

Bio-Objects

Life in the 21st Century

Edited by
**Niki Vermeulen, Sakari Tamminen and
Andrew Webster**

BIO-OBJECTS

Theory, Technology and Society

Series Editor: Ross Abbinnett, University of Birmingham, UK

Theory, Technology and Society presents the latest work in social, cultural and political theory, which considers the impact of new technologies on social, economic and political relationships. Central to the series are the elucidation of new theories of the humanity-technology relationship, the ethical implications of techno-scientific innovation, and the identification of unforeseen effects which are emerging from the techno-scientific organization of society.

With particular interest in questions of gender relations, the body, virtuality, penalty, work, aesthetics, urban space, surveillance, governance and the environment, the series encourages work that seeks to determine the nature of the social consequences that have followed the deployment of new technologies, investigate the increasingly complex relationship between 'the human' and 'the technological', or addresses the ethical and political questions arising from the constant transformation and manipulation of humanity.

Other titles in this series

Decentering Biotechnology
Assemblages Built and Assemblages Masked

Michael S. Carolan

ISBN 978 1 4094 1005 8

The Genome Incorporated
Constructing Biodigital Identity

Kate O'Riordan

ISBN 978 0 7546 7851 9

Technology and Medical Practice
Blood, Guts and Machines

Edited by Ericka Johnson and Boel Berner

ISBN 978 0 7546 7836 6

Contested Categories

Life Sciences in Society

Edited by Susanne Bauer and Ayo Wahlberg

ISBN 978 0 7546 7618 8

Bio-Objects

Life in the 21st Century

Edited by

NIKI VERMEULEN

University of Vienna, Austria

SAKARI TAMMINEN

University of Helsinki, Finland

ANDREW WEBSTER

University of York, UK



ASHGATE

© Niki Vermeulen, Sakari Tamminen and Andrew Webster 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Niki Vermeulen, Sakari Tamminen and Andrew Webster have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the editors of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East
Union Road
Farnham
Surrey, GU9 7PT
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington
VT 05401-4405
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Bio-objects : life in the 21st century. -- (Theory,
technology and society)

1. Life (Biology)--Philosophy. 2. Genetic engineering.
 3. Genetic engineering--Moral and ethical aspects.
 4. Transgenic organisms. 5. Human reproductive technology.
 6. Human reproductive technology--Moral and ethical aspects.
- I. Series II. Vermeulen, Niki. III. Tamminen, Sakari.
IV. Webster, Andrew, 1951-
660.6'5-dc22

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Vermeulen, Niki.

Bio-objects : life in the 21st century / by Niki Vermeulen, Sakari
Tamminen, and Andrew Webster.

p. cm. -- (Theory, technology, and society)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-4094-1178-9 (hbk) -- ISBN 978-1-4094-1179-6 (ebk)

1. Life sciences--Social aspects. 2. Transgenic animals.
- I. Tamminen, Sakari. II. Webster, Andrew, 1951- III. Title.

QH333.B48 2011
508--dc23

2011040150

ISBN 9781409411789 (hbk)

ISBN 9781409411796 (ebk)

IV



Printed and bound in Great Britain by the
MPG Books Group, UK.

Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xiii</i>

Introduction: Bio-Objects: Exploring the Boundaries of Life <i>Andrew Webster</i>	1
--	---

PART 1 CHANGING BOUNDARIES OF HUMAN, NONHUMAN AND SOCIETY

1 Challenging Bio-objectification: Adding Noise to Transgenic Silences <i>Tora Holmberg and Malin Ideland</i>	13
2 Pluripotent Promises: Configurations of a Bio-object <i>Lena Eriksson</i>	27
3 Water – An Exploration of the Boundaries of Bio-objects <i>Ragna Zeiss</i>	43
4 Bio-objectification of Clinical Research Patients: Impacts on the Stabilization of New Medical Technologies <i>Conor M.W. Douglas</i>	59

