solving": assuming the institutional ontology and epistemological bona fides of the academy, philosophers sought to work out the basic structures of language, science, and ethics. Doubtless, rigorous work was produced; but the results were also tacitly dogmatic, in that they simply accepted the norms of disciplinary knowledge that characterized the special sciences.

There are signs that 20th century disciplinary excess is breeding a counter-movement toward inter- and transdisciplinarity. This movement is discernable both within and outside the academy, but it is still half-conscious, halting, and subject to backtracking. Despite constant invocations of the need for interdisciplinarity, disciplinary assumptions still dominate the structure of the academy. The philosophic community has been notably laggard here: in a time calling for bold interdisciplinary experimentation the field remains more disciplined than most, and is characterized by the dreary repetition of the puzzle solving mentality. It is clear that the impetus for change within philosophy will come from outside philosophy.

This talk will discuss the development of a new model of philosophic reflection currently being pursued at the University of North Texas.

4.3
Bringing Results to Fruition through Publication?
An analysis of a peer-reviewed, open access and context-focused journal's editorial practice

Anne B. Zimmermann, *Susanne Wymann von Dach*, *Theodore Wachs*, and *Hans Hurni*, University of Bern, Switzerland
Keywords: Peer review system; dissemination; transdisciplinary journals; science-society gap; North-South divide

When it comes to helping to shape sustainable development, research is most useful when it bridges the science–implementation/management gap and when it brings development specialists and researchers into a dialogue (Hurni et al. 2004); can a peer-reviewed journal contribute to this aim? In the classical system for validation and dissemination of scientific knowledge, journals focus on knowledge exchange within the academic community and do not specifically address a 'life-world audience'. Within a North-South context, another knowledge divide is added: the peer review process excludes a large proportion of scientists from the South from participating in the production of scientific knowledge (Karlsson et al. 2007). *Mountain Research and Development* (MRD) is a journal whose mission is based on an editorial strategy to build the bridge between research and development and ensure that authors from the global South have access to knowledge production, ultimately with a view to supporting sustainable development in mountains. In doing so, MRD faces a number of challenges that we would like to discuss with the td-net com-

munity, after having presented our experience and strategy as editors of this journal.

MRD was launched in 1981 by mountain researchers who wanted mountains to be included in the 1992 Rio process. In the late 1990s, MRD realized that the journal needed to go beyond addressing only the scientific community. It therefore launched a new section addressing a broader audience in 2000, with the aim of disseminating insights into, and recommendations for, the implementation of sustainable development in mountains. In 2006, we conducted a survey among MRD's authors, reviewers, and readers (Wymann et al. 2007): respondents confirmed that MRD had succeeded in bridging the gap between research and development. But we realized that MRD could become an even more efficient tool for sustainability if development knowledge were validated: in 2009, we began submitting 'development' papers ('transformation knowledge') to external peer review of a kind different from the scientific-only peer review (for 'systems knowledge'). At the same time, the journal became open access in order to increase the permeability between science and society, and ensure greater access for readers and authors in the South. We are currently rethinking our review process for development papers, with a view to creating more space for communication between science and society, and enhancing the co-production of knowledge (Roux 2008). Hopefully, these efforts will also contribute to the urgent debate on the 'publication culture' needed in transdisciplinary research (Kueffer et al. 2007).

Paper session 5: Education and urban Planning for Public Health
room: B108 | chair: Barbara Smetschka

5.1

A Significant Sustainability Question:
Increase the number of health treatments or increase public health?

Willi Haas (Co-author: Ulli Weisz), Institute of Social Ecology, iff-Klagenfurt University, Vienna, Austria

Keywords: health, sustainable development, health promotion, quality management

It is paradox that while the health care sector is aiming at treating health problems at the same time it is significantly contributing to pressures on the environment, which in turn consequently threaten human health. First assessments show a 4-8 %[1] share in GHG pollutions of the health sector including its up-stream effects in developed countries. Additionally costs for the health care sector are constantly increasing relative to the GDP and such are increasingly overstretching the capability of national finances. Furthermore the health sector is one of the most straining workplace set-

---

1   This wide range is due to huge data uncertainties.