For some time we have been having a discussion in Europe on science journalists versus communication officers. Instead of debating whether people are real science journalists or not, I rather think we should discuss integrity, quality and good practice of science journalism and communication.

Of course, the two things are not the same, but in many ways we have common interests. As a science journalist, you may produce misleading clickbait headlines and fantastic but inaccurate stories on science and as a communications person at a research institute you may oversell and promote the institute’s research way beyond its real value. In both cases, it may give rise to some immediate popularity but in the long term it erodes public confidence in science, science journalism and communication.

The discussion of science journalism vs communication is becoming more intense as the media are facing the worst crisis since Gutenberg. In most countries, newspaper readership is falling dramatically and science journalists with full time jobs are becoming rare. Many former science journalists are now employed by institutions, and write articles offered free of charge to the newspapers and magazines. This should not come as a surprise. The latest statistics from Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2016 says only 6 per cent of young people aged 18-24 years are reading newspapers. In this age group, television is for the first time less popular than social media as a news source. Science and technology is the most popular topic among all age groups in the 26 countries surveyed!

The change in media consumption makes it very difficult for media producers to pay for good quality articles and television programmes. It is crucial to define the problems and create new space for accurate information on science and new knowledge. Now is the time to take the debate to a higher level; we need to focus on
sustainable solutions and best practices both for science journalists and for communicators. In a globalised world, we need to inspire each other by discussing how to tackle the challenges in today’s media. EUSJA – a 45 years old organisation with 23 national science journalist associations from 20 European countries – can play a role in generating a constructive dialogue and improve the environment for science-based stories in the new media landscape. It is time to regain terrain as professionals in an amateur-dominated social media world.

One of our traditional activities is the EUSJA journalist visits, where national organisations arrange international gatherings and provide access to their local science institutions, industries and museums. Other activities include EU projects, where EUSJA is the critical component in knowledge-based projects that makes the bridge between communicators and science journalists.

There is an urgent need for more dialogue and a clearer understanding of the new media reality. This will aid science journalists and communicators to find their role. This is why EUSJA started a series of conferences where we discuss the challenge of science in the media and facilitate training and dialogue across borders and cultures. Our third European Conference of Science Journalists was organised this year in collaboration with ABSW (the Association of British Science Writers), and held on Saturday July 23 in Manchester, directly before ESOF 2016.

We need to strengthen the understanding of the role of science journalism in a dynamic knowledge-based society: not only with our fellow science journalists, but also with the other stakeholders who interact with, compete with, and study science journalism.

I hope to see you all next year at ECSJ2017 in Copenhagen. This event will be much more than a conference where we share our thoughts. It will be a showcase of good science communication, a platform for broadcasting and distribution of good stories and a forum for networking and updating your skills.

By JENS DEGETT, EUSJA president

Delegates at this year’s EUSJA GA in Strasbourg © Fabio Pagan
The EUSJA board has a new line-up, following this year’s election in Strasbourg. Jens Degett (Denmark), who had been the treasurer since March 2015, was elected president. The vice president is Marina Huzvarova (Czech Republic); the honorary secretary is Oliver Lehmann (Austria); and the treasurer is Antonio Calvo Roy (Spain, AECC). The four will hold office until the 2018 General Assembly (GA).

Satu Lipponen, who had served as president for two years, and had decided not to stand for re-election, was appointed president emeritus. The other outgoing board members were Viola Egikova (Russia), vice president for four years; Wolfgang Goede (Germany, TELI), honorary secretary, also for four years; treasurer Jens Degett; and associate board member Priit Ennet (Estonia), previously treasurer.

During the day-long meeting, the delegates discussed the importance of study trips, progress on EU projects, the new Cologne science centre and various activities of the associations, as well as financial and other reports. There is a short article on the GA at www.eusja.org/new-eusja-board-elected-jens-degett-president/, written by Wolfgang Goede.
A PERSONAL VIEW OF THE JOURNALISM/PR CONTROVERSY

By ANTONIO CALVO ROY, President Spanish Association of Scientific Communication (AECC) and EUSJA treasurer

I am a journalist and I write about science. Throughout my life, I have been part, often head, of communication offices in a diversity of areas, always related to science and technology. My life has been, and is, science journalism. I write about it and enjoy teaching courses on the subject, especially in Spanish-speaking America. And now an international controversy is trying to tell me whether I am a journalist or not, if I can work in a press office or not, if the paths are one- or two-way roads. A growing body of opinion is trying to place me on the “dark side”, that of public relations, where it seems I became polluted and irreversibly tainted, as if I had lived there forever. My ethics, alas, staggering.