PART 2 GOVERNING BIO-OBJECTS

5 Beasting Biology: Interspecies Politics <i>Nik Brown</i>	71
6 Comparing Public Engagement with Bio-objects: Implementing Co-existence Regimes for GM Crops in Denmark, the UK and Germany <i>Janus Hansen</i>	85

- 7 Governing Hereditary Disease in the Age of Autonomy: Mutations, Families and Care
Aaro Tupasela 103
- 8 At the Margins of Life: Making Fetal Life Matter in Trajectories of First Trimester Prenatal Risk Assessment (FTPRA)
Nete Schwennesen 117

PART 3 GENERATIVE RELATIONS

- 9 The Fruit of Love: The German IVF-embryo Turning from Abject into Bio-object
Bettina Bock von Wülfingen 137
- 10 On Why States Still Matter: In vitro Fertilization Embryos between Laboratories and State Authorities in Italy
Ingrid Metzler 151
- 11 Growing a Cell in Silico: On How the Creation of a Bio-object Transforms the Organisation of Science
Niki Vermeulen 171
- 12 Genetic Discrimination 2.0: The Un/Differentiating Gene in Insurance
Ine Van Hoyweghen 187
- 13 Still Life? Frozen Gametes, National Gene Banks and Re-configuration of Animality
Sakari Tamminen 203
- Index* 219

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

2.1	Distribution of ‘pluripoten*’ and ‘totipoten*’ in ES cell articles 1975-2005	33
7.1	Pedigree of family predisposed to hereditary cancer	108
7.2	Contact protocol for possible HNPCC carriers	110
7.3	Telephone contact protocol for HNPCC family members and relatives	113
12.1	Medical genetics and regulatory considerations	198
13.1	Performing visual judgements of mobility and motility	208

Tables

4.1	Components of PGx warfarin project, the associated disciplines and concurrent bio-objectification of the clinical research patient (CRP)	64
6.1	Public engagement and the governance of bio-objects in three countries	97

This page has been left blank intentionally

Notes on Contributors

Bettina Bock von Wülfingen is a biologist with a PhD in public health, now Assistant Professor at the Institute for Cultural History and Theory at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. Her work revolves around epistemologies in Life Sciences, always applying a historical perspective. Her current, second book project deals with methodology, more explicitly with the interrelation of instruments, background beliefs and models in heredity and reproductive sciences around 1900 and 2000. She did her doctoral thesis with a discourse analysis on the health and illness notion in discourses on new reproductive and genetic technologies. During her PhD, she received different international visiting fellowships within Science and Technology Studies, working *inter alia* at the IAS-STIS in Graz/Austria, the SATSU in York and the BIOS in London.

Nik Brown is Reader in Sociology and co-director of the Science and Technology Unit (SATSU) at the University of York. His research interests focus on culturally intriguing developments in the biosciences such as cloning, transpecies transplantation, hybrids, chimeras, stem cells, and biobanking. He is interested in the social management of the boundaries between life and death, the human and the animal, the biologically mundane and the exotic, the public and the private. He is particularly interested in the politics, regulation and governance of novel biological developments and reproduction. He has also written extensively on the sociology of hope, expectations and futurity.

Conor M.W. Douglas is a post-doctoral Researcher in both the Section Community Genetics at the Vrije University (Amsterdam) medical centre, and in the Technology Assessment group at the Rathenau Institute in The Hague. Originally trained as a sociologist and then in science and technology studies (STS), his research interests are located in the interactions and co-production between biomedical sciences and society. This general interest has resulted in empirical research in patient and 'user' involvement in biomedical innovation processes including pharmacogenetics, biobanking, bioinformatics, synthetic biology, meta-genomics and bioremediation, and translational science more generally.

Lena Eriksson is Assistant Professor at the Department of Philosophy, Linguistics and Theory of Science, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. Her main research interests are effects of taxonomies and standards in science and medicine; which she explored in an ethnographic study of international standardisation efforts in human embryonic stem cell research. Her two most current research projects

examine the understanding and management of pain in varying health care contexts and the production of a new standardised decision-making tool for Swedish health care practitioners. She holds a PhD from Cardiff University and has also worked in the Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU) at the University of York.

