University of Oklahoma—A Boon to the Bibliographic World

The University of Oklahoma (OU) has hosted the Society’s Bibliographer’s office since John Neu’s retirement, back in the late 1990s. HSS Vice President Bernie Lightman and HSS Executive Director Jay Malone were on the campus 14-15 June 2017 to review the arrangements, to offer their thanks to OU administrators for their support, and to finalize a new 5-year agreement with OU. We are grateful to Hunter Heyck, Chair of the History of Science Department at OU, for his help in arranging the visit.

During our meeting with the University Libraries’ Associate Dean for Knowledge Services and Chief Technology Officer Carl Grant, Lightman, Weldon, and Malone received a hard-hat tour of the renovations nearing completion at the library. The new space will enhance collaborative efforts across campus.

Pictured, from left to right are Jay Malone (HSS Executive Director), Bernie Lightman (HSS Vice President), Stephen Weldon (HSS Bibliographer) and Carl Grant, who is the only one who can wear a hard hat with panache.
A Day at the *Isis* Office

When you read this, the *Isis*-in-Utrecht period will have completed its third year and the search for my successor—orchestrated by the Committee on Publications—already in full swing. On earlier occasions, we have sought to give you insights into the basics of how we handle manuscripts and book reviews. But perhaps you are also interested in learning more about what a day at the office looks like. So I have written a paragraph describing my activities on Friday, May 19 (Friday being the day when the entire *Isis* team is present at the office), and I invited the other team members to add a paragraph each.

H. Floris Cohen, Society Editor:

The morning opened with a routine activity: Didi van Trijp, the current Manuscript Assistant, and I reviewed what the mail had brought us since last Tuesday (Didi works on Tuesdays and Fridays), and we worked our way through our survey of manuscripts-in-process that we keep and regularly update. Today was unusual in that no manuscripts were ready for a yes/no/maybe decision; I only had to select suitable referees for two new manuscripts and to decide which referees should receive a reminder for tardy reviews.

I further prepared a list of future Focus, Viewpoint, and Second Look sections, noting down possible subjects, likely contributors, future issues in which these sections might appear, and some, as yet, very crude time lines.

With Ad Maas, one of the book review co-editors, I discussed his problems with a certain reviewer who appeared to have some difficulty describing the book under review. And one of the two book review assistants gave me some valuable information about the contents of a certain volume that had just arrived.

I had a lengthy conversation with Didi and with Desiree, our Managing Editor, about the future archiving of *Isis*, now that our office has left the paper age almost completely behind. What to preserve for posterity, and in what format? The outcome of some further probing of these questions will be a proposal to the HSS Executive Committee for an updated “memorandum of understanding” with the Smithsonian Institution where, over many decades, *Isis* materials deemed worthy of preserving have been stored.

Finally, I discussed with Desiree whether, in view of *Isis’* contractual number of pages per year (224 plus an 8% penalty-free overage), we can assign four articles, rather than just three, to the upcoming September issue (her final answer proved to be “yes, we can”).

Desiree Capel, Managing Editor:

The June issue will be published somewhat earlier than expected, i.e. Thursday 25 May or Friday 26 May. Since this means that we also need to have some Facebook posts ready for publication, I asked Ad Maas (Book Review Co-Editor) if he would have time to prepare some posts for the June issue, which he did. Together with Didi and Anne Knape (Book Review Assistant), we discussed the *Isis* Facebook and Twitter policy. From now on Anne will be keeping an eye on our Twitter account. We also discussed the possibility of generating publicity for the June Focus section, which was organized by Ad, and for which Lara Bergers (Anne’s predecessor) and Didi wrote an overview.

Back at my own desk, I checked whether the latest items in our financial administration had been allocated to the correct account number. This will save me time when compiling the annual financial statement for *Isis*-in-Utrecht in September (the *Isis* financial year runs from 1 July to 30 June).

And then it was time for lunch. Anne and Jeroen Bouterse (Book Review Assistant) had done the shopping for our customary team meal every Friday. We set one of the meeting tables and, over sandwiches and orange juice, discussed *Isis* matters, chatted, and caught up with each other.
HSS News, cont.