I remember myself always writing, and writing about science from very early on. For about ten years, from 1980 to 1990, I was a freelance science writer for newspapers and magazines, and occasionally I worked as a press officer in small projects, such as the awarding of prizes for inventions and matters like that. Once, I was hired by a radio programme, and then I left when I was offered the chance to travel to Antarctica as a journalist for two months: I could not refuse. Upon my return I wrote my first book, precisely on Antarctica. This was not the story of a journey but one about what's there, what scientists are doing there and the reasons to be actively present. I also worked in the science section of a Madrid daily that is not published anymore. In 1992 I was hired for the press office of a ministry.

Then I moved to another ministry, and then I returned to the first, this time as head of communications. After that I worked for the Spanish regulatory body of nuclear energy, which reports to the Parliament, also in communication, and then for an association of copyright defence. With a friend who is also a science journalist, we created a company for communication and journalism, Divulga, where we worked with newspapers and magazines, always on science and the environment. We wrote scripts for television series, worked on exhibitions, and wrote books. We took on press offices of research centres and congress and gave dozens of courses on science journalism at universities and research centres.

In 2004 I was appointed director of communications for a large energy company and in 2012 returned to my small communication business, to write reports and my third biography of a Spanish scientist. Since 2014 I have been working for the communications department of a Spanish private university, combining this with writing reviews of science books for newspapers and magazines. Since 2005 I have been chairing the Spanish Association of Scientific Communication (which has been a partner of the EUSJA since the early 1980s) and I am a member of the board of EUSJA since March 2016.

AM I A JOURNALIST?

I wonder, am I a journalist? I would say I am, this is how I feel, this is what I do and how I approach my professional work. But there are always journalists who believe that there is a distinction between the journalism for the media and the communication made for press offices, whether in universities, research centres, laboratories, or energy companies; in short, places where research is done and scientific knowledge produced and from which information is issued.

I firmly believe that the quality of journalism that everyone treasures, such as knowledge and skills, experiences and readings, the attention paid to what is happening and a particular sensitivity, all this does not depend on your skin colour, or on where you work and have been trained. It depends on each person’s way of being in the world, with or without ethics, working honorably or carelessly, as a person with principles or without them.

These years of work on both sides of the trench have taught me that in either place you work better if you know the other side. My work as a journalist in the media is better if I know how a press office works, and no doubt is better my job in a cabinet if I know how media journalists work and if I know the media from within.
And by the way, my ability to be a good professional, a range that could go from being lazy to being corrupt, can be developed equally well on both sides.

The assumption that a job in a communication cabinet makes you a supporter of giving no information and of concealment of unlawful practices is unfounded. As it is unfounded to think that media journalists are angels who only seek the truth and well-being of the readers. The Italian historian of economics Carlo M. Cipolla has shown that the number of idiots is a universal constant and does not depend on the type of people who form a group but on its size, and the same principle applies to morality.

Beyond that, in the current terrible crisis of the media, the fact that many of our colleague science journalists are working in the press offices of companies or in scientific and technological organisations is good. These are perfectly decent career opportunities and ultimately such a professional trajectory would benefit all who are in science journalism and, therefore, society as a whole. If in those cabinets there would be not only people trained and experienced in marketing and public relations but also journalists, there is no doubt that they would all do a better job, more effective for the media and more useful to society.

And if we deny professional recognition to those colleagues, many of whom go back and forth between the media and press cabinets precisely because of the state of journalism and media, if we deny them the “bread and salt” as we say it in Spanish, for having gone to the “dark side”, we are creating morally unacceptable and professionally very limiting ghettos. If we prevent them from joining associations of science journalists, participating in decisions and discussions, and joining the group for better and for worse, we will be misunderstanding what the world of information is about.