Janus Hansen is Associate Professor of Sociology at the Department of Business and Politics, Copenhagen Business School. He holds a PhD from the European University Institute in Florence (2005). Prior to his posting at CBS he has taught and conducted research at several other universities in Denmark. His research interests include sociology of science and technology, sociology of risk, social theory and comparative sociology. He is particularly interested in the comparative studies of public engagement with science and technology and the interplay between science and politics. Recent publications include a research monograph entitled 'Biotechnology and Public Engagement in Europe' (2010).

Tora Holmberg holds a PhD in sociology and is an Associate Professor at the Institute for Housing and Urban Research, Uppsala University, Sweden. Her focus lies at the intersection of animal studies, STS (science and technology studies) and feminist science studies, researching human-animal relations in bio-technology as well as in the urban setting.

Ine Van Hoyweghen is assistant professor at the Department of Health, Ethics & Society (HES), Maastricht University. She holds a PhD in Social Sciences from the Catholic University of Leuven (Belgium), which was published as a book, *Risks in the Making. Travels in Life Insurance and Genetics* (Amsterdam University Press, 2007). Her work focuses on the social implications of biomedicine and biomedical technologies. She is interested in the hybrid processes of classification in biomedicine, states and markets in producing identities and social relations. Her empirical research covers the domain of European life and health insurance. She recently guest edited a special issue of *New Genetics & Society* (2010, 29[4]) on the *matter*ing of solidarity in private and social arrangements. She is currently developing an account of 'genetic discrimination' in European insurance.

Malin Ideland is Associate Professor in European Ethnology and Senior Lecturer in Educational Science at Malmö University. Her main research and teaching areas are 1) cultural perspectives on biotechnologies and 2) science education for citizenship and sustainable development. In her research on cultural perspectives on biotechnologies, she has studied media reports on gene technology, debates on embryonic stem cell-techniques, parents decision-making on MMR vaccines and dilemmas concerning transgenic animals.

Ingrid Metzler is a PhD student at the Department of Political Science at the University of Vienna, Austria, and a junior researcher at the Life-Science-Governance Research Platform at the same university. She

has worked on several research projects exploring the governance of biomedicine in Europe. With a background in political science, she is particularly interested in the co-construction of bio-objects and regimes of governance.

Nete Schwennesen is a sociologist, and holds a PhD from the Center for Medical Science and Technology Studies at the Institute of Public Health, University of Copenhagen. For her PhD she studied processes of knowledge production and decision making in the context of first trimester prenatal risk assessment, on the basis of ethnographic material. She has a Masters degree in contemporary sociology from Lancaster University, UK and was a Marie Curie fellow at Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU), University of York, UK in 2005. Her research interests centres on the co-production of agency and health care technologies, new reproductive technologies, feminist science studies and issues of reproductive choice. Currently she works as a researcher at Steno Diabetes Health Promotion Center in Copenhagen, where she studies programmes of patient education from a social setting perspective.

Sakari Tamminen gained his PhD from the University of Helsinki, Finland, where he graduated in social psychology and social anthropology. His research interests lie in the exploration of human-nonhuman boundaries, new genetic technologies and the insights these provide for rethinking social theory. He also holds a Licentiate of Technology degree in usability and user-centered design from Aalto University where he acted as university lecturer for a number of years. He has also worked as a Marie Curie Research Fellow at the Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU) at the University of York, UK (2004-2005) and as a research fellow at the Institute for Advanced Studies on Science, Technology and Society (IAS-STs) in Graz, Austria, in 2007. He is currently interested in efforts to digitalise and recreate life in all of its shapes and is an Academy of Finland post-doctoral researcher at the University of Helsinki, Finland.

Aaro Tupasela works as a researcher in the Department of Social Research at the University of Helsinki and is a member of the Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies (HIST). His areas of interest include the sociology of science, the sociology of knowledge, public understanding of science and bioethics. He also works as a Finnish representative on the Nordic Committee on Bioethics and serves as a board member of the European Sociological Association's (ESA) research network on science and technology studies (SSTNET).

