

VIORELLA MANOLACHE* THE POSTHUMAN CONDITION OF EUROPE

Abstract: The present study, focused on the concept of *posthuman condition*, aims to warn, monitor and comment on the path started / traced from the *condition of postmodernity / postmodern condition* to the *posthuman condition*. This approach will focus on a case-by-case analysis, after a thorough re-examination, and on a double counting, applied to “scores” that focus on new philosophical-political data. These influence the creative dimensions and the combining of the prefix *post-*, managing to modify it, adjust it, and orient it towards particular rebirths and uses.

Recognizing the existence of the *posthuman condition* and inventing ways of accommodating the human to posthuman demands, the positioning of current crises explicitly calls for new benchmarks, transferring them from the theoretical level to the field of practical questions. With regard to the changing configurations of Europe and the world, the *posthuman condition* generates news, concern, up to the minute issues, a recent paradigm not only in the academic-scientific area, but also in the area of institutional and legislative resolutions and initiatives.

Aware (via Habermas) of the enthusiasm and the anxiety that such *post-positioning* involves, Rosi Braidotti offers a set of clarifications which she considers to be essential for clarifying and redefining the role of Europe in the light of the *posthuman condition*, which is, in fact, a plea for the launching of a *posthuman project of Europe*.

Keywords: the condition of postmodernity/postmodern condition, posthuman condition, Lyotard-Harvey, Habermas-Braidotti, posthuman security, affirmative politics.

Виорела Манолаче – Постчовешката ситуация на Европа

Резюме: Това изследване е посветено на понятието за *пост-човешка ситуация* и има за цел да предупреди за, да проследи и да коментира траекторията, която върви от *ситуацията на постмодерност/постмодерна ситуация* към *пост-човешка ситуация*. Този подход е приложен към анализ, проведен случай по случай след обстойно преразглеждане и повторно преброяване на “общия брой точки”, отнасящи се до нови философско-политически данни. Тези данни оказват влияние върху творческите измерения и съчетанието с префикса *пост-*, като го модифицират, приспособяват и насочват към конкретни прераждания и употреби.

Като осъзнава наличието на *пост-човешка ситуация* и изобретява нови начини за приспособяване човешките изисквания към постчовешките, позиционирането на текущи кризи определено изисква нови критерии, които то пренася от областта на теорията в полето на практическите въпроси. С оглед на променящите се конфигурации на Европа и на света, *постчовешката ситуация* поражда новини и загриженост относно детайлни проблеми, което представлява нова парадигма не само в академично-научната сфера, но също и в областта на институционалните и законодателни решения и инициативи.

* Scientific Researcher III, PhD, Institute of Political Sciences and International Relations “Ion I. C. Brătianu”, Romanian Academy, Bucharest,
Email: vio_sl3@yahoo.com; viorella.manolache@ispri.ro

Осъзнавайки (през Хабермас) ентузиазма и тревогата, с които е свързано това *постпозициониране*, Рози Брайдоти предлага набор от уточнения, които тя счита за съществени за изясняването и предефинирането на ролята на Европа в светлината на *постчовешката ситуация*; това фактически представлява апел за лансирането на един *постчовешки проект за Европа*.

The Condition of Postmodernity related to the Postmodern Condition

More than a decade after the appearance/publication of Lyotard's report into the *Postmodern Condition* (Lyotard 1979), David Harvey in *The Condition of Postmodernity* (2002) re-examined Lyotard's initial starting point and ideas, examining under the guiding lights of *the transient*, *the elusive* and *the evanescent*, but also under the guiding lights of the acts or identifying evidence of *the dynamism* and nostalgia for the present, of Habermas-ian origin.¹ Harvey also highlights the Neilsmithian aporia (on the Nietzsche-Barthes-ian limit) of the dissolution of *ideological-cultural movements* (the Age of Enlightenment, Marxism, working class dynamics), and discerns the exhausting state of the author/*rapporteur* ("nor does the author feels good").