AECC

The Spanish Association of Scientific Communication provides, in my view, a good example of this very thing. It was born in 1975, as the Spanish Association of Scientific Journalism, founded by Manuel Calvo Hernando who, two years earlier and with the Venezuelan Aristides Bastidas, had founded the American Association of Scientific Journalism. Calvo Hernando himself supported, several years afterwards, a change of name: ‘Communication’ instead of ‘Journalism’, precisely to include those who collaborated in the dissemination of science and the creation of a scientific culture, i.e. those working in science museums, as science writers, in units of scientific culture of universities and press offices. And here we are.

We believe that all of us who are interested in scientific information fit into the AECC, even if we do scientific journalism from a diversity of places. And we are also aware of the importance of defending professional interests and the need to require the professionalisation of those involved in this.

As with all equivalent associations, we keep watch on the rigour and ethics of our colleagues, and we do not believe that their morale has to do with their particular job either in the media or in a press cabinet. It is possible that, since I’ve been all my life in this (yes, I always feel I am a reporter) I have romanticised my work to the point of considering that those who can work best in communication, on either side of the trench, are journalists.

This it is not the result of my romanticism but of my experience. And part of my experience has been seeing soft ethics, too soft, on both sides of the trench. Good journalists will always be so, no matter where they are; those who have no principles do not have them either in writing or in the press office work.

Among the books written by Antonio is a biography of the founder of oceanography in Spain, Odon de Buen (1863-1945). One of the founders of European oceanography, in 1914 he created the Spanish Institute of Oceanography (http://www.ico.es). The book is a detailed overview of his life.
In common with the first and second Conferences of Science Journalists, the third such conference was characterised by interesting and relevant discussions. Held in Manchester on 23 July, the one-day conference preceded the multi-day ESOF event, and was open to all science journalists, though EUSJA journalists were much in evidence.

Just some of the highlights from both the 3rd ECSJ and ESOF follow in the next few pages. Readers will find more coverage on www.eusja.org and on the EuroScience websites.

Stranger in the day
SOME THOUGHTS ON THE PLENARY SESSION ON CLIMATE

By VIOLA EGIKOVA, PRESIDENT AND EUSJA DELEGATE OF THE RUSSIAN ASSOCIATION INTELLECT

If I had realised that I would be the only non-English person in a session for which Bob Ward, the policy and communications director of the Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment at the London School of Economics, suggested I should be a speaker, perhaps I would not have dared to accept his invitation. I’d be afraid to be a stranger in the discussion in which such brilliant English journalists attended. When I realised that all the panelists except me were from London, it was too late to retreat. I knew well two panelists from the group – Tim Radford and Steve Connor, both former science editors, Tim from The Guardian, Steve from The Independent. I had a previous happy experience of collaboration with them, so that encouraged me to take the risk. Later I was so glad I did.

It was one of the most interesting sessions I ever took part in. First of all, the topic itself was exciting: “Outside the consensus – working for media that are ‘sceptical’ about climate change”. Secondly, the panel gathered great discussants – alongside the two I already named, the speakers were: Geoffrey Lean, former Daily Telegraph columnist and environment reporter; Louise Gray, writer and freelance environmental journalist, formerly environment correspondent, Daily Telegraph; and Ben Jackson, former environment editor at The Sun. The session was produced by Bob Ward, who is also a board member of the Association of British Science Writers (ABSW). No wonder the room was fully booked. Later I read in one of the numerous tweets from the ECSJ: “Just counted around 120 people at the closing plenary at the #ECSJ – best session so far?”

About 83 per cent of those who filled in the survey about the conference replied ‘yes’ to that question. It seems the topic touched a sensitive chord in journalists’ hearts and minds.

Bob had anticipated this in his invitation letter: “There is an extremely strong consensus between scientists in Europe and across the world that climate change is happening, is driven by man, and poses serious risks if it is not tackled. Yet in most European countries there are one or more newspapers or broadcast organisations that have an editorial line that is ‘sceptical’ of scientific consensus. Science writers and journalists for such organisations can be expected to report both the findings and views of the consensus scientific community, and those of those individuals and organisations...
that reject the consensus. How should journalists and science writers manage such a task in a way that both satisfies their editors and promotes the public interest?"