Niki Vermeulen is a post-doctoral research fellow in the Department of Social Studies of Science at the University of Vienna, Austria, and is consultant for Technopolis Group. Niki holds a PhD in Science and Technology Studies from Maastricht University, The Netherlands, and worked for the Executive Board of Maastricht University, the Scientific Council of the Royal Netherlands Embassy

in Washington DC and the Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR). Her research interests concern transformations in research, and science and innovation policy. She is particularly interested in scientific collaboration, focusing on the life sciences and looking into both ecology and (post-)genomics research.

Andrew Webster is Professor in the Sociology of Science and Technology and Director of the Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU) at the University of York, UK. He was Director of the £5m ESRC/MRC Innovative Health Technologies Programme, and was national coordinator the ESRC's £3.5m Stem Cells Initiative (2005-2009), and member of the Royal Society's Expert Working Group on Health Informatics. He is currently undertaking externally funded research on stem cells as well as the implementation of pharmacogenetics into clinical practice, and is coordinating a European project on Regenerative Medicine (REMEDiE). He is co-editor of the *Health Technology and Society* Series (Palgrave Macmillan). His most recent book is *Health, Technology and Society: A Sociological Critique* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007). He was elected a Fellow of the Academy of the Social Sciences in 2006.

Ragna Zeiss is Assistant Professor at the Department of Technology and Society Studies, Maastricht University, the Netherlands. She obtained her PhD from the Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU) at the Department of Sociology, University of York, UK. As a post-doctoral researcher, she worked on the project 'Rethinking Political Judgement and Science-Based Expertise: Boundary Work at the Science/Politics Nexus of Dutch Knowledge Institutes' at the VU University Amsterdam. Her main research interests concern water, sanitation, and the environment; standardisation, regulation and governance; knowledge brokerage and boundary work; risk governance; and sustainability. She is currently involved in European and national (research) projects on brokering sustainable sanitation; nanotechnologies, risk governance, and development in India, Kenya and the Netherlands; bio-objects and their boundaries; and science, ethics, and technological responsibility in developing and emerging countries.

Acknowledgements

The origin of this book lies in York, United Kingdom, in the Science and Technology Studies Unit (SATSU) in the Department of Sociology of the University of York, that was a Marie Curie training site in the period 2002-2005. With the title 'New Genetics/New Society? Integrating Science, Society and Policy', it attracted 15 European doctoral students working on recent developments in bioscience and society. Such was the success of the programme the idea of continuing our collaboration beyond the formal end of the EC contract was welcomed by all: we now have a well-established group that has met for annual meetings (York 2007; Geneva 2008; Uppsala 2009; Graz 2010). In these meetings, we developed our collective work on 'bio-objects' which resulted in this book. In 2010 the network has been granted a COST Action entitled 'Bio-objects and their Boundaries: Governing Matters at the Intersection of Society, Politics, and Science'. This means that our network is expanding and we will be continuing working together in the period 2010-2014 and beyond to further develop the bio-objects concept.

First and foremost, we would like to acknowledge all the members of SATSU that made our stay in York such a pleasant intellectual experience. We are also grateful for the support that our network has received from several other organisations: The Brocher Foundation in Geneva, Switzerland, the Centre for Gender Research, Uppsala University, Sweden, Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, the European Association for the Study of Science and Technology (EASST), the Society for the Social Studies of Science (4S), the Institute for Advanced Studies on Science, Technology and Society (IAS-STs) in Graz, Austria, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University, The Netherlands, and the European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST). Finally we want to thank Neil Jordan and other staff from Ashgate who provided us with the necessary support for the publication of the book, as well as the sub-editors of the three parts: Conor M.W. Douglas, Aaro Tupasela, Bettina Bock von Wülffingen and Ingrid Metzler.

