Hi all,

This is a call to action on the Imaginaries entry. There have been a few crucial developments:

* Clark Miller sent a message about editorial support, formatting, etc. and this included the outline of the whole volume—which indicates the sections. (Not sure if the rest of you received this—so I’m attaching a copy.) You will see that our chapter is to be included in a section titled: ‘Socio-Technological (Re-) Configurations’. I noted that there was a recasting of the title of our section (STS and the Imagination?). I’m not sure how this happened but I’ve written to him to have this corrected. **Please read the rubric here and note the anticipated readership, etc.**
* There has also been a reminder about the schedule – also attached.
* I also wrote to Sheila Jasanoff and she has forwarded copies of her two chapters in her forthcoming book: *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociological Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. So, I’m attaching these – which I would encourage you to read asap. **Please circulate any comments coming from your reading of this piece. You’ll note some changes in her position, etc. that we will need to register.**

**Seminar**: The plan was to have a preliminary draft that we could use as the basis for a presentation in Lancaster on March 5. Although Joan is now unable to attend and we are running tight on preparation time, I think it would be good to go ahead with this. It would focus our attention and force us to get on with the project. Also, if you can attend – Michael – the seminar would provide an opportunity for a group meeting, as well as potentially benefitting from feedback from those who attend. (Also, I am concerned that some of you may be busy over the Easter break.) **So, do let me know if you agree about doing the seminar on March 5th – as advertising for this should go out asap.**

**Revision work and schedule**: I’ve also tried to work out a division of labour and schedule, partly in response to the review commentaries you have provided. In what follows, I run through the various sections, making suggestions as to who might revise these and assigning approximate word lengths. I have used some of the specific points made in your reviews to orientate my proposals. **Please let me know if the proposed division of labour is acceptable to you.**

**Introduction**: There were various comments about needing a stronger intro. I was assuming that we would draft the intro when we had the rest of the entry in draft form. However, taking your comments about engagement with SF seriously Joan (and note Sheila’s intro in this regard) this may be the key to a good intro. ‘The Gernsback Continuum’ may be an appropriate pivot. The two concerns here are accessibility and brevity (whether this could introduce the piece succinctly). Are you willing to have another try with this, **Joan**? [500 words]

**Definitions and etymology**: **Michael** – since you indicated some views on this, would you have a go on this? Could this be done in a way that linked more with genealogy as suggested? [1,000 words]

**STS turn to imaginaries** **– survey**: needs updating; done through charts and very short accompanying commentary. **Adrian** – would you update this and prepare a chart and a short commentary? [1,000 words]

**Theoretical genealogy**: Joan suggests some reference to Althusser (short) and Appadurai definitely should be included. Michael mentions possible movement of discussion of Le Doeuff to this section? However, some drastic cutting needed (as Richard and others suggest) here with a map of the terrain. **Joan** – would you be willing to have a go? [2,000 words]

**Clusters of STS work on imaginaries**: Richard’s suggested that symbolic interactionist section should be cut – Joan’s solution for this seems good. **Richard** – could you handle this? [2,000 words]

**Methodologies**: I suggested that we need more detail here (Adrian – I did mean methodologies in STS research, rather than our own methods.) **Maureen** – I’m willing to have a go with this. [500 words]

**Turn to imaginaries (and conclusion?)**: Glad to hear that some of what we have so far on this is promising (Richard and Michael). But I think we need more on this turn – theoretical reasons, but also the kinds of questions which are being and can be tackled; what does it mean for STS. The Jasanoff pieces handle these issues rather differently and we would need to register this. Also noting Joan’s comments about ‘different turns’ and versions of imaginaries (Joan) and matters of temporality (promises, promissory, etc. –Richard and Michael); as well as performativity (Michael) **Maureen** – I’ll have another take on this. [1,000 words]

**Schedule**: I would suggest that we should circulate our drafts by Tuesday, 3rd March. I would then work to assemble them and hoped that we might be able to organise a meeting on Wed. 4th to organise the presentation. [Adrian, Richard, and myself primarily; Michael if available?; Joan – skype consultation?]

I recognise that all of this is tight and I appreciate that each of you has many other commitments and pressures. **So, do let me know what you think: I’m just trying to find a way of getting this done! (Please make concrete proposals about other arrangements, etc.)**

With best wishes,

Maureen