

Dear Reader,

Issue 4 has, if not everything, then at least very many things: mental illness, literary forgers and Gorbachev; Parkinson's disease and mind-reading computers; the French *banlieues* and Somalia; old age and 'intercultural therapy'; castles in Wales and chasms in the Tate Modern; compact newspapers and Hitler on the big screen.

It also contains two one-off sections. The first of these is dedicated to the publication of the winning reviews of the Graduate School's annual Review Competition. Their accomplished authors are Eli Park Sørensen (1<sup>st</sup> Prize), Erin Sullivan (2<sup>nd</sup> Prize) and Pei-Suin Ng (3<sup>rd</sup> Prize) – our congratulations to you! The second is our special feature on 'Women in Academia', introduced by Cat Sebastian and Rachael Dobson (our Life- and Biomedical Sciences Editor). Gender equality seems to be a hot topic at the moment, if the recent flurry of articles in various academic and non-academic journals, and the 2008 UCL 'Gender Equality' conference, are anything to go by. For *Opticon1826*, it all began with a letter by Dr Banerjee in Issue 3, and has come to something like a freeze-frame, if not quite a still-life, in our pages in the shape of an article, four letters and a conference report.

I now bid you farewell and leave you in the supremely capable and strong hands of *Opticon1826*'s new Editor-in-Chief, Christine Lai, who knows just what to do and is not afraid to do it. It is two years since we published our first issue, and to the credit of the members of UCL that *Opticon1826* is still around and has not been consigned to the scrap-heap of the 'Almost Was', or 'Was for a Little While'. It is truly thanks to all of you that our high hopes have been fulfilled almost in their entirety (merely the Nobel Prize for Achievement in Online Academic Journal Publishing still eludes us, but that is no doubt only because it does not yet exist).

Eduardo Calvillo, the *Opticon1826* Engineering Sciences Faculty Editor, was moving offices last week and found a box of hundred-year-old scientific journals. Among these, he came across a copy of the Industrial Fatigue Research Board's eighth annual report (1927), which tells us that 'there is no evidence to suggest that a normal, healthy woman is rendered physiologically ineffective during menstruation';

however, '[a]ny conclusion to be derived from this investigation is limited by the fact that only a single subject was employed'. If one reads it in a certain way – perhaps over a cup of tea, or from behind the sofa, or from right to left – this may tell us as much about women, men, scientific reports, the publishing industry, and academia, as it may not; and it does so rather interestingly.

Gesche Ipsen  
*Editor-in-Chief*