

TENSIONS OF EUROPE **(ToE)** **NETWORK NEWSLETTER**

(2) November 2006

Theme: First ToE Summer School



(Panorama, Bordeaux. Photo Courtesy of Suzanne Lommers)

In this issue:

Word from the Editor

News: ToE Breakfast, SHOT 2006

Conferences

- **Joint Inventing Europe and ToE Conference**
- **Media and Imperialism**

Two Summer Schools, 2007

Hot off the Press

First ToE Summer School:

Tales of Integrating and Fragmenting Europe: The Role of Infrastructures, 1850-2000, Bordeaux, France

- **Word from the Organizers**
- **Word from a Teacher**
- **Prizewinning Student Reports**

The *Tensions of Europe* Newsletter and website are supported by the Foundation for the History of Technology, Eindhoven, The Netherlands (www.histech.nl/tensions) and Eindhoven University of Technology (www.tue.nl).

Word from the Editor

I am happy to present reports of the First *Tensions of Europe* Summer School. While I cannot provide first hand observations, the informal stories I heard were extremely enthusiastic. Below you will find the perspective of the organizers, as told by Jan Oliva. A summer school teacher, Andreas Fickers, also shares his views here. Many students submitted reports hoping for the prizes. The Prize Committee has informed me that the winners are: Kristiina Korjonen-Kuusipuro and Yves Bouvier! Congratulations to them both. Their pieces are included here. The other student reports will soon be available on our website.

Reflecting on, and paraphrasing from, the original summer school proposal discussed at the Transition Committee Meeting in April 2005, I can confidently say that the summer school lived up to the objectives outlined by Mikael Hård and Johan Schot. It addressed the history of technology and related fields by focusing on issues relevant for the ToE project, provided Ph.D. students with insights in recent developments in the history of technology and ToE, and gave Ph.D. students an opportunity to present their own work and discuss international trends in the history of technology and related fields in the English language. Furthermore, it utilized an international group of professional historians of

technology developed in through the network, maintained the network by bringing together teachers and students from different countries, and mobilized the collective competence of network participants to teach Ph.D. students. I congratulate the organizers and the network as a whole for this achievement. I trust its success will encourage and stimulate future summer school organizers.

The *Inventing Europe* full proposals are now under review. I wish all you the best of luck in the final stage. Do keep me informed so that I can share good news in the next newsletter.

I would appreciate receiving information of interest to the network for the next newsletter. Please submit reports on your research projects, new publications, historical images, as well as organizational news.

Donna C. Mehos
Editor
Eindhoven University of Technology
d.c.mehos@tm.tue.nl

News

SHOT Breakfast

Tom Misa hosted the ToE Breakfast at the 2006 Annual Meeting of SHOT in Las Vegas. Both familiar and new faces from Europe, the USA, and Canada were seen among the +/- 35 scholars who attended. They engaged in animated discussion after individual introductions and the presentations. Misa informed SHOT attendees that the EUROCORES Program *Inventing Europe* had been funded by the ESF and that proposals were currently under review, and he led a brief discussion about the substantial multinational complexity of the funding and decision-making processes. Misa also announced the Transition Committee's decision in Lappeenranta, Finland, to maintain ToE as an informal but active and open network, that will facilitate collaborate research, will operate in parallel with *Inventing Europe*, and continue to organize conferences and summer schools. Furthermore, Misa brought the upcoming Third Plenary Conference to their attention. At this breakfast, Karl-Erik Michelsen gave a presentation on the successful Second Plenary Conference in Lappeenranta. Michelsen awarded the conference prize for the most promising paper presented by a junior scholar to Waqar Zaidi, Imperial College, London for his "Proposals for Internationalization of Aviation: A Case of Interwar Technological Internationalism."

Conferences

Third Plenary Conference of ToE

As you have seen in our recent email, the Call for Papers is out for the Third Plenary Conference of ToE that will be held in conjunction with the launching of the ESF EUROCORES Program *Inventing Europe* (see ToE website). Please circulate this call to colleagues who may be interested in attending. Note that the deadline for proposals is **January 5, 2007**. We look forward to seeing you in Rotterdam in June 2007.