After lunch, Floris, Didi, and I discussed the archiving of *Isis* material. Now that the number of pages for the June issue is final, I also calculated the total number of pages that have been published during the past year (from 1 July to 30 June): with the new interior and exterior design implemented from the March and June 2015 issues onward, the conversion rate from the number of words in the manuscript pages to the number of printed pages is now pretty reliable. This makes it easier for me to advise Floris, Ad, and Huib Zuidervaart (Book Review Co-Editor) on the number of book reviews and the number of articles that can be allocated to the next issue.

**Didi van Trijp, Manuscript Assistant:**
Upon my arrival, Floris and I went over the status of all the manuscripts currently “in process.” Some referees needed to be prodded, whereas other referees received our warm thanks for handing in their reports on time. I also corresponded with an author who had sent me a couple of items required to finalize the publication of his piece. I uploaded all these documents into the Editorial Manager system, so that the whole package could be transferred swiftly to our Manuscript Editor, Joan Vandegrift.

Through this same system a new manuscript had come in. I first checked whether it did not overstep the 15,000 words maximum and whether the text had sufficiently been blinded. After having found all to be in order, I updated the gender survey that we use to track the gender balance in our semi-annual reports to the Executive Committee. I then printed the document and handed it to Floris for perusing (he refuses to read more than a single page from the screen, so this is just about the only piece of paper still around in the office).

After lunch, I discussed matters of archiving with Floris and Desiree, and we decided to tackle this project during the summer when fewer manuscripts generally come in. I also conferred
with Ad about the way in which we could highlight the upcoming Focus section on social media, and we drafted a strategy.

Ad Maas, Book Review Co-Editor (post-1800 books):
Where are my reviewers? A large part of my time as book review editor is consumed (perhaps surprisingly so) by the never-ending quest to find the right reviewer(s) for the right book. Today, this is pre-eminently the case. On the one hand, I had only two newly arrived reviews to check. On the other hand, quite a number of books have piled up on the shelves, waiting to be assigned to a reviewer. Unfortunately, about half (I estimate) of my invitations to review books are, on average, declined, so I must select a couple of reviewers per book to make sure that the assistants—who actually send the requests—will succeed in finding a volunteer.

One important resource for finding suitable reviewers is the online membership directory on the HSS website. There, I can select a topic (say physics, or Darwinism) and see which members have tagged this as one of their specializations. These people are potential reviewers. Unfortunately, many members—among whom, I am sure, are many historians of science interested in writing reviews for Isis—have not recorded their fields of specialization. So, if you would like to write a review from time to time, please fill in your research interests (you can check your membership profile here).

Jeroen Bouterse, Book Review Assistant:
I measure my day with two metrics: the number of books we receive, and the number of books we send out to reviewers. We always try to provide our reviewers with physical review copies. Today is a good day. I have been able to mail 12 books to 11 reviewers, and a batch of books arrived from MIT Press. Each book’s arrival leads to myriad activities: I feed the information into an intricate system of Excel worksheets, log Editorial-Manager entries, place the books on shelves, write post-it notes to our book review co-editors, read post-it notes from our book review co-editors, and employ a variety of rubber bands, springs, and levers.

Since today we have virtually no backlog of unpublished reviews, the main source of stress for the book review department is the question of whether or not we will have enough reviews ready for the next issue of Isis. For me, this means that every new book and every reviewer’s “acceptance” email is a source of great relief and gratitude. The next question is whether or not the book reviewers actually hand in their reviews on time....

Huib Zuidervaart, Book Review Co-Editor (pre-1800 books):
Huib happened to be absent this week, but his experiences are rather similar to those of his colleague Ad Maas.

Anne Knape, Book Review Assistant:
Tardy reviews is where I enter the equation (or rather, the intricate system of Excel worksheets). I “take care” of those who did not manage to present me with their book review before the deadline. By writing firm but polite reminders, a subtle art in which I am hoping to become increasingly well-versed, I make sure that we meet the goals of the book-review section for the corresponding Isis issue. On most occasions it only takes, at most, two reminders, but the record of 11 reminders still holds (at which point me and the book review co-editors get together to decide what the next move is: giving a personal call perhaps?). Today, however, not many reviewers needed reminding so I turned instead to the task of sending publishers copies of the reviews of their books. I frequently play the part of “courier,” since in addition to mailing reviews, I also fetch books from the mail box for Jeroen to send out again later. I pass along the finished reviews to the book review co-editors, who take a closer look at them. Eventually, I can put the final reviews into the folder for the upcoming Isis issue. Although today involved no Tweets, I also manage the Isis Twitter account.

