





The
Future
of
Human
Nature

JÜRGEN HABERMAS



The Future of Human Nature



**The
Future
of
Human
Nature**

JÜRGEN HABERMAS

polity

Copyright © this translation Polity Press 2003

Chapter 1 was first published as "Begründete Enthaltbarkeit. Gibt es postmetaphysische Antworten auf die Frage nach dem 'richtigen Leben'?" in *Die Zukunft der menschlichen Natur. Auf dem Weg zu einer liberalen Eugenik?*, © Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2001.

Chapter 2 was first published as "Auf dem Weg zu einer liberalen Eugenik? Der Streit um das ethische Selbstverständnis der Gattung" in *Die Zukunft der menschlichen Natur. Auf dem Weg zu einer liberalen Eugenik?*, © Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2001. Chapter 3 was first published as "Glauben und Wissen" in *Friedenspreis des Deutschen Buchhandels 2001*, © Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2001.

First published in 2003 by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishing Ltd

Editorial office:

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Marketing and production:

Blackwell Publishing Ltd
108 Cowley Road
Oxford OX4 1JF, UK

Distributed in the USA by

Blackwell Publishing Inc.
350 Main Street
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN 0-7456-2986-5

ISBN 0-7456-2987-3 (pb) only available in the UK

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library and has been applied for from the Library of Congress.

Typeset in 11 on 13 pt Berling
by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International, Padstow, Cornwall

For further information on Polity, visit our website: www.polity.co.uk



Contents

<i>Publisher's Note</i>	vi
<i>Foreword</i>	vii
Are There Postmetaphysical Answers to the Question: What is the "Good Life"?	1
The Debate on the Ethical Self-Understanding of the Species	16
I Moralizing human nature?	23
II Human dignity versus the dignity of human life	29
III The embedding of morality in an ethics of the species	37
IV The grown and the made	44
V Natality, the capacity of being oneself, and the ban on instrumentalization	53
VI The moral limits of eugenics	60
VII Setting the pace for a self-instrumentalization of the species?	66
Postscript	75
Faith and Knowledge	101
<i>Notes</i>	116



Publisher's Note

Chapter 1 was translated by William Rehg. The foreword and the postscript to chapter 2 were translated by Max Pensky. The main body of chapters 2 and 3 was translated by Hella Beister and Max Pensky. For the German origins of these chapters, please see details on the copyright page.



Foreword

On the occasion of receiving the Dr Margrit Egnér Prize for the year 2000, I delivered a lecture on September 9 of that year at the University of Zurich that served as the basis for the first of the texts reproduced here. I proceed on the basis of a distinction between a Kantian theory of justice and a Kierkegaardian ethics of subjectivity, and defend the restraint that postmetaphysical thinking exercises regarding binding positions on substantive questions of the good or the un-misspent life. This is the contrasting background for an opposing question that arises in light of the debates touched off by genetic technology: Can philosophy tolerate this same restraint in questions of a species ethics as well?


The main text, an expanded version of the Christian Wolf Lecture given at Marburg University on June 28, 2001, is an entrance into this debate that does not relinquish the premises of postmetaphysical thinking. So far, this debate over genetic research and technology has circled around the question of the moral status of prepersonal human life without results. I therefore adopt the perspective of a future present, from which we might someday perhaps look back on currently controversial practices as the first steps toward a liberal eugenics regulated by supply and demand. Embryonic research and preimplantation genetic diagnosis excite strong emo-

tions above all because they exemplify a danger that is bound to the metaphor of “human breeding.” Not without reason, we worry over the possible emergence of a thick intergenerational web of actions for which no one can be called to account, because it one-sidedly cuts vertically through the contemporary network of interactions. Therapeutic goals, by contrast, on which all genetic technological procedures ought to be based, draw narrow boundaries for each and every intervention. From the therapeutic perspective, one must assume an attitude toward a second person whose consent has to be taken into account.

The postscript to the main text, written at year’s end, responds to objections less as a revision than as a clarification of my original intentions.

The third text is based on a speech I delivered on October 14, 2001, on the occasion of my reception of the Peace Prize of the German Book Trade. It takes up a question that has gained new relevance in the wake of September 11: What does an ongoing “secularization” within already secularized societies demand of the citizens of a democratic constitutional state, that is, from the faithful and the unfaithful alike?

