

Alexander I. Stingl

**The Technoscientific State Through the Heteroscope:**

**History and the Translocality of Technoscientific and Post-Democratic Governance of Biomedical and Human-Ecological Regimes. (Towards a Theory of Nomadic Statehood.)**

“How to govern?”, is a question that not only fazes governments, politicians and political parties but an increasing number of (world-)societal actors, enmeshed in the making of science policy and politics of science itself, in particular in the spheres of *life itself*: Biomedicine and Environmentalism. These actors are subject to government while licensed to usurp governing positions over disbanded and unevenly organized societal collectivities, imbricated in regimes of governance that are post-legitimized, post-transparent, post-democratic procedures. As STS researchers and environmental historians, we must critique the acceleration in the dependence on techno-scientific practices of knowledge and management beyond the State by making explicit the and trans-nationality and historicity of the enmeshed trajectories:

Citizens of nation-states, extra-national conglomerates, and producers of techno-scientific knowledge stake historical claims in legitimated representation, representative participation, and transparency, where post-democratic society and techno-scientific embeddedness of decision-making processes on the trans-local scale (trans-local meaning, broadly, that stake-holders and stock-holders do not share the same space of causes and effects) seem to suggest that people paradoxically proliferate and govern their existences in abandonment of the State, while transnational corporate entities rematerialize as quasi-state entities, because the embeddedness of claims, the political-economical institutions and and the social construction of individual political existences are the products of history that cannot be grasped by either history of science or political history in isolation; an comprehensive analytics of the convergent discourse and the exigencies of the historically realities of trans-nationalism between (biomedical) science and its publics requires a historical critique that is informed by Science and Technology Studies (STS).

The history of the post-democratic transformation of our understanding of the State and its relation with its interlocutors is inherently intertwined with the transnational history of the discourse of the regime of the biomedical sciences, the environmental institutions regime, the convergent emergence of regimes of technoscientific governance, and their different publics:

*World polity* analyst John W. Meyer (et al) and *situational analyst* Adele C. Clarke (et al) have studied these histories from 1890 forward respectively and with different methods: Meyer et al have argued that the global history and emergent institutional properties of the environmental regime can be accounted for by using either discourse analysis or institutional analysis, and opted for the latter; whereas Adele Clarke applied forms of discourse analysis to create an effective discursive understanding of the imbrications

of biomedical knowledge in American society.

In “taking ideas and discourse seriously”, a new analytic mode of *discursive institutionalism* has become available, forged around scholars like Vivien A. Schmidt. For historians who have not abandoned the idea the *genealogical* ideal that understanding the history events matters for changing them in an effort towards better (political/institutional) practices, and who accept STS historians' warning like Hans-Joerg Rheinberger's that recent preference of micro-histories over deeper histories runs the danger of creating ineffective 'mono-cultures of the the mind' (Vandana Shiva)

Equipped with these tools, I argue in my research that the European and American history of science and scholarship (that is, of scientific institutions and individual scientists and scholar) and their publics in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century is the birthplace of the historic apriori for the state of post-democracy and technoscientific governance. These processes must be thoroughly uncovered and understood, not only to unlock the potentials of a genuine postcolonial science – as has been the most urgent demand within STS circles (Amit Prasad, Sandra Harding, Karin Knorr Cetina) – nor to pay tribute to the the historically normative task of 'decolonizing Enlightenment' in the face of the recent issue of the 'provincialization of Europe' (Dipesh Chakrabarty). More importantly, in the effort of not just committing to blind 'creative destruction'(Schumpeter) but to uncover 'creative differences', one must understand one's own genealogy to create potentials for new practices (Foucault) or, in other words, one can only create difference with others by comparing one's system to the differences – temporal, spatial, social – within that system (Luhmann).

However, unlike Foucault proper or systems-theory, I suggest that the pragmatic form of *discursive institutionalism* I work with as a tool for historians offers a distinct advantage because it provides a genuine theory of statehood build on historical evidence, from the transatlantic discourse of the interlocked, translocal regimes of biomedicine and environmentalism.

On the basis of demands suggestions for alternative forms of governance and novel conceptualizations of statehood: Does the techno-scientific state necessarily emerge from the governance practices of actors such as corporations, NGOs and collective actors formed by interested private citizens as stakeholders? Will it redefine the boundaries of empirical and theoretical concepts in displacing or misplacing the State, and how does the state so placed *see* people and how do they *look* back? The new State theory is, I argue, based on an analysis of the history of convergent discursive trajectories, a nomadic entity that gazes at us just as heteroscopically as we gaze back at it.