FB: https://www.facebook.com/isis.journal/  
Twitter: https://twitter.com/isisjournal
Thank you Greg Macklem!

Anyone who has contacted the Executive Office (or who has attended an HSS meeting) in the past 7 years, will have encountered our Society Coordinator, Greg Macklem. Greg began work with the HSS shortly before the Montreal meeting in 2010, a devilishly difficult conference that featured a hotel lobby renovation, meeting rooms hidden from sight, and a grand reception in the Complexe Desjardins (aka mall)... an experience that likely shaved years off of his life. Somehow, he managed to hang on, improving with each conference and growing to handle every aspect of HSS governance, from bookeeping, to supervising students, to divining the nuances of federal regulations, to helping the Executive Director eliminate headers on the second page of a document.

It is with decidedly mixed feelings that I let you know that Greg has accepted a job with Notre Dame’s Institute for Educational Initiatives, which is slated to start 1 July. I am verklempt to see him go but this is a wonderful opportunity and I know that he will flourish in his new position. As many of you know, Greg was a high school mathematics teacher before coming to HSS (he loves teaching), and he will be working with math teachers with a focus on high schools with large numbers of students who are typically not well-represented in advanced placement courses (Advanced Placement (AP) is a program in the United States and Canada created by the College Board which offers college-level curricula and examinations to high school students. American colleges and universities may grant placement and course credit to students who obtain high scores on the examinations.) But his new office is just a short walk from the Executive Office, and he has graciously offered to help train the next Coordinator.

Greg has been Society Coordinator far longer than any of his predecessors, and I’m deeply grateful for the work he’s done for the HSS. The good news is that we do not have to tell him good bye. For reasons that defy logic, he plans on attending the Toronto meeting in November, with his lovely wife Heather, so that you may wish him “happy trails” in person.

HSS at AAAS

Left: Pnina Abir-Am, co-organizer of the 2017 American Association for the Advancement of Science session “RNA Splicing at 40: Reflections on Scientific Progress, Policy, and Social Justice” with session speaker Ruth Sperling.

Consortium for History of Science, Technology and Medicine

The Consortium is delighted to welcome the Adler Planetarium and the Society for the History of Technology as new member institutions (the HSS is a proud member of the Consortium).

The Adler, located in Chicago, is America’s oldest planetarium and the only independent planetarium in the world holding significant collections and engaging in science and history research. The Adler’s collections on astronomy and space exploration include astronomical and surveying instruments, astronomical texts and tables, as well as treatises on mathematics, optics, physics, astrology, geography, and navigation.

Founded in 1958, the Society for the History of Technology has been pivotal to promoting scholarship on both the history of technology and the role of technology in history. The Consortium looks forward to welcoming SHOT as it convenes its 2017 annual meeting in Philadelphia this fall, home of the Consortium.

Other Consortium updates, including news of recent and past fellows, working groups, and webinars can be found at https://www.chstm.org/.

60th Gathering of the Midwest Junto

The 60th annual meeting of Midwest Junto for the History of Science took place during the weekend of March 24-26, 2017 at Indiana University-Bloomington (IU). After a Friday-night reception, the Junto formally began on Saturday morning, where participants heard twenty papers by four faculty and sixteen graduate students over the next day and a half. As is typical for Junto meetings, the papers covered a diverse range of topics, including the social structure of Islamicate science, Soviet psychology, medicine in Project Apollo, the Indian Aurochs in nineteenth century paleontology, and archeological tourism in late nineteenth century Alexandria, to name a few.

View the complete list of talks.

The highlight of each Junto is the Stuart Pierson memorial lecture, which was given this year by William Newman of Indiana University. Bill spoke on the importance of Newton’s alchemical experiments and demonstrated some of Newton’s experiments, including the transmutation of base metal into “gold.” At the Sunday morning business meeting, President David Robinson (emeritus, Truman State University) announced that Sander Gliboff (Indiana University) would serve as President-elect for the coming year. The Junto is grateful to Sandy and the many IU graduate students for planning and hosting the Junto this year.

