

**What is a Geography of Trust in Scientific Field Practice?** – *Michael Bravo (Geography), University of Cambridge (GB)*

Today most people agree that experiments in the field should give something back to the field as well as take knowledge away. In other words the practice of science should be a reciprocal relationship with give and take. This position has to some extent become the status quo, but will it be so in the future? Will the social contract between scientists and their public audiences change, and if so how? In this paper I will suggest some new ways to think about the social contract. To begin with, there is a need to acknowledge that the social contract has a history and that the expectations and obligations of scientists are much greater than in the past. The public meanings of science have been rewritten over time as the terms of the contract have been renegotiated to become socially and ontologically more inclusive. Key to this process has been the recognition of the plurality of voices of stakeholders, the significance of lay forms of knowledge, changing standards of consent, and the search for local and regional self-determination. The full implications of this way of thinking about scientific experiments in the field are only rarely appreciated: a career of field experiments not only creates new knowledge; no less importantly it transforms scientists' understanding of many things beyond their individual specialisations. Minority self-determination movements have understood that knowledge and capacity-building are profoundly linked; the same ought to be true of publicly-funded scientific research.