Steve Connor, who chaired the session, organised the discussion so that the audience participated as well as the speakers. There was no lack of interest, because the topic concerned each of us. Later Mićo Tatalović, a board member of the ABSW, did a great job: he collected comments and photos from the ECSJ in Manchester and posted to the EUSJA page in Facebook. It seems that the words of the speakers hit the target because they were quoted many times. The most quotes were from Tim Radford's observation that science correspondents who wrote about the environment often faced indifference.

I found some references even to my speech: “Very apt, Viola Egikova from Moscow Daily describes climate sceptic media as not journalism, playing ‘Russian roulette’ with #climate #ECSJ”. Actually it was a mixture of different theses, but never mind. If the audience asked questions during the session and later left comments, that meant the session did its best: it caused hot debates.

This is what we always need when choosing topics for our conferences: they must fire debates – professional and ethical. Our discussion at the plenary session on climate change has shown that the issue is far from closed. So it was natural when it was proposed that the discussions should be continued. I would be glad to participate once again. It would be wonderful if it were in the same company. What about being again the only non-English person? I absolutely forgot about it during the session. Right, in such a friendly company I should not have worried!

"The panel in session © Simon Levey"
Dilemmas at work - NUCLEUS workshop in Manchester

By GORM PALMGREN and BERIT VIUF, EUSJA in house consultants on the NUCLEUS project; the authors are members of the Danish Science Journalists Association

What are the daily dilemmas that science journalists are exposed to when times are changing? We asked journalists at the 3rd European Conference for Science Journalists in Manchester what dilemmas they experience in their work and organised a panel of experts to give their advice.

The EU project NUCLEUS aims to implement RRI (Responsible Research and Innovation) in research institutions around the world. It is still a question though, whether science journalists have a responsibility when it comes to RRI. And if we do, how can we ensure RRI in our research and reporting?

Journalists can, roughly speaking, fill two roles in connection to RRI: the watchdog or the bridge builder to the public. The watchdog would stand outside and report on how well scientists are doing RRI. The bridge builder would work within the system, and make sure that the public understands what goes on inside the lab, thus enabling non-scientists to participate in the debate about how relevant a certain line of research is for society.

As EUSJA’s representatives in the NUCLEUS project we wanted to know about some of the dilemmas that journalists face when working in a new media landscape. Before we can work on guidelines that can help journalists to navigate in science and RRI, we need to narrow down the most common challenges for science reporting.

At the 3rd European Conference for Science Journalists we ran a workshop to discuss this with fellow science journalists, with the intention that everybody should have a chance to exchange experiences. Based on what we have chosen to call a Conversation Menu, we asked the participants to have discussions at their tables before presenting one dilemma to a panel. In the panel were a freelance science journalist (Elisabetta Curzel, Italy), a science editor at BBC Radio (Deborah Cohen, United Kingdom) and a scientist at EuroScience (Jean-Pierre Allix, France). The role of the panel was to comment and give advice on how to deal with these dilemmas.

The issues

These are some of the topics that arose:

⇒ How do we manage as science journalists when there is always editorial pressure to entertain and fascinate, despite the fact that there is sometimes a serious and dark side to science?

⇒ It seems unusual to pitch stories to an editor about how science fails to deliver. Yet that is happening all the time. How do we deal with that as science writers?

⇒ We are faced with a lot of problems in the media industry: crisis, double standards, bias, too little time and money, so journalists often use press releases and struggle to be objective. How can we do good science journalism when we depend so much on communication officers?

⇒ There is too much talk about the watchdog and not so much of the importance of the scientific process and the society in science journalism. When you are very critical about science, you lose the positive aspects for society.

⇒ Science journalism often exaggerates and personalises messages to the audience and this distorts the accuracy of the science. It has a big impact on the news, and it seems as if nobody in the newsroom cares about how reliable a science story is. Don’t journalists have a responsibility of any sort?

The main purpose at this stage of NUCLEUS was to put words to the frustrations journalists can feel when reality obstructs their ambitions. But it was also interesting to hear the responses from three different stakeholders in the science media industry.

Advice from the panel

The biggest frustration seemed to be that the pressure on the industry makes it difficult to tell the stories that journalists would really like to report about. As a result, reports easily become superficial and dependant on press releases. The panel seemed to agree on many of the problems raised, but also had some important input:

Deborah Cohen: “It is that balance of telling the audience about science. We do try to help people understand that science is a process. So part of what we do is to explain that. Another part is being a watchdog. Essentially we want to explain what scientists are doing, what makes them tick, because people in general don’t see a human face to science.”