The date and location of the 2018 meeting will be announced later this year. For more information on the Junto and the Pierson Fund, contact the Secretary-Treasurer Peter Ramberg (ramberg@truman.edu), visit the Junto’s Facebook page, or see the Junto website.

Peter Ramberg (Truman State University) long-time Secretary/Treasurer/Everyman of the Midwest Junto encourages everyone to sign “The Book,” which records the place and the attendees of every Junto meeting.
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Lone Star Historians of Science

The Lone Star History of Science Group held its thirtieth annual meeting on 7 April 2017 at Texas A&M University in College Station, Texas. The gathering was hosted by Professor Anthony Stranges of the A&M History Department.

This year’s speaker was Dr. John Tracy, director of the Texas Water Resources Institute, who spoke on “How Lead Gets into Our Water and Why We Don’t Want It There.” Weaving together history, chemistry, engineering, and public affairs, including reflections on the recent problems with lead contamination in Flint, Michigan, Dr. Tracy gave a clear and engaging account of how issues of water supply and distribution play out in the public sphere. After a lively discussion, the group headed off to enjoy dinner and further conversation at Paolo’s, a local Italian restaurant.

Each spring, the Lone Star Group draws together historians of science, technology, and medicine from around Texas to discuss their shared interests and enjoy a friendly dinner. Its constitution, adopted over dinner in an Austin restaurant in 1988, provides that there shall be “no officers, no by-laws, and no dues,” and the group remains resolutely informal, and all the more convivial for that. This year the group marked the passing since its last meeting of three of its longtime members, each of whom had served as the speaker at a previous meeting: Ron Rainger, Ian Russell, and Loyd Swenson. All will be sorely missed.

The next meeting of Lone Star group — its 30th anniversary gathering — will be held in either Austin or San Marcos in March or April 2018. Anyone interested in being added to the group’s e-mail list should contact Professor Bruce Hunt of the University of Texas History Department at bjhunt@austin.utexas.edu.

Fellowships Available

The Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard University awards 50 funded residential fellowships each year designed to support scholars, scientists, artists, and writers of exceptional promise and demonstrated accomplishment.

For more information, please contact:

Radcliffe Application Office
8 Garden Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-496-1324
fellowships@radcliffe.harvard.edu
www.radcliffe.harvard.edu

National Humanities Alliance Appropriations Update and New Advocacy Resources

On 4 May, Congress approved an Omnibus Appropriations package to fund the government for the remaining five months of FY 2017. In a significant victory for the humanities community, the bill provides $149.8 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities, a $2 million increase over FY 2016. The bill also provides increases for the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, the Smithsonian Institution, and the Library of Congress. Finally, the bill provides level-funding for Title VI and Fulbright-Hays despite draft legislation in the Senate last summer that proposed slashing funding for Fulbright-Hays. These funding levels follow on increases or level funding for all of these programs in FY 2016. View a detailed funding chart.

These successes are a testament to the steadfast efforts of the humanities community, which included scores of op-eds and letters to the editor and hundreds of Humanities Advocacy Day visits, more than 150,000 messages, and thousands of phone calls to Capitol Hill offices in support of the NEH since January.

With FY 2017 appropriations now behind us, our attention turns fully to FY 2018, which we expect to present more challenges. In the coming months, the Administration will submit a full Presidential Budget Request—following up on a blueprint that requested elimination of or cuts to the NEH, IMLS, the Woodrow Wilson Center, and Title VI and Fulbright Hays—and Congress will draft a Budget Resolution. While we expect each of these documents to call for the elimination of the NEH and other programs, decisions on funding will ultimately be made in the Appropriations Committees. With noteworthy increases for most humanities programs in FY 2016 and FY 2017, we are confident that members of the Appropriations Committees understand the value of these programs, nationally and for their constituents.

That said, the dynamics surrounding the FY 2018 appropriations bills are likely to be different than the final negotiations over FY 2017 as the Trump Administration seeks to influence the process from the beginning. Accordingly, Members of Congress will be under increased pressure to follow through on the president’s agenda. It is crucial that all Members of Congress continue to hear from their constituents in case efforts to eliminate humanities funding begin to gain traction in Congress.