Media and Imperialism: Press, Photography, Film, Radio and Television in the Era of Modern Imperialism

International Association for Media and History (IAMHIST) XXII
Amsterdam, July 18-21, 2007

Deadline for proposals:

December 20, 2006

Please see conference website:
www.media-and-imperialism.com

ToE Summer Schools

In the coming year, expect there will be two summer schools. We will inform you of more details as they become known.

Hot off the Press: Tensions of Europe Book Publication

Edited by Erik van der Vleuten and Arne Kaiser, *Networking Europe: Transnational Infrastructures and the Shaping of Europe, 1850-2000* (Science History Publications, Sangamore Beach, MA) has just appeared. It is the result of the ToE Phase 1 Theme Group “Networking Europe.”

Summer School Reports Bordeaux, September 2006

Organizing Integrating and Fragmenting Europe

In 2005, the *Tensions of Europe* Network Transition Committee members Mikael Hård and Johan Schot proposed plans to organize annual summer schools. Potential hosts faced both financial and institutional challenges. Two French scholars, Pascal Griset and Christophe Bouneau, took on the task and organized the first ToE Summer School this year in Bordeaux.

The French have little experience in organizing such events in the human and social sciences—unlike the natural sciences where they are more common. When we tried to find a similar event in France, we could find only one summer school that took place in 1996 in Paris. Therefore, the organization of the first ToE Summer School in our country was a real institutional challenge.

In order to succeed, we combined scientific effort, skills, and material support from two main French research institutions: the *Centre de Recherche en Histoire de l'Innovation* (CRHI) lead by Pascal Griset, professor of contemporary history at the Paris IV-Sorbonne University and Director of CRHI,¹ and the *Maison des Sciences de l'Homme d'Aquitaine* (MSHA) lead by Christophe Bouneau, its director, who is also professor of contemporary history at the Bordeaux III University.² I assisted them in the organization.

Due to short term planning (the final decision about hosting the summer school in France was made relatively late in early 2006) and other practical issues, we had little time to spread the information. (I recommend future organizers have a full year for planning, with the application deadline well before the summer break.) Fortunately, the basic work was done and we could announce the summer school at the *Second ToE Plenary Conference* in Lappeenranta, Finland (25th – 28th May 2006). This was in fact a very good place to publicize it. Once more, the *ToE* network proved to work well. By the deadline (June 30), we received more proposals from PhD candidates than we could accept. In fact, our wish as organizers to receive a sufficient number of applications, but not so many that we

¹Université Paris IV-Sorbonne, Centre de Recherche en Histoire de l'Innovation, 1, rue Victor Cousin, 75 005 Paris

² Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Esplanade des Antilles, 33607 Pessac ; www.msha.fr

would have to reject some, was impossible. We could accept only two thirds of the applicants.

The criteria of selection were based on scientific relevance (mainly the link between the students' research and the theme of the summer school) and representation from many countries. Although the call for applications was not limited to the existing ToE network, primarily network participants responded. We eventually hosted 20 students (19 Ph.D. students, one post-doc) and six professors³ from 15 different European countries (and one US representative). In this sample, Europe was quite equally geographically represented: UK (1), the Netherlands (3), France (2), Italy (2), Czech Republic (1), Norway (2), Finland (1), Lithuania (1), Ukraine (1), Hungary (1), Bulgaria (1), Romania (1), Greece (1), and Germany (1), but our overall impression is that the ToE network is still does not cover the whole continent. Countries including Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Switzerland, and Russia were missing. Students from some countries are prevented from participating for financial reasons, others certainly because of a lack of information. In order to compensate for financial difficulties of students, in general, and, in particular,

³ In addition to P. Griset and C. Bouneau, six professors were invited to give lectures on various themes (see the programme on www.histech.nl/Tensions): Maria Paula Diogo, Portugal; Johan Schot, The Netherlands; Andreas Fickers, The Netherlands; Luciano Segreto, Italy; Patrick Fridenson, France.

those with origin from poorer countries, in Bordeaux we could offer quite generous conditions (all residential fees covered). Although we recommend that future organizers arrange similar material conditions, we admit that this might exclude some countries from organizing it. It is also important that we continue to seek funding for future summer school travel grants.

