Editorial

Maryon McDonald

This first issue of a new volume of the journal – volume 31 – takes us into the biosciences and into discussions about climate change. In so doing, this issue incorporates a diversity of voices from within anthropology and beyond it.

Anthropological studies of scientific working practices and objects are not new. Some might want to argue that medical anthropology had been looking at cognate matters for some time before the rest caught up. In general, anthropological studies of science have owed much in the past to histories of science, to Actor-Network Theory and to Science and Technology Studies. Anthropology has necessarily moved on, and the ever-growing field of medical anthropology and associated anthropological studies of the biosciences have certainly, in many important respects, shown the way. We know that certain entities, public persons and processes are shaped or even brought into being by the very technologies, regulations and data-gathering practices that seek to discover, represent or protect them. This has been shown for different areas – from certain laboratory practices and their scientific working objects to various regulatory objectivities in medicine and bioethically informed protocols or consent forms, to name but a few – and we have become increasingly aware of the realities wrought by ethnographic practice. However, opening this issue of the journal, we have an article entitled *In Vitro Anthropos* that takes such points much further. The author, Sarah Franklin, is very well acquainted with scientific and regulatory practices and their effects. In her paper, she pushes us to reflect on what kind of models of the *anthropos* are being developed, in the biosciences and anthropology alike, and guides us for this purpose on a very particular journey through shifts in biology, through models and modelling, raising her own questions about ‘recursivity’. Hannah Landecker and Charis Thompson then add their own voices, in agreement or disagreement. This is a conversation of three scholars who have, each in their own way, been pioneers in bringing anthropology and science together to new effect.

A Special Section of this issue, guest edited by David Sneath, then takes us to concerns about climate change. We might seem to be here in a world of ‘the environment’ that has been constituted, in its dominant apperceptions, by the sciences. The papers collected in this Special Section make it very clear, however, that the lived environment is constituted in different ways, and questions of evidence frame the discussion here. From icebergs to forest fires, and from the poetry of John Clare to assessments of the IPCC, from literary studies to archaeology and natural science, or

from Alaska to Mexico and from Brussels to Scottish fishermen: this is another journey in which different voices are deliberately elicited – and with some urgency here – in what is now deemed to be the age of the Anthropocene, with its ‘anthropogenic nature’. Different disciplines stand side by side in this Special Section, with anthropology and the sciences brought together again and in such a way that, hopefully, self-monitoring disciplinary practices are of less import than the possibilities for mutual understanding and productive discussion.

A lesson to that effect can perhaps be taken from the ‘Reflections’ by Carlos Fausto and Luiz Costa entitled ‘Feeding (and Eating)’, published in this issue after the Special Section. Their short piece is a contribution to another conversation – reflecting on an article in our last issue (vol. 30, no. 2: 1–14) by Marilyn Strathern. Given the concerns of the rest of this current issue of the journal, it is perhaps salutary to remind ourselves again that Fausto and Costa are engaging in their own work with a world in Amazonia wherein one might in any case reach in vain for the enduringly powerful nature/culture distinctions on which so many of our older convictions and disciplines, as well as some of the apparent excitement and novelty of our insights, transgressive or ‘going beyond’, have depended.