New Advocacy Resources:

As we continue to mobilize for FY 2018, we have centralized our advocacy resources on two new webpages. We encourage you to share these resources with your members and colleagues, if that is an appropriate activity for your organization.

Our new Take Action page offers several suggestions for humanities advocacy, including writing or calling Congress, writing op-eds, and recruiting additional advocates on social media. It links to a variety of resources to facilitate each action item. Our new Advocacy Resources page consolidates several of these resources.

National Humanities Alliance
http://www.nhalliance.org/

Teaching the History of Science

View the latest issue of the HPS&ST monthly Note here. The Note is sent to about 7,500 individuals who directly or indirectly have an interest in the connections of history and philosophy of science with theoretical, curricular and pedagogical issues in science teaching, and/or interests in the promotion of more engaging and effective teaching of the history and philosophy of science. The Note is also sent to different HPS lists and to science education lists.

The Note seeks to serve the diverse international community of HPS&ST scholars and teachers by disseminating information about events and publications that connect to HPS&ST concerns. It is an information list, not a discussion list.
The University of Illinois Archives, British Library, American Philosophical Society, and MIT Receive NEH Grant to Preserve the History of Cybernetics

The University of Illinois Archives has been awarded a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to develop a prototype web-portal and analysis-engine to provide access to archival material related to the development of the iconic, multi-disciplinary field of cybernetics. The grant is part of the NEH’s Humanities Collections and Reference Resources Foundations program. The project, entitled “The Cybernetics Thought Collective: A History of Science and Technology Portal Project,” is a collaborative effort among several academic units at the University of Illinois (U of I) and three other institutions that also maintain archival records vital to the exploration of cybernetic history: the British Library, the American Philosophical Society, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In addition to supporting the development of a web-portal and analysis-engine, the award will enable the multi-institutional team to begin digitizing some of the archival records related to the pioneering work of U of I Electrical Engineering Professor Heinz von Foerster and his fellow cyberneticians W. Ross Ashby, Warren S. McCulloch, and Norbert Wiener. To learn more about the project, please visit “The Cybernetics Thought Collective” project website.

Carnegie Wins Grant to Preserve Notable Geophysicist’s Archives

The American Institute of Physics’ Center for History of Physics has awarded the Carnegie Institution for Science a $10,000 grant to organize and preserve the archives of scientist Oliver H. Gish and open them for research. Gish was a prominent figure in American geophysics in the early 20th century and an authority in the study of atmospheric and terrestrial electricity. He was a staff scientist at Carnegie’s Department of Terrestrial Magnetism in Washington between 1922 and 1948 and also worked in academia, industry, and government research. His papers are held in the department’s archives.

Gish conducted some of the first cosmic-ray research in the United States under Robert A. Millikan at the University of Chicago during World War I. At Carnegie, he designed and built instruments for the Explorer II manned balloon flight into the stratosphere in 1935. In the 1940s, Gish and collaborator George R. Wait led a pioneering, joint Carnegie-U.S. Air Force investigation of the electrical fields in thunderstorms using instruments mounted on B-29 bombers. He also contributed to our understanding of magnetic storms and the daily variation of the geomagnetic field.

Gish died in 1987 at the age of 103. His extensive files, containing five decades of his professional correspondence, research notes, instrument designs, and photographs, were donated to the Department of Terrestrial Magnetism in 2015 by his granddaughters, Nancy R. Crow and Dorothy C. Crow-Willard.

“The Gish Papers will be a valuable resource for historians of science,” said Shaun Hardy, Oliver H. Gish with his electrical conductivity apparatus for the Explorer II manned balloon flight into the stratosphere in 1935. Image is courtesy of the Carnegie Institution for Science, Department of Terrestrial Magnetism.
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librarian for Carnegie’s Department of Terrestrial Magnetism and Geophysical Laboratory, who will lead the project. “Not only do they document the lifelong professional activity of a notable researcher, but they provide insights into the organization of American and international geophysics during the decades of its transformation into a modern discipline.”

The AIP’s Grants to Archives program supports projects to make accessible records, papers, and other primary sources that document the history of modern physics and allied fields, such as astronomy and geophysics. Its funding will enable Carnegie to organize and catalog the Gish Papers and to create a website to showcase Gish’s career and scientific contributions.