EUSJA News Summer/Autumn 2016 European Union of Science Journalists’ Associations
Personal reflections on the 3rd ECSJ

The 3rd ECSJ was jointly organised by EUSJA and the Association of British Science Writers (ABSW).

MIČO TATALOVIĆ, vice president of the ABSW, board member of the Balkan Network of Science Journalists and a member of the Croatian Science Journalists Association, gave EUSJA News his thoughts on the success of the conference.

We had almost 200 people from nearly 20 countries registered for the conference. I was happy to see a similar number of people in both the first and the last plenary sessions, which means we didn’t lose people during the day, despite the sunny weather in Manchester and the parallel programme at ESOF.

Students and early career delegates I spoke to on the day said it was an amazing event that was very useful to them, so I was happy with that. A couple of more experienced journalists felt the panels only scratched the surface though – which is probably true but that’s inevitable in such a short space of time, and with several speakers on each panel.

We did have three parallel sessions on the go, which meant not everyone could go to everything they wanted to, but that’s how we usually run the UKCSJ, and it meant more variety, more sessions and more speakers than at previous ECSJs.

Personally, I was also happy to meet several colleagues from South-East Europe – Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, and Romania – and to launch a Balkan Network of Science Journalists on the sidelines of the meeting. We’ve had a loose network running for a few years now, but this meeting allowed us to formalise it and become more active as a new regional association.

My one regret is that we didn’t try to set up a fellowship scheme for colleagues from Africa to attend. ABSW is twinned with the Ugandan association of science journalists, and in the past, we had invited a few journalists from Uganda to attend our UKCSJ in London.

What many of us were unaware of was that EUSJA is twinned with its African equivalent, through the same WFSJ twinning programme. Had we known this, it would have been nice to partner up on some sessions or at least invite African colleagues over.

Similarly, we keep neglecting the needs of our neighbours to the East, especially the Balkans, where media freedoms and jobs are in danger and where EUSJA and European associations could do more to help science journalists there build capacity and integrate more with West Europe. Setting up travel grants and dedicated workshops for future such meetings could help, for example.
THE EUSJA ANNIVERSARY ROUNDTABLE AT ESOF

Does science need gatekeepers? Does mankind need gatekeepers?

This is a shortened version of a talk given by MARINA HUZVAROVA, EUSJA vice president and Czech association president.

Since being founded in 1971 EUSJA has grown to become a proud group of science journalists from 23 associations in 20 countries. The collapse of the so-called Iron Curtain in 1989 was a milestone for Eastern European countries suffering an enormous hunger for communication and collaboration across borders in every direction and in every sphere of life.

The Czech Journalists Club started its formal relationship with EUSJA at the beginning of this century. Although it’s been only a short time, quite a lot has happened.

Job losses

As the main challenge for many of us worldwide could be seen as the loss of jobs for science journalists, pushing out highly professional, carefully authenticated journalistic work in favour, all too often, of unreliable or simply ‘quack’ articles and endless discussions on electronic media and on social networks. This work is often penetrated by the commercial media and infused with PR materials in such a sophisticated way that some kind of paid advertisements or politically or commercially-slanted articles can barely be detected as such by the ordinary reader. That said, it has brought us to the general platform of contemporary journalism. There are often moans (at least, but not only, in my country) about the fact that experienced and educated journalists disgustedly leave their positions or are being sacked from their jobs and thrown out. Journalistic output has started to be both greater and shallower, everything being subordinated to the dictates of commerce and global media owners, and the guiding principle of the age: Bigger, Faster yet Shallower! Anyway, there is nothing new under the sun. Who was the first to utter: the one who controls the media also holds the reins of power…?

As science journalists we might sleepwalk in hope that we would be less affected than our colleagues reporting on a “normal world”. But this is a big mistake: globalised commerce controls the world of science as well. Is it possible anywhere nowadays that very fundamental research with the sole purpose of exploring the hidden secrets of the matter that surrounds us is being carried out? I’m afraid not. Because of lack of money and any room for the principle of discovery, scientists and also journalists are more or less continually being manipulated to ask how new discoveries can be ‘monetised’ as soon as possible.