This page has been left blank intentionally

Introduction

Bio-Objects: Exploring the Boundaries of Life

Andrew Webster

Biotechnologies and new biological artefacts are currently disrupting the conventional boundaries and identities of biological forms – whether these be of a human, animal, plant or synthetic nature. Indeed these discrete forms of life may well be brought together, hybridised, through developments in the biological sciences, such as in tissue engineering. At the same time, these new life-forms – such as pluripotent stem cells outside of bodies, synthetic biology or genetically modified organisms – create new clinical (Mason 2007) and commercial (Waldby 2006) possibilities as well as regulatory demands (Brown and Kraft 2006).

This book conceptualises these different life forms as what we shall call ‘bio-objects’. Bio-objects play a crucial role in the 21st century in which increasing knowledge of life and its components are fundamentally transforming what life means and where its boundaries lie: as Thacker (2010) says, ‘...it seems that life is everywhere at stake, and yet it is nowhere the same’ (ix). New developments in the biosciences – especially the molecularisation of life – and their influence on health care and other aspects of our society have been explored in a diverse body of literature, discussing the ethical (e.g. Holm 2005), legal (Johnston and Kaye 2004) and social (Rose 2006) implications of these new developments. In the following chapters we will draw on an extensive body of work to ground our own material which is primarily though not exclusively underpinned by and seeks to make a contribution to science and technology studies (STS). In this introductory chapter, we sketch out some of the basic ideas we will expand on in later chapters about the meaning of the bio-object, give some indication of how this work relates to existing literature and outline the structure of the book as a whole.

The meaning of bio-objects and bio-objectification

We want to suggest that the term ‘bio-object’ is a useful conceptual device or heuristic to refer to socio-technical phenomena where we see a new mixture of relations to life or to which ‘life’ is attributed. As a consequence of these novel relations, the boundaries between human and animal, organic and nonorganic, living and the suspension of living (and the meaning of death itself), are questioned

and destabilised, though sometimes can be re-established or re-confirmed. This dynamic process, and the possibility of moving backwards and forwards between different life statuses suggests that there is no once-and-for-all list of bio-objects, a sort of bio-object catalogue, made up of life forms that have specific properties or essential characteristics. Instead, we want to argue – and show in this book – that it is more useful to focus on the *process* of bio-objectification, that is to say, how different life forms are created and are given life, and perhaps, multiple lives. Aborted fetal tissue is a simple example of this process that is deemed, as such, to be waste matter and dead, yet can be re-vitalised as source material for stem cell lines. Here, as elsewhere, life is in constant interplay with novel techniques aiming at re-routing, diversifying, collecting and commodifying the vital processes that ‘life’ consists of.

A number of deep going philosophical questions are raised by the emergence of technologically enacted vital materiality – for example cell life imitated by silicon chips or deep frozen animal reproductive material – as they contest our contemporary understanding of ‘life’ and its boundaries. What could be said about organic life does not apply easily to forms of life that are technoscientifically created and sustained – that might be regarded as ‘creatures’ ‘...positioned somewhere between the normal and pathological’ (Thacker 2010: 97). At the same time these novel forms of vitality also highlight the materiality of vitality in surprising ways. Bio-objectification clearly requires working with the materiality of the biological but not all biological objects – say the gene – can be seen as bio-objects, even though they may become the basis for them.

To be more precise, particular instances or collections of matter *become vital* in/to different practices and knowledge regimes, which at the same token *make life matter*. Historically speaking, the knowledge regime of biology, hence also ‘biological objects’, are of recent invention as Foucault (1970) and other historians of life sciences have famously argued. What we are currently witnessing, however, is that ‘life’ as an *object* of research, intervention and innovation is increasingly represented through an idiom of science and its unquestionable regime of truth – both in academic literature as well as in science communication aimed at different publics. A number of academic contemporary writers (e.g. Rose 2006) even claim that humanity has crossed a threshold where life has become totally manageable through its ‘molecularisation/genetisation’ as a result of a revolutionary co-development of scientific understanding of life’s basic components and the technologies capable of representing and modifying them (e.g. molecular structure and genetic engineering). In short, the argument is that the total ‘objectification’ of life has happened through breakthroughs in scientific knowledge and related representation and intervention techniques.