On a par with this, the attribute of *circumstantial writings*, of documents focused on the warnings launched by the *rapporteurs* (those who, full of energy and vivacity, replace the exhausted authors!) should be admitted to the two constructs (of postmodern/postmodernity *specific condition* reinforcement in its own limits) regarding either the transformations of the 19th century that led to the meta-story *crisis* and its credibility (Lyotard), or the over accumulation *crisis* (which began at the close of the 1960s and ended in 1973). To this latter Harvey annexes consequences which could be quantified in terms of the experience of space and time, in the acute erosion in trust in scientific-moral judgments, in the primacy of the esthetic over ethics, in the image domination of image over narration, in fragmenting/ provisional truth and politics or in the prevalence of autonomous political-cultural practice (Harvey). If, in Lyotard's opinion, the object of investigation consists in the condition of knowledge in the (most) developed societies, and the analyzed subject aims at changing the postmodern rules, from Harvey's perspective, postmodernity seeks acceptance as a distinct historical-geographical *condition*, as a not so new *orientation* but most of all actualized by recent versions theorized by capitalist development meta-narratives.

Simon Malpas (2003) considers *the Condition of Postmodernity* to be a fundamental concept for stimulating the debate regarding the relation *postmodernism-postmodernity*, without giving up on the fundamental role accorded to the Lyotardian *condition*, expressing reservations about the attempt to credit the French Philosopher with the status of promoter of a certain type of postmodernism, or to limit him to a particular area of study/to a closed postmodern *condition*. Malpas observes that, from the galaxy of theoreticians-thinkers actively engaged in an ideate dialogue with Lyotardian themes, registers and ideas, David Harvey's thought must be viewed as an "excellent general discussion on the postmodern culture and society", a valuable

¹ The reference to Habermas allows the acceptance of two positions: adopting, in Harvey's case, an agreement regarding the condition of postmodernity-modernity and the management of Lyotard's closeness to Habermas, by opposition, insisting on the avant-garde Lyotardian equivalent.

analysis of the standard of postmodernity, even if its relationship with Lyotard is, on occasion, reductive-offensive. Harvey understands by postmodernity more than a cultural phenomenon, attentive to the time-space relation (compression) and to the impact of the flexibility/flexibilization of society and cultural experiences. The method used consists in limiting the relationship only to *La Condition Postmoderne*, without giving importance to the Lyotardian textual corpus to which, as Simon Malpas affirms, Harvey draws close to, by means of derogatory inflections.

In J.-Fr. Lyotard's usage, the postmodern recurrent state implies a reality more modern than modernity itself. However, the *Postmodern Condition* remains detached from inherent disillusionments and illegitimate positivity: postmodern knowledge does not represent only an instrument of power(s) but also the formulae extracting its reasoning from the inventor's paralogue (Lyotard 1979: 8). The deferred sense of postmodernity is not to exceed but to re-issue future connections, with direct implication for the strong meta-narrations of science and knowledge, of overpassing metaphysics in the own sphere of crisis.

In the fetishist-libidinal economy (the explicit but unexamined reference is *Économie Libidinale*), David Harvey confirms the postmodernist maturation role within the examined economic climate for building and forming of a new social class, remarking that the "condition of postmodernity is overwhelmingly present", subsumed under a meta-theory that sums up "postmodern cultural thinking and production" (Harvey 2002: 339–340). The resulting perspective doubles and sustains the Lyotardian offensive against any notion that may represent a meta-language/meta-narration/meta-theory with connecting-representative valences.

Harvey notes that Lyotard *simply defines* postmodern by refusing to give credibility to meta-narratives (Harvey 2002: 53). What Harvey appreciates in Lyotard is his *subtlety* and the *explicit* capacity for inventorying the transformations of modernism guided by socio-technical communication dynamics. Likewise, the French philosopher is appreciated for his *ability to alternate the analytical angles* in knowledge equivalence, as the main production force, in order to *locate precisely* the arguments issued in the post-industrial area. But, differentiating himself from Lyotard, Harvey notes the *relatively surprising affirmations* about the way in which "the consensus becomes an old-fashioned and suspect value", and it is criticized as being an extra element of explanation regarding the reason for decreeing justice to be an universal factor, distanced from the diversity of the language games (Harvey 2002: 60).