Starnberg, December 31, 2001



Are There Postmetaphysical Answers to the Question: What is the “Good Life”?

In the novel *Stiller* Max Frisch has Stiller, the public prosecutor, ask: “What does a human being do with the time he has to live? I was hardly fully aware of the question; it was simply an irritation.” Frisch poses the question in the indicative mood. In their self-concern, reflective readers give the question an ethical turn: “What should I do with the time I have to live?” For long enough philosophers believed that they could give suitable advice in reply. But today, in our postmetaphysical age, philosophy no longer pretends to have answers to questions regarding the personal, or even the collective, conduct of life. Theodor Adorno’s *Minima Moralia* begins with a melancholy refrain of Nietzsche’s “joyful science” – by admitting this inability: “The melancholy science from which I make this offering to my friend relates to a region that from time immemorial was regarded as the true field of philosophy . . . : the teaching of the good life.”¹ But ethics has now regressed, as Adorno believed, and become the “melancholy science,” because it allows, at best, only scattered, aphoristic “reflections from damaged life.”



As long as philosophers still had faith that they were able

to assure themselves about their ability to discuss the whole of nature and history, they had authority over the supposedly established frameworks into which the human life of individuals and communities had to fit. The order of the cosmos and human nature, the stages of secular and sacred history provided normatively laden facts that, so it seemed, could also disclose the right way to live. Here "right" had the exemplary sense of an imitation-worthy model for living, both for the life of the individual and for the political community. Just as the great religions present their founders' way of life as the path to salvation, so also metaphysics offered its models of life – for the select few, of course, who did not follow the crowd. The doctrines of the good life and of a just society – ethics and politics – made up a harmonious whole. But with the acceleration of social change, the lifespans of these models of the good life have become increasingly shorter – whether they were aimed at the Greek polis, the estates of the medieval *societas civilis*, the well-rounded individual of the urban Renaissance or, as with Hegel, at the system of family, civil society, and constitutional monarchy.

Rawls's political liberalism marks the endpoint of this development, precisely as a response to the pluralism of worldviews and to the spreading individualization of lifestyles. Surveying the rubble of philosophical attempts to designate *particular* ways of life as exemplary or universally obligatory, Rawls draws the proper conclusion: that the "just society" ought to leave it to individuals to choose how it is that they want to "spend the time they have for living." It guarantees to each an equal freedom to develop an ethical self-understanding, so as to realize a personal conception of the "good life" according to one's own abilities and choices.

It is certainly true that individual life-projects do not emerge independently of intersubjectively shared life contexts. However, in complex societies one culture can assert itself against other cultures only by convincing its succeeding generations – who can also say no – of the advan-

tages of its world-disclosive semantic and action-orienting power. "Nature reserves" for cultures are neither possible nor desirable. In a constitutional democracy the majority may also not prescribe for minorities aspects of its own cultural form of life (beyond the common political culture of the country) by claiming for its culture an authoritative guiding function (as "*Leitkultur*").

As the foregoing remarks indicate, practical philosophy by no means renounces all of its normative concerns. At the same time, it does restrict itself, by and large, to questions of justice. In particular, its aim is to clarify the moral point of view from which we judge norms and actions whenever we must determine what lies in the equal interest of everyone and what is equally good for all. At first glance, moral theory and ethics appear to be oriented to the same question: What ought I, or what ought we, to do? But the "ought" has a different sense once we are no longer asking about rights and duties that everyone ascribes to one another from an inclusive we-perspective, but instead are concerned with our own life from the first-person perspective and ask what is best "for me" or "for us" in the long run and all things considered. Such ethical questions regarding our own weal and woe arise in the context of a *particular* life history or a *unique* form of life. They are wedded to questions of identity: how we should understand ourselves, who we are and want to be. Obviously there is no answer to such questions that would be independent of the given context and thus would bind all persons in the same way.

Consequently, theories of justice and morality take their own separate path today, at least a path different from that of "ethics," if we understand this in the classical sense of a doctrine of the right way to live. The moral point of view obliges us to abstract from those exemplary pictures of a successful or undamaged life that have been handed on in the grand narratives of metaphysics and religion. Our existential self-understanding can still continue to draw its nourishment from the substance of these traditions just as