While the ‘molecularisation/genetisation thesis’ certainly holds true for certain epistemic cultures (Knorr-Cetina 1999) of our technoscientific modernity (such as bio-medical research communities), the relevant collection of things related of life-processes, materialities and social/political issues – are not so clearly cut in other communities or for all actors involved. In fact, the argument of molecularisation

of life dangerously flirts with the essentialisation of life as molecules and DNA, the reduction of the meaning of living and materialities of life to an essentially contemporary biological thinking. What we argue in this collection of articles is that in order to resist the temptation of this reductionist thesis we have to look in detail to the way in which life is *made an object* in different settings – both in and outside of the current truth regime of the contemporary biosciences. Instead, life – and different forms of life that are created – become an object of knowing, representing and intervening in a myriad of ways not reducible to the molecuration thesis. Rather than reduction, we see hybridisation everywhere, the ongoing ‘border crossings’ (Haraway 1997: 60) made possible by the biosciences and by the socio-technical cultures that enable their movement.

Given this state of affairs, we expect to see bio-objects as being characterised as having considerable fluidity and mobility across different socio-technical domains or arenas. This means that a bio-object, associated with, say, biomedical research, may find its way into the food system or the environment, become part of a repository and new medium of technical innovation (as in biobanks or cord blood banks), and have multiple or even contrasting cultural meanings as it circulates between different sectors or networks of society. At the same time, new regulatory boundaries are developed for what human and non-human material can and cannot be legitimately traded as bio-objects (for example, oocytes and embryos) (Hauskeller, Bender and Manzei 2005).

Much of the recent literature in STS that has examined the issues central to this collection has focused on the field of biomedicine and particular areas within it, such as genetics/genomics (Atkinson et al. 2009), the tissue economy (Waldby and Mitchell 2006; Sunder Rajan 2006) and through its commercialisation, the exploitation of reproductive and clinical labour (Cooper 2008). The biomedical domain is clearly one where matters of life and what matters, and definitions of normal and abnormal life, provide a rich ground for STS scholars to explore the life-technology relationship. Such work shows that what is deemed to be medically normal is highly dependent on what technologies exist and how these – through greater diagnostic power for example – define the boundaries of the normal and the pathological (Canguilhem 1998; Lock and Nguyen 2010); Rose (2007) calls these – echoing Foucault – ‘technologies of optimisation’. The book builds on this corpus as well as recent work on biological citizenship (Rose 2006), the contestation over categories of the biological (witnessed e.g. in the emergence of ‘biomedica’ as Thacker, 2005, argues, [see also Bauer and Wahlberg, 2009]) and the precariousness of new life (see, e.g. Mesman 2008, and her study of premature birth).

Beyond the biomedical domain, work by STS scholars on the role of the taxonomic sciences (e.g. Waterton et al. 2010) shows how taxonomy itself as the classification and so in effect disciplining of life (and indeed, of scientific communities) changes over time as new techniques are developed, such as genetic determination of species boundaries. More importantly for our purposes, this work also makes clear how taxonomies are best seen as epistemic assemblages, that is, always relational and subject to change as to what ‘counts’ as ‘in’ and ‘out’. Related

work on standardisation (e.g. Bowker and Star 2000; Eriksson and Webster, 2009) shows how classification procedures not only seek to order and bring closure to – ‘sort out’ – life forms (such as ‘race’) and behaviour (such as the allocation of illness categories) but also carry moral dimensions and presumed hierarchies of life. Bio-objects can be closed down or opened up as they fall within or move across classificatory regimes – such as in insurance systems (e.g. Van Hoyweghen, this book) or international databases to do with crime, biodata, identity, or indeed at a mundane level, as to what goes into what recycling box (Neyland and Woolgar, 2010). More generally, they can be directly linked to the reorganisation of scientific disciplines themselves, as Vermeulen shows (Chapter 11, this book).