The overall structure of the summer school was a very classic one, drafted already in the above mentioned ToE summer school project, based upon professors' lectures, students' work presentations, and roundtable sessions. This structure proved efficient and probably more intensive than some students expected. We could not organize "student roundtables" focusing on common lectures but this would be a possible improvement for future summer schools.

The sessions emphasized both scientific discussion and presentation skills in a relaxed and supportive atmosphere. This last point should be underlined. The friendly atmosphere – which is typical for ToE meetings – is a basic condition for international scholarly work. Young scholars, who are not necessarily used to this kind of scholarly work, have become internationally mobile and they are confronted with increasing competition. Events like this summer school provide an interesting platform where presentation

and language skills can be trained, friendly relationships created, and professional links developed. We all have (in France in particular) the need to be more open to the rest of Europe. Too many careers are based only upon national recognition. This is, of course, a necessity, but more openness and international experience is sorely needed. In this sense, the summer school in Bordeaux was a symbolic and a material link between France and Europe.

The scientific backing and the financial platform were provided by our four-year program at the MSHA called *Les Logiques Spatiales de l'Innovation* (LSI).⁴ As you see, it has to do with the links between “space” and “innovation”. Pascal Griset and Christophe Bouneau are leaders of the project. The problematic defined for the summer school, therefore, included a spatial (Europe) and a technological (infrastructures) dimension. It was modelled around current scholarly questions about the complex relations that influenced the history of European building processes. Also, future research planned within the framework of the ESF Eurocores program *Inventing Europe* was discussed. A number of issues (and some students were dissatisfied) were too briefly treated during the sessions. Some of them, such as the linking and de-linking process, need further analysis by senior

scholars from as many European countries as possible. We expect no easy answers, as national experiences and perspectives continue to influence our work and reasoning. It is therefore important to host the future summer schools in different countries, to reflect a variety of national perspectives of defining themes, and organizing scientific and material aspects for our work.

On the ToE level, we are facing a fascinating four-year-program, with more summer schools, more research, and more synthetic conferences. We hope that the First ToE Summer School in Bordeaux contributed to the overall dynamic, on both, individual and collective levels.

On behalf of the organizing team,
Jan Oliva, Ph.D. student Bordeaux III,
Prague Charles University
Scientific Assistant, MSHA Bordeaux

⁴ We also received financial support from the French Ministry of Research, the Conseil régional d'Aquitaine, the CRHI and the Foundation for the History of Technology in the Netherlands.

»Entre tensions et tentations«:

Eclectic Recollections of a ToE Summer School Teacher

Felicitous experiment – this might be the shortest and most appropriate characterization of the first ToE summer school on European infrastructures in Bordeaux last September. Marvellously hosted by the *Maison des Sciences de l'Homme d'Aquitaine* (MSHA) on the campus of Bordeaux III University, the summer school united twenty young scholars from 13 European countries. As the two organizers, Christoph Bouneau and Pascal Griset, stated in rhetoric both proud and uneasy, this summer school was without doubt the first one to be held in English on the haughty “terroires Bordelais”! In doing so, they performed perfectly what the summer school was all about: looking at Europe as a hybrid construction, merging the apparently conflicting ingredients of “tension” and “temptation”, making Europe so vivid and complicated, or – to use the vocabulary of the summer school proposal – so integrated *and* fragmented.