Where is the door to open?

At this point, therefore, perhaps we can see the right place to look for those “doorkeepers”… are we these or not? Don’t we also need somebody else to hold the door for us? One more important question: in which direction is the door to open - whether towards the notion of open information for all people for the benefit of all, or towards breaking news inspiring some perhaps premature hopes or directing people to the great Temple of Consumerism? We should keep asking, searching tags, clues, but also watchfully looking out for traps and blind spots. Globalised science opens up a lot of space also for us journalists, and this area is too large for any single person – so it is hardly to be overviewed without collaboration.

Disillusionment

The next change during the period of the Czech membership in EUSJA is disillusionment, especially of members who came from countries engaged before the time of the Iron Curtain and who still remember times when communication was very complicated and when it was even more difficult to co-operate with partners abroad. That isolation meant a huge loss for scientists as well as for the whole of society. Greater enthusiasm has led to developing co-operation in various fields of life, including journalism.
What a disappointment, when we were confronted with the rising life-style of political correctness. It suddenly turned us back to those times when things were not allowed to be called their proper names.

There was no willingness to listen to our experience in similar situations, and whoever says other than the mainstream opinion is being almost criminalised (and I don’t mean extremists at all); this is especially the case for journalists. Why don’t we learn from scientists how to rely strictly on the exact and calibrated evidence of the situation around us? Shouldn’t we be the ones to try to hold the door open in this field? It will be much better if we could start much stronger cooperation together.

Danger

Due to our common inability to point out this possible danger, we are effectively led simply to oscillate in our lives, endlessly and pointlessly spinning wheels. In Europe where we live, but also in the world all round us, we find ourselves with ever increasingly large tensions. In spite of everything we are still not able to discuss these problems in a meaningful way, to listen to each other and respect opposing views and opinions, compare them with ours, and to find some good solution.

In this atmosphere, of course, our organisation can’t remain as an untouched, positive island of deviance in a hostile sea. Upcoming tensions, which had begun to manifest themselves even a few years ago, uncomfortably put a black mark on our relations inside EUSJA. Fortunately, however, this is outweighed by our common goodwill and consciousness that we need to work together, to collaborate across our diverse countries, rather than fragment.

I believe that one of the good examples of traditional co-operation across borders is in the organising of study trips for our members. What we learn looking at the world only through the computer monitor may vastly differ from our own knowledge learned in the field. Those who have gained their own experiences through their own eyes, those people are far more difficult to manipulate. I would venture to say that study trips are a wonderful example of co-operation across Europe. Everyone who has ever participated in the organisation of a study trip for EUSJA members deserves really big thanks.

A final question: what will co-operation after Brexit look like? I believe that we all will find the strength to overcome this unexpected situation. Apparently, it is also a big challenge and a warning for all of us. If we’ll not be able to collaborate, to work together, if we allow spades not to be called spades and we remain outwardly silent and just simmer in our discontent, then the door inside us slams shut.

I believe that our roundtable here in Manchester, this year’s European City of Science, has showed us evidence that we all need the open door, under the condition that everybody complies with the house rules. It is a basic need of scientists, journalists, Europeans, all people. And - either with gatekeepers or not - this is where I see a sense of co-operation across the whole of Europe, in whatever shape it may be in the future.
ESOF Declaration on eHealth

At the TELI/EUSJA science debate at ESOF2016, the topic was ehealth, including questions such as whether we should trust edoctors. The outcome was the Manchester Declaration on eHealth. With the proliferation of medical apps and electronic networking of health systems, the discussion was timely. A distinguished array of experts spoke on the topic, followed by structured discussions involving everyone attending. “Balance – training – choice” is what it’s all about, according to Wolfgang C. Goede, who is on the boards of both the German association TELI, and the World Federation of Science Journalists. He has written a comprehensive account of the session and the declaration on www.eusja.org/manchester-declaration-on-ehealth-more-training-better-choice

ESOF moments © Marina Huzvarova

Astronomy book by Italian member

“The Unforgotten Sisters: Female Astronomers and Scientists before Caroline Herschel” is a new book by GABRIELLA BERNARDI.

