

3


2

1

If you want to develop blisters try walking around in someone else's shoes. At this summer's Hybrid WorkSpace we managed just that when, together with net-journalist Josephine Bosma, we lip-synched the talk and limped the walk of empirical science. With roughly 600 people a day dropping into the Hybrid WorkSpace, we were in the perfect environment for carrying out a questionnaire on the subject of Technoscience. We wanted to find out what people think about the ethics of certain technological and scientific developments and whether they would like to have a greater say in their social implementation. We were able to persuade a far from random selection of, mainly German and footsore, art enthusiasts to fill out our Direct Biocracy Questionnaire.

The experience taught us above all else that the raw data of human experience has to be skilfully sifted, filtered and generally manipulated before meaningful data can be extracted. Our initial questionnaire had to be modified because we were asking too many open-ended questions which begot open-ended answers impossible to quantify. Later, leafing through the completed version 2.0s, it also became clear how bias had stowed away in every nuance of our questioning. Some of this was absolutely intentional because we had no interest in masquerading as disinterested and modest witnesses. A stance we highlighted by our use of provocative sub-headings like *The Baby Factory*, inclusion of scary statistics and loaded questioning. But we had not suspected the extent to which we were pitching questions at an assumed age group and gender (the questionnaire was entirely devised by women) until we read the replies. In one particularly acute case our question about the impact of information concerning potential population explosions on family planning received the wounded answer: *We are very happy with our four adult children.*

Our empirical credibility was once more cast into doubt by the final filtration phase required in order to produce nice, neat rows of statistics. Using catch-alls like the word *other* to smooth over dissenting remarks which attempted to buck the yes/no categories and by generally applying the Japanese dictum: *If the nail sticks out, hammer it back in*, we were able to remove all signs of the participants' sarcasm, eccentricities or biting critique of our own methods. So without further ado, and with a large question mark over the veracity of the data we set before you, we would like to present *The Direct Biocracy Questionnaire (V2.0)*.



# DIRECT BIOCRACY QUESTIONNAIRE V2.0

yes no other