While the temptations of this summer school appeared in the robe of excellent food and wine, challenging ideas and fresh perspectives of both the key note speakers and the students, and unorthodox forms of academic exposure (“interview session”), productive tensions arose from the simple fact of bringing together people from various disciplinary

backgrounds and scholarly traditions, all looking at European infrastructures from different perspectives and alternative questions. Both Pascal Griset’s opening speech on the historiographical roots and transitions of the network concept in history of technology, and Johan Schot’s investigation on the possible narratives of a future European history of technology set the theoretical frames for the thematic paths of the summer school. In introducing the concepts of “networks and large technological systems” (Pascal Griset), “agency, regime, and landscape” (Johan Schot), “translation and domestication” (Maria Paula Diogo), and “performance and event” (Andreas Fickers), the key note speakers tried to sound critically the potentials and limitations of a history of technology in Europe circling around the concept of infrastructures. (I unfortunately missed the lectures of Lugiano Segreto and Patrick Fridenson, so I cannot reflect on their input).

Unfortunately, the students focused less on concepts of infrastructures in their presentations of their ongoing PhD research. As a general impression, I would say that the discipline of history of technology – and especially its offspring – would profit from a broader interest in theoretical and methodological knowledge and skills from disciplines like anthropology, cultural studies, or media studies to enlarge the creative potential of scholars. I do not intend to trivialize the

importance of political or economic contexts for the shaping of technological infrastructures, but rather to open new ways of looking at European infrastructures as material, institutional, and discursive performances and their various forms of symbolic appropriation in our daily lives. Summer schools are without doubt the right place to do so, and

I can only congratulate the organizers for having taken the initiative to offer a more than pleasant platform for this purpose and hope that this was the start of a long lasting series of ToE summer schools!

Andreas Fickers
University of Utrecht



Fickers and Others at Work
(Photo Courtesy of Suzanne Lommers)



Summer School in Action at the MSHA (Photo Courtesy of Jan Oliva)



Summer School on Break (Photo Courtesy of Suzanne Lommers)

First Prize

Summer School Student Report



To the Summer School and Beyond

I begin my report with a photograph from Bordeaux. The horse in the picture is an appropriate example of the fact that the making of Europe and technology has influenced many different things.

This seahorse is from the fountain adorning the monument of Girondis built in 1899. The horses and other figures were removed from their place during the Second World War and they were to be melted in order to get the metal to war material. These statues were removed from their place in 1943, but in 1944 they were found intact and returned to their own places in 1945. Luckily they were never melted and reused.

On what grounds do I think that this statue and this incident symbolize the history of technology? I do not argue that this seahorse could be or is a symbol of history of technology per se, but as a mixture of horse and sea animal it represents the idea of history of technology as a combination of the two disciplines, namely history and technology. The history of these statues

described above is also an excellent symbol of the making of Europe in which the Second World War played a major role.

The focus of the Bordeaux Summer School was on infrastructures and the building of Europe. Teachers of the summer school told us about the conceptual framework we should be aware of when doing research about the history of technology. In this framework the concept of *network* was important. We were enlightened about the three levels in the study of networks. And it seemed that these levels - micro, meso, and macro - could easily be found in any of the cases. By far all was simple.

For me the most important points in the sense of evaluating the summer school were not the idea and the concepts in the history of technology (although those were important, too). The most important thing was the network. Networks have been a popular focus of studies in many fields in recent decades and the idea of network is basically the same as a system in systems theory. But why did the concept become so relevant in evaluating the Bordeaux Summer School?

In my application I wrote that the participation in the summer school would have a fundamental influence for my thesis. I hoped for excellent teachers and useful information. I was a little frightened that I was expecting too much from the whole summer school. Either I would be really disappointed or the information I got would be useless. Actually I was rather naïve in my application even though the teachers were good and I did get lots of useful information. All the same, I couldn't clearly see the benefits of the summer school beforehand, because what I really received from it was totally different from what I expected.

A Finnish philosopher, Professor Pekka Himanen⁵ has done research about creativity. He speaks of “the law of Linus” (that is Linus Thorvaldsen, the developer of the Linux system) in which there are three levels that must come true if you aim at the most creative outcome. The first phase of this law is the survival, where a person has to have an ability to survive his/her own life. The second phase is the enriching social networks and the third phase is the creative passion. If all these phases come true, a person can achieve such a level in his/her work that he/she could not achieve by working alone. The end product is something unexpected and of very high quality.