Classification is, in one sense, a form of governance inasmuch as it provides one of the bases on which the regulation of life can occur, establishing boundaries of responsibility, inclusion and exclusion, and accountability. Governance forms an important theme in the book to encompass both formal state regulation and the ‘soft law’ that monitors and steers bioscience according to culturally derived normativities (Gottweis et al. 2008). More recently, Faulkner’s (2009) work on ‘governance’ provides a conceptual framework that links governance with innovation, and shows how the two are co-constructed (Brown and Michael 2004).

The governance and materiality of bio-objects: Making matters of vital concern

In this collection we see governance as having two inter-related processes: governance of the bio-object, precisely through governance being generative of the bio-object qua *object* (as Metzler shows Chapter 10, this book), and thereby governance through the bio-object. So governance and the other core theme of the book – materiality – come together, for governance also points to the social requirements associated with the traceability of bio-objects and their moral status within different domains. The play of governance/materiality relations can vary considerably, such as enabling hybridity or closing it down. For example, as Brown argues later in this book (Chapter 5), UK legislation on interspecies embryos has successfully enshrined ‘the novel unpredictability of hybrid biology in legal statute.’ In contrast, during the Bush administration in the US, university researchers were barred from storing human embryonic stem cells from unapproved lines in lab refrigeration units paid for with NIH (National Institutes of Health) grant money and had to have designated ‘private’ and ‘federally-funded’ fridges for different cell lines. The two sets of lines as material objects carried quite different moral statuses, which were then reflected in two discrete fridges, which, as a result, were themselves of distinct material and moral status.

Paralleling the question of the material and moral traceability of bio-objects is the question of the tradability that they have. Indeed these two are typically closely tied together: for example, a novel biomedical therapy or device becomes marketable, tradable, only when it has secured a licence to be marketed through

approval by regulatory agencies, such as the European Medicine Agency, and meets the requirements set down in various ‘directives’, such as the Advanced Therapy and Medicinal Product Directive (ATMP). The ATMP gives authorisation for a product to be placed on the market.

Outside of the commercial market for therapies or products, bio-objects – such as transgenic mice – become tradable across labs where they are deemed to conform to the standards of a high quality ‘pure’ transgenic mouse, but simultaneously framed as ordinary lab mice, as one of the chapters (Holmberg and Ideland) in the book explores. Tradability and traceability are in turn linked, for bio-objects move across and are commodified within different trading zones that are more, or less, open. Genetically-modified crops, for example, may (as in the US) or may not (as in the UK) be grown commercially, are subject to regulatory and trading constraints and various forms of containment, including biocontainment strategies which uses the genetic internalisation of regulation to overcome the failings of governance regimes in managing the problem of policing. In one sense, plants become self-policing. A further issue is where to draw the boundary lines between what is, and is not, subject to regulatory control: in the European Union, while food from cloned animals cannot be sold without authorisation as they fall under the terms of the ‘novel food directive’, there is some uncertainty as to whether their offspring are too (Mahony 2010).

These different themes – of the attribution and malleability of life, its materiality, governance and movement across different trading and regulatory spaces – are key to our understanding of the bio-object and the conceptual model we have of the bio-objectification process, and figure in different ways in the chapters that make up this book. They all share too a particular methodological approach that draws on a number of STS strategies, and these are sketched out below.

Methodological approach

As we are concerned in this book to understand how bio-objects come to be and the lives that they take-on we are interested, as noted above, in bio-objectification as a process. This means that the methodological approach – the logic of our inquiry – is to understand the interplay of material and epistemic dynamics in each of our cases, and to look at the ways in which boundaries of life are disrupted or conserved, are disentangled from, or entangled with, other forms of life.

We regard bio-objectification as an emergent process inasmuch as it is shot through with uncertainty and unknowns (Webster and Eriksson 2009). We also recognise (as Pickering) that materiality has agency, or performativity, inasmuch as the object – as we saw above with GM crops – can act at a distance in ordering social (farming) practices. This performativity is, as Pickering says, a ‘dance of agency’, but one we would characterise as reflecting an unstable ontology, an ongoing process rather than a stable form of being – so, our chapter on transgenic mice describes them in this regard as ‘boundary crawlers’. As such, bio-objects