Eighty Years of Ambix


New Blog Explores History of Atmospheric Science

In January 2017, Roger Turner launched a new blog at https://www.PicturingMeteorology.com. Each post begins with a compelling image and tells a surprising story about the history of atmospheric science, broadly understood. He translates solid scholarship into stories accessible to general readers interested in science and history. Recent posts have explored William Rehnquist’s brief career as a meteorological observer, whimsical cartoons about air pollution in the 1950s, and a debate about contemporary lessons we should learn from the potential Oxygen Deprivation Crisis of the 1960s. Several colleagues have shared wonderful guest posts. A new post is added each Wednesday.

Southern Studies Conference at Auburn University

Auburn University at Montgomery, AL, 9-10 February 2018
Deadline for submissions: 16 October 2017
Contact email: southernstudies@aum.edu

Now in its tenth year, the Auburn University at Montgomery (AUM) Southern Studies Conference invites proposals for pre-formed panels or individual papers on any topic pertaining to the history and culture of the American South from any time period, including presentations on art practice, American history, the history of science and medicine, the history of art, anthropology, history of music, foodways studies, theatre, literature, and sociology.

Proposals should be emailed to southernstudies@aum.edu and include a 250-word abstract and a brief CV. The deadline for proposals is 16 October 2017. For more information, please visit the conference website.

VISTAS: 39th Annual Conference of the Nineteenth-Century Studies Association

Philadelphia, 15-18 March 2018
Deadline for submissions: 30 September 2017
Keynote: Elizabeth Milroy (Drexel University)

In honor of the 100th anniversary of Philadelphia’s Benjamin Franklin Parkway, the NCSA committee invites proposals that explore the notion of the vista in the nineteenth century. From personal gardens to public parks, from the street level to the top of a skyscraper, or from the microscope to the panoramic photograph, the nineteenth century was a moment when the idea of the vista changed from a narrow sightline to a sweeping, expansive view. How did theorists alter our historical perspective, broadening our notion of the world through science or religion? In what ways did power systems affect urban vantage points? How did man-made vistas reflect
socio-cultural ideals? How did domestic spaces or nightlife transform with the widespread use of gas or electric lighting? How does the conceptual vista operate metaphorically? Topics might include horticulture, landscapes and seascapes, new technology, photography, sightseeing, film and the theater, urban planning, visions and dreamscapes, shifting perceptions of the gaze, or literary or artistic descriptions or depictions of viewpoints. In contrast, papers may consider the absence of vistas, such as mental or physical confinement or elements that obfuscate a view.

Please send 250-word abstracts with one-page CVs to ncsaphila2018@gmail.com by 30 September 2017. Abstracts should include the author's name, institutional affiliation, and paper title in the heading. We encourage individual proposals and panel proposals with four presenters and a moderator. Note that submission of a proposal constitutes a commitment to attend if accepted. Presenters will be notified in November 2017. We encourage submissions from graduate students, and those whose proposals have been accepted may submit complete papers to apply for a travel grant to help cover transportation and lodging expenses. Scholars who reside outside of North America and whose proposals have been accepted may submit a full paper to be considered for the International Scholar Travel Grant (see the NCSA website for additional requirements).

AAAS and the March for Science

[The following note from AAAS Chief Executive Officer, Rush Holt, was sent to AAAS members on 1 May 2017. It speaks to AAAS's ongoing desire to promote science in our culture and expresses a hope that the enthusiasm demonstrated in the March will continue. The letter is reproduced with some minor editing.]

Dear Colleague,

Tens of thousands of people in more than 600 cities all over the world recently came together to rally for science. But what, really, does it all mean? And what do we do next?

It is now up to the science community to identify the message within the cacophony. What are the concerns that prompted so many—scientists and nonscientists alike—to march? And—most importantly—what are we going to do about these concerns?

The science and engineering community must stay in the public square. We must run to the action and bring the evidence with us. We must continue to insist that evidence and not ideology be the driving force behind public policy decisions and in public debate.

And the American Association for the Advancement of Science is here to give you the tools to do this. Just last week, our board of directors launched a series of strategies to galvanize the science and engineering community.