David Harvey values the postmodernism that he considers to be "mimicry of social, political and economic practice", without losing sight of its multifaceted, super positioned representations and the productions specific to a different ethos. He notes that he grounds, through a *simple recurrence* (in Lyotard's manner), an essential direction/dynamic: postmodernism represents "a movement with a powerful will and mostly chaotic, having as its scope the overcoming of all presumed postmodernist mistakes" (Harvey 2002: 111). In an equal measure, Harvey reacts to the exaggerated postmodernist fashion of offering crude caricatures of the modernist movement, postmodernism's politics operating on its own, following the "explicit rerunning of modernism's landmarks" rule. If the history of modernism and the postmodernist movement is grounded in an un-syncopated rhythm, Harvey considers postmodernism "pushes things too far", indicating a space of the "beyond", which implies an act

of reification and partitioning, of accepting “all fetishisms” but also of denying the “meta-theory of the globalizing economic-political processes” (Harvey 2002: 113).

“The postmodernist rhetorical hazard”, generated by the conscious attitude of avoiding “the confrontation of economic-political realities with the circumstances of global power”, becomes, for Harvey a pretext for signaling the invalidity of Lyotard’s “radical proposal” (regarding the opening of data banks), considering the proposal to be “a radical reform’s prologue” and a cause for the possibility in which even “the most rational of the postmodernists is faced with the opportunity of making a gesture with universal implications”. In Harvey’s version (drawing on Eagleton) in Lyotard’s case there is no effective principle for differentiating the truth from authority and rhetorical seduction, a radical reflex found in the standard affirmation: “he who possesses the most attractive language or the most exciting story has the power” (Harvey 2002: 113–114).

Meaghan Morris (2006) interprets the relation of these two views identified by stating that David Harvey’s view *relates itself to* Lyotard’s analysis and *recomposes* it through a double operation: the first, of denying the distinction which Lyotard and Jencks draw, with the scope of mediating a “monolithic postmodernism centered on the visual” (the Lyotardian view of the nature of TV games and considerations about *narrative* are of no interest to Harvey); the second operation being the ignoring of the very possibility of accepting the similarities with Lyotard, avoiding the *difference-opposition* analogy and revealing “relativism’s routine and defeatist” posture with regard to the category of *Rapporteur*. For Harvey, the affinity does not imply perfect identity, from which equation Morris deduces the position of the two conditions in the above report: *the pragmatism of Lyotardian speech is incompatible in the end with the reflections offered by Harvey*. Moreover, the reporting registry is given to much status, on the one hand by the semantic-conceptual difference (for Lyotard, for instance, eclecticism shows the absence of aesthetic criteria, for Harvey, the concept signifies that ethics and narrative take precedence over aesthetics— Morris 2006: 134), and, on the other hand, Harvey’s refusal to be compared with another *Rapporteur*. If Lyotard represents Harvey’s major reference point, Harvey does not *draft* a report on knowledge, but diagnoses the symptomatology of *postmodernity’s condition*, appealing to Lyotardian fragments only with a view to recomposing a particular perspective on postmodernity. Morris considers Lyotard to be “a hostile and at the same time a crucial reference” for Harvey’s text (Morris 2006: 132-133), the two conditions disputed by the *degree of attraction* and *the proportion of exciting dramatics* that are contained and developed therein.

The Posthuman Condition

Theoreticians of posthumanism consider J.-Fr. Lyotard to be the author who has had a decisive role in research into the *Posthuman Condition*, reorienting the French philosopher’s ideas towards the area of posthumanism, particularly by means of an invitation to reconsider its significance. In this sense, Lyotard provides Neil Badmington (2014: 7–23) with the necessary opportunities to clarify the active implication of the prefix *post*, attached to humanism and impregnating with meanings and values the affirmation according to which “posthumanism is not totally sundered from humanism’s legacy”. “Lyotard’s postmodern”, Badmington maintains, “appeals to the modern in the name of *investigation*”. Badmington’s method differentiates it-

self from the formulae utilized by Harvey, in the sense that, while recognizing the importance of “Lyotard writings on the postmodern”, he also recognizes the continuity effect in theorizing posthumanism. Badmington does not relate his work to the key work *La Condition Postmoderne*, does not position himself in the category of *Rapporteur*, nor does he make use of dissociations or the re-direction of meaning, but instead appeals to the Lyotardian-ideatic score found in *Rewriting Modernity*. His appeal *investigates* the way in which, on the one hand the *postmodern* signifier “plainly and simply indicates a disposition or, better said, a state of spirit”, and, on the other hand modernity and postmodernity may be “taken together” by means of recognizing a rewriting of the report, as a “constitutive and continuous” flow. Especially in a Lyotardian sense, the posthuman condition is reproached as having the *form* attachment to a “critical practice *inside* humanism” inside a *core* of psychoanalytic analysis.

