



## Editorial

Nicolas Rasmussen<sup>1</sup> · Vassiliki Betty Smocovitis<sup>2</sup>

Accepted: 27 February 2024

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature B.V. 2024

With this issue, we begin our second year as Co-Editors-in-Chief of this journal. We are especially pleased to have published a number of original research articles, essay reviews, and book reviews, and to have worked with a diversity of talented authors, helpful topical collections editors, constructive referees, and timely book reviewers. We have also learned a great deal about modern journal publications that depend on digital technologies and collaborations on a global scale. It has sometimes been a challenge to coordinate all this, but it has also been exciting to follow the scholarship from start to finish and see how it has improved at each stage, thanks to the efforts of the *JHB* team. Sadly, it has been a bittersweet year too, marked by the loss of Garland Allen, and Everett Mendelsohn, one a past editor, the other the founding editor of this journal. We never expected to be editing a journal filled with so many tributes and memorial reflections and hope these are the last *in memoriams* we see in *JHB*, for a long time.

We thus enter 2024 happy with the first four issues behind us, but especially happy to note that the year marks the 100th anniversary of the History of Science Society (HSS). Though *JHB* has had independent origins, as readers of the special section in honor of Everett Mendelsohn will recall, we nonetheless share in some of the success of the history of science as a discipline, one that draws on exacting scientific work while at the same time meeting some of the highest standards of the historical profession. We are pleased to note that *JHB* has always welcomed work that speaks to practicing life scientists, whether in the lab, the field, or in the classroom, and did not engage the many fruitless disputes of the late 1970s, 1980s and especially the 1990s arguing for the separation of science and history; *JHB* has never been “whig”

---

✉ Nicolas Rasmussen  
N.Rasmussen@unsw.edu.au  
Vassiliki Betty Smocovitis  
bsmocovi@ufl.edu

<sup>1</sup> University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW, Australia

<sup>2</sup> University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, USA

nor “prig” nor “rated X” (see Brush 1974 and Harrison 1987 for some of this early literature). It has always been an inclusive journal, one that welcomes a diversity of approaches whether exploring the intersection of biology and history, or drawing on approaches from philosophy, sociology, anthropology or even visual studies, and popular culture through critical prisms that include race, class, gender, or varying abilities. We hope to continue this inclusive approach, especially one that encourages collaborations between biologists, historians, and others. In this spirit we have invited Kate MacCord and Jane Maienschein, two historians of biology, to share their experiences collaborating with biologists. We hope this inspires other such collaborations that might find publication venues such as *JHB*.

## References

- Brush, Stephen G. 1974. Should the history of science be rated X? The way scientists behave (according to historians) might not be a good model for students. *Science* 183: 1164–1172.
- Harrison, Edward. 1987. Whigs, prigs and historians of science. *Nature* 329: 213–214.

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.