Through our Force for Science initiative, we will:

• Help you, our members, speak up on behalf of science where you live, work and worship—you can get started with a series of training exercises on Trellis that will offer tools so you can create your own public engagement plan and best practices for engaging with policymakers at the federal, state and local levels.

• Make sure you’re kept informed of policy issues that affect science as they happen, through our weekly #AAASLive Chats on social media and through our weekly Policy Alert e-newsletter.

• Build a center for scientific evidence in public issues to make sure decision-makers—from school board members to state government representatives to U.S. court judges—understand the science they need to know to make informed policy choices.

• Lead a coalition of societies to ensure that the science community can move forward with one unified voice.

The March for Science was a truly remarkable event, but there is much more to do. AAAS has a responsibility—an obligation—to keep this unprecedented momentum going and channel it into effective action.

Sincerely,
Rush D. Holt
Chief Executive Officer and Executive Publisher, Science family of journals
Humanities Departmental Survey (HDS-2)

(Adapted from http://www.humanitiesindicators.org/content/indicatordoc.aspx?i=457)

The American Academy of Arts and Sciences initiated the Humanities Departmental Survey (HDS), first administered in 2008 (collecting data on the 2007–08 academic year), to fill critical gaps in our knowledge about the state of the humanities in higher education; specifically, about the number of faculty and students in the field and the role of humanities departments in their institutions and society. Apart from trends in the number of students receiving degrees in humanities disciplines, data sources about the state of the humanities at the national level have fallen away over the past 15 years, leaving decision-makers without key guideposts during a time of change in higher education. The History of Science Society worked with the Academy of Arts and Sciences to include the history of science as a subdiscipline in the surveys.

With the 2012–13 survey (HDS-2), the American Academy provided information about two points in time for the eight disciplines and subfields included in the first survey (art history, English, history, history of science, languages and literatures other than English (LLE), linguistics, combined English and LLE, and religion). For HDS-2 these data were supplemented with complementary information from departments in five additional disciplines (classical studies, communication, folklore, musicology, and philosophy). While it does not supply trend data for these new disciplines, HDS-2 offers an informative snapshot—and important baseline data for subsequent studies—that, it is hoped, will enrich the national conversation about the present condition and future of the academic humanities.

The questions in HDS-2 covered a number of topics included in the original survey—such as the number and character of departments, the faculty teaching in them, and their students—while adding new questions designed to understand departments’ undergraduate assessment practices and to capture the ways humanities departments connect to the wider world through workforce training and the digital humanities.

The Statistical Research Center at the American Institute of Physics (AIP) worked with staff members at the Academy’s Humanities Indicators project, stakeholders from the scholarly societies, and funders at the National Endowment for the Humanities to revise the survey instrument and field it. As with the first department survey, AIP achieved a remarkably high response rate (over 70% for all but two disciplines). AIP weighted and tabulated the data, and has presented their detailed findings in a final technical report available in its entirety on this site.

To make the information as accessible as possible, the tables included in the AIP report are posted here in the topic areas indicated above, and also by discipline (view the report on the history of science here). For each topic, Humanities Indicators staff have also compiled key findings. These brief summaries, which include visual representations of the data, are available on each of the topic-oriented pages of the site. Alongside the summary reports, more detailed breakdowns of the results for each discipline are available. Many of these parse the data by Carnegie classification type and the type of institutional control.

Please do not hesitate to contact the staff of the Humanities Indicators project with questions or concerns about HDS-2 or its findings. Suggestions as to topics that should be addressed in the next iteration of the HDS are also warmly welcomed.

Mellon/ACLS Dissertation Completion Fellowship Program

Contact: Rachel Bernard, 212-697-1505 x134

The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) has announced the 2017 Mellon/ACLS Dissertation Completion Fellows. The 65 fellows were selected from a pool of more than 1,000 applicants through a rigorous, multi-
stage peer-review process. Now in its eleventh year, the fellowship program provides a $30,000 stipend and up to $8,000 in research funds and university fees to advanced graduate students in their final year of dissertation writing. “The fellows are completing their degrees at 36 different U.S. universities, and their work represents the broad range of disciplines that this program supports, including literature, philosophy, media studies, ethnic studies, linguistics, sociology, and archaeology,” said ACLS Program Officer Rachel Bernard. The fellowships offer promising graduate students a year of support to focus their attention on completing projects that form the foundations of their careers and that will help shape a generation of humanistic scholarship. The program, which is made possible by a grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, also includes a faculty-led academic job market seminar, hosted by ACLS, to further prepare fellows for their postgraduate careers.

