

Editorial Note

The presumptuous judgement made by a committee of self-proclaimed experts who were probably eager to put some order and taxonomy in the big menagerie (or did they think of a jungle?) of the reviews of history and philosophy of medicine and sciences, their authoritarian gesture of producing a graded list of journals where the serious and international reviews would be ranged on one side and on the other side the local and perhaps – at best – entertaining reviews (which one can suppose would correspond, in the mind of these experts, to specific categories of readers: the fully qualified historian or social scientist, or the amateur in a pejorative sense), has provoked a common reaction and statement from the whole community of professionals (see the Editorial Note of our last issue, *Gesnerus* 66/2 2009, published jointly by several dozens of specialised journals). Beyond this remarkable outburst of solidarity and sound reason shared by many editors of journals across the fields of history of medicine and science all over the world, the best answer to all possible new forms of Manichaeism cannot but lie in continuing to edit a range of journals that demonstrate to which extent the categories of «local» or «international», of «lay» or «professional» (be it from the point of view of the geographical or professional provenance of the authors, be it also in the perspective of the content of the papers) are not only dangerous, but outdated and do not correspond to any serious criterion of quality any more: the community of our journals must be heterogeneous, various, distinct. We even take the view that the content of this very issue is a part of the answer: there is no way of asserting if the detailed history of cholera in a small community in Northern England is more or less «local» than the narrative of research on plague in Tunisia, or if the introduction of a new therapeutic molecule in Belgium is more «professional» than the history of a concept in German psychiatry or the historiography of ancient psychopathology. For certain, we praise (linguistic as well as thematic) heterogeneity in *Gesnerus*, not because it sticks to an a priori conception of what history of medicine of science should be, but because it corresponds to the intrinsic dynamics in our disciplines.

Vincent Barras