Of course the benefits of networking people are widely known, and I think there is always such a hidden curriculum in the summer schools or in scientific conferences. The Bordeaux summer school showed me in practice that there is indeed a level of enriching social networks and that these kinds of networks are worth gold. For years I have worked in a community I thought was enriching enough, but with all these people attending the summer school, all interested (almost) the same field of scholarship, I realized that a person should not work individually but as a part of a truly creative group including all the people. I have to rename the summer school as *stimulation*. I realized that in my forthcoming research there is a huge amount of work to be done, but I am not alone and there are always people willing to help and also I can help others mitigate this task.

From time to time during the summer school I caught myself thinking: what am I doing here among all these historians? As a cultural anthropologist I realized that some studies about infrastructures missed something – the concept of culture was

sometimes mentioned but it was actually never truly used. Sometimes the people also ignored the true sense of the word. In fact these doubtful thoughts of mine made me search for deeper understanding: why do I feel the way I do? What am I really interested in? Am I in the wrong place even though I have gained so much already? During those five days in Bordeaux I also got the glimpse of the answer. For me and my work, the concept of culture is of main importance and I do have to concentrate very hard on those concepts I know the best. I should not adopt concepts I do not believe in or copy them from someone else. This was put very nicely and astutely by Patrick Friedenson when he said “Don’t be a clone of your supervisor, be yourself”. I just do have to make these concepts more visible in my thesis if I really think they are useful and vital for the research.

I have also been rather naive thinking that we Europeans somehow look at different phenomena from the same perspective. Of course I have known that there are differences, but discussions with other students and also teachers illustrated that all of us need a wider perspective and with this kind of network the wider perspective comes kind of automatically. I realized that those of us who were from Scandinavia understood some things differently than others. This is especially true in environmental questions. The time that we lived from nature is not so long ago and it has had an immense effect on our culture and the way we use technology, for example. And if I do not make my statements clear, people do not understand properly what I am trying to say.

The teaching methods in Bordeaux summer school were very traditional. Students were divided into two groups and every one of us had to have a presentation. We also had lectures on various subjects by teachers. In the coming summer schools it could be useful to try some different methods other than these

⁵ Professor Pekka Himanen gave a lecture about the future of the information society in Lappeenranta in 5th of October.

traditional ones. Five days is a long time and a small change would have brought in a different kind of rhythm. It could have been more useful, for example, to read some theoretical texts beforehand and base discussions on this required reading even in smaller groups. Sitting in classrooms and listening to one person talking is not always the most creative and inspirational way to study. In spite of my criticism, I am quite sure that the methods of teaching in Tensions of Europe summer schools will develop during the forthcoming years.

I finally close my report with a symbol. It is already a familiar picture, but this time it symbolizes me. As an anthropologist I

felt myself partly as an alien in the summer school full of historians and moreover historians of technology. When the speech turned to human beings and identities I felt myself more “at home”. Anyway, the horse is a symbol of courage and strength, and after the summer school in Bordeaux I felt that I had received a great amount of new ideas and also power. I got much more than I was able to expect: the network of students (and also teachers). I hope that this network will function in the future as a truly enriching social network.

Kristiina Korjonen-Kuusipuro
South Karelian Institute
Lappeenranta, Finland



Second Prize

Summer School Student Report

From our special reporter in Bordeaux

-----PRESS RELEASE-----

Breaking News:

*Europe and Technology
are having an Affair!*

The rumour was increasing during the past few years. Europe, the famous star who has been on the front page of the newspapers for 50 years, who is the main subject of TV shows in more than 30 countries, who is well-known all around the world and not only for the election of Miss World, wouldn't have only an affair with Politics. Technology is, of course, less mediated than Politics but this atmosphere of mystery is often seen as an advantage. Nevertheless, Technology is far from unknown and the key role of electricity, transportation, and communication in everyday life has lead some editorialists to speak of a kind of a "technological shaping" when it was not a "technological determinism" of the industrialized societies.