Find more information about the recipients and their projects here. Dissertations that may be of interest to HSS members include the following:

**Tony Andersson** (History, New York University) *Environmentalists with Guns: Conservation, Revolution, and Counterinsurgency in El Petén, Guatemala, 1944-1996*

**Mohamad Ballan** (History, University of Chicago) *The Scribe of the Alhambra: Lisān al-Dīn ibn al-Khātib, Sovereignty, and History in Nasrid Granada*

**Héctor Beltrán** (Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley) *Disenchanted Hacking: Technology, Startups, and Alternative Capitalisms from Mexico*

**Alex Hudgins Bush** (Film and Media, University of California, Berkeley) *Cold Storage: A Media History of the Glacier*

**Nabeel Hamid** (Philosophy, University of Pennsylvania) *Being and the Good: Natural Teleology in Early Modern German Philosophy*

**Joshua Hudelson** (Music, New York University) *Spectral Sound: A Cultural History of the Frequency Domain*

The ACLS, a private, nonprofit federation of 74 national scholarly organizations, is the preeminent representative of American scholarship in the humanities and related social sciences. Advancing scholarship by awarding fellowships and strengthening relations among learned societies is central to ACLS’s work. This year, ACLS will award more than $20 million to over 300 scholars across a variety of humanistic disciplines.

**NEH and the History of Science**

On March 29, the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) announced 208 new grants to support research, teaching, preservation, and public programming around the country. This round of grants underscores NEH’s crucial support for curricular innovations to bridge the humanities and STEM disciplines, programs that help veterans reflect on and share the experience of war, and community conversations that engender civic dialogue on divisive issues.

These awards come just weeks after the Trump administration released a budget proposal calling for the elimination of the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the Department of Education’s international education programs, the Institute for Museums and Library Services, and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.

NEH’s attention now turns to Congress, which has the ability to fund these programs despite the administration’s proposals. The NEH has been heartened that these programs, which have been backed by presidents of both parties, have seen growing support in Congress in recent years. Indeed, over the past two years, Republican-controlled Congresses have voted for increases for the NEH.
The NEH is optimistic that as Members of Congress take a close look at these programs and hear from their constituents, more of them will appreciate the importance of federal funding for the humanities. NEH, for example, reaches not only every state, but also every Congressional district, bringing high-quality cultural experiences to rural and urban audiences, preserving cultural heritage that would otherwise be lost, and providing opportunities for life-long learning for all Americans.

The NEH has already seen a significant outpouring of support from the humanities community, and the Endowment will be working to ensure that Members of Congress hear from their constituents about the impact of humanities funding.

The following awardees were identified as members of the HSS.

**CALIFORNIA**

*San Francisco*

University of California, San Francisco
Outright: $315,000
[Humanities Collections and Reference Resources]
Project Director: Polina Ilieva
Project Title: Digitizing and Providing Access to Historical AIDS Records

**ILLINOIS**

*DeKalb*

Anne Hanley
Outright: $6,000
[Summer Stipends]
Northern Illinois University
Project Title: An Institutional History of the 1872 Brazilian Census and Adoption of the Metric System

*Urbana*

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Outright: $49,973
[Humanities Collections and Reference Resources]
Project Director: Bethany Anderson
Project Title: The Cybernetics Thought Collective: A History of Science and Technology Portal Project

**NEW YORK**

*New York*

Leif Weatherby
Outright: $6,000
[Summer Stipends]
New York University
Project Title: Early Digital Humanities: German Idealism and the Development of Cybernetics in the mid 20th Century

**TEXAS**

*Austin*

University of Texas, Austin
Outright: $97,491
[Humanities Connections]
Project Director: Stephen Sonnenberg
Project Title: Patients, Practitioners, and Cultures of Care

*Houston*

James Schafer
Outright: $6,000
[Summer Stipends]
University of Houston
Project Title: The American Medical Profession, Militarization, and the State in the First World War