Fixing the date [Robert Pepperell (1997: 176–177) identifies the appearance of the concept of the *posthuman condition* in the period immediately following the First World War], and affirmed by the perspectives (certifying, via Heisenberg, the location in an area with multiple possibilities) offered by the theory of relativity, quantum physics and cubism, the *posthuman condition* does not announce the end of the human being (in a Nietzschean manner), nor does it accept the “naiveté” that foresees the annihilation of the humankind by machine/technology: “Posthumanism refers to the end of a man centered Universe, human in a phallogocentric way” (Pepperell 1997: 176–177). If, however, a *terminus point* be is indicated, one that is infused with the *posthuman condition*, it will recognize itself, according to Pepperell, in the end (albeit not a precipitous end) of humanism, in the end of the belief in the infallibility of power and in human superiority/uniqueness. Therefore, the *posthuman condition* is related to mechanical-technological evolution, without giving up on the old models evaluation and is preoccupied with the intercession (initiatives and projects) of generating new *patterns*. Politically and ideologically, radical manifestations are registered, regarding “the gradual exit from any type of exploitation” (by means of flourishing feminist movements, movements for animal rights, movements against the unrestrained exploitation of the Earth’s resources, against slavery or in favor of the rights of the Planet, etc.).

Robert Pepperell identifies three constitutive-fundamental stages of the *posthuman condition*: the first accords the posthuman with a sense of the “closure of the social development period” (of humanism), by means of rethinking the semantic value attached to the prefix *post*; the second assumes the revision of “the traditional account of what the human being/man means, in particular, or human, in general”, the third identifies the convergence of biology-technology. In the light of such an inventory proposed by Pepperell, the sense of the term *condition* indicates, in the context of attaching it to the posthuman, “the existential situation in which we found ourselves at the moment of the beginning of the posthuman era, fully aware of reaching this stage, of the energy/effervescence that the prefix *post* holds, when attached to the human”. If we were to establish a relationship between the *posthuman condition* and the syntagm *postmodern condition-post modernity condition*, one would immediately ascertain the preservation of the meaning of knowledge in the technologized

societies, the changes imposed on the subject, and also the particularities of the recent versions of theorizing posthuman meta-narrations.

In Rosi Braidotti's usage (2016), the variations imposed by the prefix *post* that accord a specific meaning to the *posthuman condition* are maintained by the data attached to the "qualitative change of the basic reference point for the human species, for the social organizing and for the inter human relationships". Braidotti uses posthuman theory as a "genealogical-navigational instrument", a way of "exploring the forms of affirmative engagement with the present", of "non-reductionist and critical understanding of empirically grounded characteristics", deferring to the posthuman status the "dominant term of technologically mediated and globally connected societies". An "instrument generating the rethinking of the basic and referential unit for the human", posthuman theory reaffirms "the basic principles of non-human agents interactions on a planetary scale" (Braidotti 2016: 13).

To the stages identified by Pepperell, Braidotti proposes the association with *four vignettes* able to exemplify "the contradictions generated by the historical posthuman condition", with roles in identifying: the limits of humanism and the registry of the anti-humanist critics – both contexts becoming central themes for posthumanist discussion; the new post anthropocentric approach stating, that, in a paradoxical way, the *posthuman condition* is generated by advanced capitalism, recommending, in response, various forms of ideological resistance; the preservation of "in-human moments", the management and co-existence of bio-power and necropolises; civic responsibilities by means of a new type of knowledge and intellectual value. All these indications converge towards investing the *posthuman condition* with the status of an "alternative scheme of thinking, knowing and self-representation, of critical and creative thinking in the becoming process" (Braidotti 2016: 21).

From an alternative point of view, Braidotti identifies in the *posthuman condition* both the distancing from anti-humanism as well as the reconstruction of the posthumanist program on the basis of the anti-humanist legacy, of political-epistemological origins, of the post structuralist generation. Contemporary posthumanist thinking sustains, therefore, three particular currents: the first, arising from moral philosophy, which articulates a form of *reactive posthumanism*; the second – a formula derived from studies in science and technology – assimilates the *posthuman-analytical* form; the third, drawn from the anti-humanist philosophy of subjectivity – proposes the reference point of *critical posthumanism* (Braidotti 2016: 55–57). Interested in the *critical posthumanism*, as own brand inventory, Braidotti offers and develops affirmative opinions regarding the posthuman subject, invested with relational valences and marked by multiplicity, differentiated, grounded and responsible, possessor of an acute sense of collectivity, relations, and preoccupied with the construction of communitarian approaches. These points ground the well-defined score of a "radical posthuman subjectivity", based on the ethics of becoming, on moving the accent from the unity of subjectivity to a nomadic one, operating with the enlarged comprehension of the inter-connectivity of self-others (by others, meaning also non-humans) and by an affirmative recomposing of the human interaction. In Braidottian manner, "radical posthumanism transforms hybridity, nomadism, diasporas into means of re-establishing the claims regarding subjectivity, connections, and community" (Braidotti 2016: 69–71).

Europe's Posthuman Condition

Admitting the existence of the *posthuman condition* and inventorying the human modalities of accommodation to the appeal of the posthuman, the positions taken regarding the actual crises explicitly identify the new reference points, transferring them from the theoretical sphere to a practical questioning one. Referring to the Europe's and the world's configurations as they are in the process of changing, the *posthuman condition* becomes news, preoccupation, the story of the day,² the most recent paradigm not only for preoccupations in the academic-scientific area, but also for institutional-legal solutions and initiatives (Herbrechter, Callus, Rossini, 2016).

Focusing (in the year of 2003) on the then future data of human nature, Jürgen Habermas (2003) anticipated the characteristics of Europe's *posthuman condition*, identifying with precision some key points seen in/through the continuing sense of Central European thinking, of certifying the fact that the whole arsenal of organic initial conditions subsists beyond any "programming and deliberate manipulation effort". In an equal measure, the Habermasian approach contains warning valences regarding "substituting the previous uncontrollability of the contingent process of human fertilization resulting from an unforeseeable combination of two different sets of chromosomes. However this rather ordinary contingency proves to be – in the very moment we can master it – a necessary presupposition for being-able-to-be-oneself and for the fundamentally egalitarian nature of our interpersonal relationships" (Habermas 2003: 13). Habermas presents, in a philosophical manner, "the ethical understanding of humanity as a whole", but also interprets the institutional-legal data found in the European Union Charter approach regarding the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights (Nice), that took into consideration the circumstances by which the "the act of procreation and giving birth lose sight of the natural element of uncontrollability as an essential grounding for normative self-understanding"³. At its core, the approach questions *the resistance of the European resistances* to flow of theoretical-scientific change, inside a new area within which, the roles of morality and law in regulating social interaction are rearranged following the prescriptions of a "functionality lacking norms"⁴. What Habermas identifies by the ethics of *successfully being oneself* represents, in a Braidottian manner, an *alternative* way of rethinking the concept of the *good life* and for managing the changes implied by new technologies, biology and advanced engineering (Habermas 2003: 15).

Rosi Braidotti (2006) explicitly presents Europe's posthuman reference points, clarifying the concepts that comprise the evidence given: Europe (here) is invested with a notional philosophic concept, being offered as a form of philosophical language performing an essential role in the European construct. *Difference* represents

² See in this sense (selective): Martin Rees, "Cheer up, the post-human era is dawning", *Financial Times*, 10 July 2015; Imogen Foulkes, "Are we heading towards a 'post human rights world'?", *BBC News*, 30 December 2016 or Sebastian Strangio, "Welcome to the Post-Human Rights World", *Foreign Policy*, 7 March 2017.

³ Habermas insists, in this sense on the 3rd Article, under whose provisions the right to body/mind integrity is guaranteed and "forbids Eugenic practices, especially those which focus on the selection of people" or the "cloning in the scope of reproducing the human beings".

⁴ Having regard of (here) the legal frame of the "right to genetic legacy, immune to artificial interventions", a right solicited by the Parliament Gathering of the European Council.

the key constituting concept of European identity and a philosophical tradition that defines the subject in terms of a comparison between itself with its own likeness and, in an equal measure, to the one that equivalents to “subjective consciousness, rationality and self-regulatory ethical behavior” (Braidotti 2006: 21). If Braidotti invests postmodernity with the attribute of a *specific moment* defined by the approach of re-considering *localization* as a “space-time of co-producing the subject” modality (Braidotti 2006: 29), such a perspective may be attached to the explanation of the *condition-specific localization, space for nomadic thinking and transition, recalculation of the potentially contradictory positions* concept.

The Braidottian *alternatives* recompose a sum of prescriptions that a new theory of the subject must take into account when engaging itself in the final countdown of the *posthuman outcome*. The *posthuman condition* overcomes the crisis signals, auto-delivering itself as “an open opportunity by the set of positive consequences it implies”; therefore, advanced capitalism not only accommodates but also exploits the opportunities arising from the fall of Western humanism, doubled by the globalizing processes of cultural hybridization. Posthuman contradictions are to be clarified by ethical analysis, by political intervention and by normative action. In the Braidottian approach, the conditions for reaching an accord with the postmodern/postmodernity are foreseen, by individualizing the prefigured outcome of the resulting account: “the posthuman subject is not postmodern, meaning it is not anti-foundational. Nor is it deconstructive, because it is not a subject constituted from a linguistic point of view. Posthuman subjectivity is, moreover, a materialist and vital one, embodied and rooted, firmly localized somewhere, according to the feminist politics of location” (Braidotti 2016: 72–73). The resulting perspective insists on an adjustment to the existing subject; but, more than that *affirms the definitive exit from the postmodern condition*.

Following Beck, Braidotti re-conceptualizes the problem of Eurocentrism as methodological nationalism, arguing that Europeans must fulfill their ethical obligations of knowing and accepting responsibility for past history and for the politics of the present. Europe’s *posthuman mission* should consist in criticizing Europe’s limited interests, and intolerance and xenophobic rejection of others, recognizing the *migrant’s condition* as a pragmatic response to their conditions. Against the background of European philosophical humanism, the new agenda seeks to relate itself to the *posthuman condition* as “a way of facilitating Europe’s new definition of its role”, against the background of the triumph of global capitalism triumph, and the limitations of social justice and sustainability. Resonating with the postnationalist-Habermasian approach, Braidotti proposes the accommodation of the pluralist engaged cosmopolitan with posthuman ethics, by the “qualitative alternative of the feeling for a collectivity deferred to the failings of Eurocentrism” (Braidotti 2016: 74).

But the Braidottian argument transcends the (socio-democratic) Habermasian aim, pleading in fact for a quick building of *Europe’s posthuman project*: “minority-becoming” and “nomad-becoming” (Braidotti 2016: 74). At its core, in conceiving and building *our posthuman future* it must appeal, in Braidotti’s fashion, to a particular triple *sensitivity*: visionary as well as impatient and proactive-affirmative. The posthuman outcome should therefore focus on rejecting Europe’s self-assumed missionary role of world center, by means of a change that should affect the conception

of the other as a polar opposite and dislocate the former center, the identical position and prerogatives; in short, it calls for the development of a European-nomadic post nationalist identity type.

Affirmative Politics and Posthuman Security

Under the umbrella of *hope affirmation*, Rosi Braidotti incorporates the totality of collective projects for preserving daily micro-politics, by the quantification, maintaining and planning of sustainable transformation strategies. This approach does not focus solely on reconstructing the social imaginary but also on re-launching and sustaining political economy, wishes, affects and creativity. The Lyotardian influence regarding the necessity of re-managing narrations can be seen here but also, it should be noted, individualizing, the affirmative signs of critical theory of world-subject synchronizing, by imprinting the latter with a positive difference. With a degree of intellectual flexibility (in Harvey's manner), Braidotti opposes a mentality of repudiating Euro-Universalism to ideological nationalism, by proposing as an alternative the posthuman global nomadic connections network. Redefining the attachment and connection to the common and solicitous of space reconfigurations, a sense of priority valorizes "the multiple ecologies of belonging", as a fluid collection of *Hybris* reducing existence to a radical conscience, by establishing a *life centered processual ontology* (Braidotti 2016: 250–251). *Affirmative Politics* involves the appropriateness to time/times, by means of an exteriority/open spaces philosophy and embodied practices, all these being geo-politically and eco-sophical fixed, and equally preoccupied with valorizing the *zôe* primate (Braidotti 2016: 252–253). *The affirmative* co-involves *lucidity*, a concept that does not accept any concessions to moral panic or melancholy which implies, in a prior manner, the answer deferred to the condition of insecurity.

Discerning a constantly maintained tension in the flows crossing the domain of *posthuman security*, Audra Mitchell⁵ proposes for the *posthuman condition* not only an (affirmative) philosophical-political ground, but also a placement in the context of international relations/security studies. Therefore, she accepts by posthuman a direction and horizon of debate regarding the *weakened anthropocentrism* as well as the sedimentation of the actual conditions according to the logic of security logic, perceived as a set of ethical isolating limits that make the diverse worlds more vulnerable due to the co-institution of the human in general. Investing security with a "more than human" attribute allows the domain to be stretched by attracting into discussion both cosmopolis security as well as the responsibility for the multipliable system's dynamics (human, organic, material or technological), underscoring the necessity of attaching the prefix *post* to security: *post-security answers to the security need of the posthuman*.

Fukuyama's approach (2004) anticipates the political frame, and implicitly, the [posthuman] future security context, and signals, via posthuman politics, the moving

⁵Audra Mitchell, "Posthuman Security: Reflections from an Open-ended Conversation", 25 January 2016, <http://www.e-ir.info/2016/01/25/posthuman-security-reflections-from-an-open-ended-conversation/>. The approach is anticipated by a series of pre-positions; see in this sense, Audra Mitchell, "Only Human? Towards Worldly Security", 2014; *International Intervention in a Secular Age: Re-enchanting Humanity*; "Is IR Going Extinct?", 2016 or "Posthuman Security/Ethics", 2016.

on from the theoretical to the pragmatic, from recommending to legislating, benefiting from the cooperation of implementing power invested institutions. If Fukuyama's indications supervene exactly *on/the entering point of the posthuman future*, the marking of some contexts, the limits and precise coordinates of being (the *red lines* represent ways/modalities of regulating what is legitimate) cannot distance themselves from the primacy of therapy and improvement, concepts re-invested in a Foucaultian connection with drawing forth responses from a more competitive world, made more vulnerable by social conflicts in which what is lost consists in the very precept of shared humanity. Affirmatively-affirmed, secured and securable, the *posthuman condition* claims, in Fukuyama's view the junction of a double liberty – that of political communities preserving and protecting their values, as well as the liberty exercised over the biotechnological revolution – both ways/modalities of taming the future and securing an accommodation to the *posthuman's solicitations*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badmington, N. 2014. Teoretizarea postumanismului [Theorizing Posthumanism]. // *Post/h/um. Jurnal de studii (post)umaniste*, no.1, 7–23.
- Braidotti, R. 2016. *Postumanul* [The Posthuman]. Bucharest: Hecate Publishing House.
- Braidotti, R. 2006. *Transpositions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fukuyama, F. 2004. *Viitorul nostru postuman*, [Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution]. Bucharest: Humanitas Publishing House.
- Habermas, J. 2003. *The Future of Human Nature*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harvey, D. 2002. *Condiția postmodernității. O cercetare asupra originilor schimbării culturale* [The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change]. Timișoara: Amarcord Publishing House.
- Herbrechter, S., Callus, I., Rossini, M. (eds.). 2016. *European Posthumanism*, Routledge.
- Liotard, J.-Fr. 1979. *La Condition postmoderne: Rapport sur le savoir*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Malpas, S. 2003. *Jean-François Lyotard*, Routledge.
- Mitchell, A. 2016. Posthuman Security: Reflections from an Open-ended Conversation, 25 January 2016, <http://www.e-ir.info/2016/01/25/Posthuman-security-reflections-from-an-open-ended-conversation/>.
- Morris, M. 2006. *Identity Anecdotes: Translation and Media Culture*, Sage.
- Pepperell, R. 1997. *The Post-human Condition*, ed. II, Exeter, Intellect Books.