

Editorial

Many personal memories came to mind when I heard in early 2005 that John Ziman had passed away at the age of 79. He was very close to some Finnish scholars in the field of science and technology studies and one of the icons who influenced the reorientation of the journal *Science Studies*.

When *Science Studies* was established in 1988, the editors emphasised the interdisciplinary character of science and technology studies, introducing theoretical impulses from philosophy, sociology, history and technical sciences. The broad perspective that was adopted during the first years, however, was a reflection of the analyses made by the journal's Scandinavian authors. Soon, however, we felt a need for broader internationalization. We presented our plans to highly recognised international scholars and asked them to join in the project.

I will always remember the enthusiastic letter that John Ziman wrote to me when he accepted the offer to become one of the editors of the reoriented journal. It was a good start for a fruitful collaboration that began in 1994 and continued up until to his death. When I now look back at an Editorial that I wrote in 1994, when the decision to broaden the journal's scope beyond Scandinavia was made, I notice that I refer in particular to John's emphasis of the urgency to analyse the ongoing restructuring of the science system and science policy. He wanted to activate scholars world wide to scrutinise the ways science, as an institution, is radically transforming at many levels. He asked for ambitious and systematic studies, not only of the policy implications of these changes but also, of the nature of science itself as an epistemological, utilitarian, ideological and political resource.

These kinds of warnings and accusations of passivism were typical to John as he, through his writings and work, was well aware of the increasingly complicated role of science as a scientific and social establishment. When he criticised the low responsiveness of science and technology studies to identify the new politico-economic tensions in the science-society interface, he claimed that understanding the ideological and utilitarian aspects are especially relevant as they will become increasingly complicated in the future. In countries such as Finland, decision-makers tend to increasingly regard market orientation as the primary political driver of change by transferring hegemonic ideas of market governance to the goals of science, technology, economic and social policies. In fact, already in his 1994 book *Prometheus Bound. Science in a Dynamic Steady State* John proposed strategies to oppose the rapid adoption of misconceived steering mechanisms, whether launched by the government or the market.

Even though John Ziman was a recognised physicist, having a nomination to the Royal Society on the basis of his merits in physics, he was also one of the founders of systematic science studies. In a way, he followed the tradition of John Desmond Bernal by paying attention to the social function of science. Ziman was also one of the founders, and from 1976 to 1990 also the chairman, of the Council for Science

and Society.

In his last books and conference papers John presented new interpretations of the transformation of the norms of science in the period that he called post-modern. At the same time, several other scholars developed politically relevant categories, calling them old and new modes of knowledge production. It is typical to John that due to his deep epistemological analyses of science he did not want to dichotomize traditional and new knowledge creation. Having identified the new political tensions, he pointed to normative elements in science that are sensitive to political expectations and pressures, but also to the importance of traditional norms that have to be maintained and even strengthened. During his last years he even intensified his analysis of the peculiarities of science and of the potential outcomes that result from an uneasy relationship between the systems of science and politics. Yet, even though he met tensions with Prime Minister Thatcher's government during his period as the director of the Science Policy Support Group, he chose a philosophical rather than a sociological approach in his analysis of the ideological dependencies of science in the increasingly neo-liberal political atmosphere of Europe.

His last book *Real Science: What It Is and What It Means?* (2000) fits nicely in John's scientific profile and the cognitive inheritance that he left us with. Today, when so many forces are challenging the premises of real scientific action, there is a need to remind ourselves of John's primary worries. As scientists we should always remember our moral duties to develop a good science. As researchers in the field of science and technology studies we have a moral duty to study the interfaces between science and the politico-economic system in order to assist in the development of a good society.

Marja Häyrinen-Alestalo
Former Chief Editor
University of Helsinki
Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies