

The dangers of postmodern thinking

The idea of a future based on enlightenment with the transformation of Western society by reason and the sciences has failed

After the horrors of World War II, humanity questioned and doubted itself: “How could men do this to other men?”

Old schools of thought were re-activated and new ones arose in attempts to draw lessons from this betrayal of man by man: Nihilism, which saw the world as devoid of all meaning or values; Existentialism, with its nauseous themes and obsession with the absurd; plus the deconstruction of traditional reference points such as body and spirit, masculine and feminine, man and animal, and so many others.

All these schools of thought make up what is known as “postmodern philosophy.” They abandon all reference to a treacherous reason to guide the world and confirm that humanity has entered a period of disorders and meaninglessness.

The past, hanging on to tradition, is outdated. The idea of a future based on enlightenment with the transformation of Western society by reason and the sciences has failed.

So, we all need to cultivate the present and seek our wellbeing based on a libertarian hedonism. In short, let's not waste any more time to be happy.

This type of individualism reflects the fragmentation of society into groups and communities.

Moreover, as soon as the evolution of society and the evolution techniques meet, all ways of life become socially legitimate even when their juxtaposition would be a source of instability.

With the accelerated breakdown of referential values and traditional reference points such as the state, religion or family, it's also the end of conceptualised sociological models since individual acts are dissociated from a common order.

Should one see in this new conception of life the idea that all desires should be satisfied when that is technically possible? Since assisted procreation can be an answer to the desire of women living singly or in couples, why oppose it and, why not men, too?

If one's own eggs can be conserved for a later conception, why not do it? Genetic analysis is increasingly precise, so why not use it to choose the children to be born? And soon, why not replace one's insufficient genes by more "effective" genes and thus improve one's performances?

Recent legal decisions confirm that it is possible to obtain parenthood independent of gender and, already, since "sex changes" are possible, there have been requests for "age changes" in the civil registry.

In other words, in a world limited to oneself and in a life fragmented into instants, one searches in vain for things that could make sense and which could create linkages. Does the world then have as its sole referential value the achieving of the desires of the individual?

Particularly since all of humanity's referential values and points of reference were deconstructed by postmodern philosophy, it would seem necessary to reconstruct something else.

Reconstructing another, radically different, humanity is precisely the challenge borne by posthumanism.

This is certainly about a form of modern mythology, but it is useless to give credence to the idea. In other words, one really needs to understand the danger of the temptations of so-called postmodern thought to live in a shared society.

Jean-François Mattei is a member of the Institut de France and the