Here in Bordeaux, in the sunny southwest of France, Europe and Technology have a secret meeting to prepare their engagement. The date of the marriage is not official yet but it could be held in few months in Eindhoven. To organize this big event (and perhaps to write the marriage contract), twenty young experts coming from the North and the South, the West and the East, were the guests of the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme d'Aquitaine. The codename of this confidential meeting is "ToE Summer School". Someone told me that it is the "Rosebud" of an old scholar but I think that it is more a way to mislead the journalists. What does "ToE" mean: Take or Exchange? Time of Europe? Temptation

over Equity? I've asked the question of one of these young experts who, under the seal of secrecy, revealed to me that it means "Tensions of Europe". And we all understand that Europe can be nervous before revealing her love affair with Technology.

What did these young experts, specialized in the relationship between Europe and Technology, do? They were divided in two groups, and each group worked in a workshop during the morning. One of the main subjects was the manufacturing of the wedding ring: are the infrastructures (energy, transportation...) strong enough to shape a long-term relationship? Is the practice of infrastructure the base of this marriage? Are the Europeans conscious of the ideology embedded in their practice when they're driving on the E-12 motorway? Do they feel European when they're using their cellular phone, because it is based on a European standard? The activity during the workshops was intense and each young scholar had presented his point of view. The papers were seriously discussed. It's true that sometimes, the focus was pointed on the economic logics or on a business approach but the subject related these papers.

To guide the work of these young scholars, a short list of international experts was determined to help them. Some full sessions were organized and they all listened to Johan Schot, Pascal Griset, Christophe Bouneau, Maria Paula Diogo, Andreas Fickers, Luciano Segreto, and Patrick Fridenson give their opinion on Technology on the European scale and on Europe in the technological dynamics. This was a part of the problem: they don't all speak of the same thing in the same way. But, according to all of them, it was a part of the success of the meeting. Crossing the perspectives, comparing the careers in the different European countries, moving on the scales was useful and stimulating. For example, one session was a kind of "Guantanamo questioning". Three professors were obliged to answer

several personal and professional questions. Without the usual masks, they presented their point of view in an authentic open-minded atmosphere. The “carrot-stick approach” was defined as the best mental configuration to lead the crowd of scholars in history of technology. We supposed that a more technological framework than the carrot could be used to explain the management of social research, something like interactive software in a virtual network, perhaps. But the stick is certainly an important artefact in this world.

What are the conclusions of this deep analysis of the Europe-Technology affair? Of course, three levels can be distinguished: the actors, the regime, and the landscape. First: the actors of the wedding. The scholars met each other for the first time and the links between them can now be more and more strong. It's their responsibility to keep the contact together. The scholars are able to develop their own approach in the ToE program. I don't know if this summer school was really a technological one but it was certainly a European one. Second: the matrimonial regime. The marriage between Europe and Technology seems to be based on infrastructures, technological networks, and mental categories. The regime defined for this relationship, is both real and mental, both practices and ideology. It's an unstable balance between a technological soft determinism and a diffuse political construction. Third and last level: the landscape. After this Summer School, is the ToE's landscape better? Probably yes, due to the work of all the participants. It is certainly a new dimension of the ToE network

Yves Bouvier
Foundation EDF
France



Summer School Excursion to the Castel Winery (Photo Courtesy of Viktor Pal)

Back row, from left to right: Andreas Fickers, Pascal Griset, Luciano Segreto, Ola Nordal, Jan Oliva, Waqar Zaidi, Annalisa Coli, Kristiina Korjonen-Kuusipuro, Frank Schipper, Elena Cavalieri, Christophe Bouneau, Marija Dremaite, Suzanne Lommers, Gabriela Gretu, Oleksandr Svyetlov. First row, from left to right: Yiannis Garyfallos, Jonathan Winkler, Kjetil Kvist, Viktor Pal, Elena Triffonova, Heike Weber, Yves Bouvier, Vincent Lagendijk (Thanks to Vincent Langendijk for identifying participants.)