Taking inspiration from Siv Cederings’s poem in the form of a fictional letter from Caroline Herschel that refers to “my long, lost sisters, forgotten in the books that record our science”, this book tells the lives of twenty-five female scientists, with specific attention to astronomers and mathematicians. Each of the presented biographies is organised as a kind of “personal file” which sets the biographee’s life in its historical context, documents her main works, highlights some curious facts, and records citations about her. The selected figures are among the most representative of this neglected world, including such luminaries as Hypatia of Alexandria, Hildegard of Bingen, Elisabetha Hevelius, and Maria Gaetana Agnesi. They span a period of about 4000 years, from En HeduAnna, the Akkadian princess, who was one of the first recognised female astronomers, to the dawn of the era of modern astronomy with Caroline Herschel and Mary Somerville. The book will be of interest to all who wish to learn more about the women from antiquity to the nineteenth century who played such key roles in the history of astronomy and science despite living and working in largely male-dominated worlds.

Further information: http://www.springer.com/it/book/9783319261256
Publisher: Springer

The power of STEAM

CLARISA GUERRA GUERRERO has posted a report on the STEAM summer school held in Cleve in Germany on www.eusja.org/lights-camera-steam

STEAM stands for Science + Technology + Engineering + Arts + Mathematics. The blog entry, originally posted on the Spanish Science Communication Association’s blog, is an enthusiastic account of Clarisa’s participation and her many valuable experiences.

“One of the main messages of the lectures was the necessity to maximise the public engagement in science and the capability of involving society not only in science results but also in the research itself,” she states.

There will be another STEAM summer school next year.
Vision for the European Conference of Science Journalists 2017

By JENS DEGETT

After organising three European Conferences of Science Journalism the next conference will take this to a higher level and become much more than a traditional meeting. It will be a platform for work and co-creation and an opportunity to upgrade your professional skills. It is a chance to brand science journalism and your own work in an international forum. You can explore the potential of social media and you can network with all stakeholders in science media. You will be able to get new stories from the most important international research institutions.

The European Conference of Science Journalists (ECSJ) is the most important meeting for science journalists and communicators in Europe. The European Conference for Science Journalists 2017 (ECSJ2017) will be an interactive and communicative event. We will provide a media platform for streaming video and podcasting from the conference. As a new element, ECSJ2017 will offer work grants and pay for the work of science journalists from all over the world to help you to produce articles, podcasts and videos during and after the conference.

Learn from experts, learn from each other

ECSJ2017 aims to inspire through activities. The conference will offer a variety of experiences, namely, speeches in plenum, workshops, training opportunities, academic and commercial field studies, as well as time for networking. In addition to traditional conference elements such as talks and debates among leading professionals, participants will interact with their peers from many nationalities and cultures. We expect lively debates on current issues among diverse professionals, including researchers, journalists, artists, teachers, politicians, and students.

New media’s potential

With the mainstreaming of the internet and social media, the lines of communication have changed, bringing new possibilities for science journalism and communication. At the 4th European Conference for Science Journalists (#ECSJ2017) these possibilities will be explored: new methods, best practices, co-creation and training.

The main themes from climate change to investigative journalism

The conference will have a specific focus on the climate debate with training sessions, networking, creation of transnational investigative journalism and the best climate researchers and specialised journalists in the world. It is a unique setup which will have an important impact on the debate on global climate development, sustainability and resilience. Other themes are science in social media, global development, investigative journalism and responsible communication of science.

Understand the newest frontline of research

Several major European research institutions have agreed to present their hottest research straight out of the lab. During the conference, there will be a dedicated line of press briefings on new research results from all over Europe. Possibilities for using studios for editing and upload of stories to conference website will be available.

We need to strengthen the understanding of the role of science journalism in a dynamic knowledge based society. Not only among fellow journalists but also with the stakeholders who interact with, compete with and study science journalism.

Hoping to see you in Copenhagen from 26-30 June. See more at www.ecsj2017.com

WFSJ

As usual, The World Federation of Science Journalists, of which EUSJA is a member, has been busy and there are many news items on wfsj.org.

You can sign up on wfsj.org/v2/newsletter to receive the WFSJ newsletter.
This newsletter is published by EUSJA, which has its secretariat in Strasbourg.

The views expressed in it are those of the individual writers, and not necessarily those of the EUSJA board.
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