

Introduction

Filippo Batisti

Universidade Católica Portuguesa – CEFH Braga, Portugal

As the guest editor of this issue of *JoLMA*, it is my pleasure to introduce this stimulating polyphonic collection of essays. Readers will find a brief presentation of each at the beginning of the last article (Batisti, this issue).

I must begin by thanking all the authors for having proved so brilliant in accepting the challenge posed by the call for papers. The latter deliberately addressed multiple aspects of a trend relevant to a variety of disciplines: a deep rethinking of the definition of humanness in its relationship with traditional non-human counterparts.

An editorial operation like this comes with risks. It is not rare that invitations to discuss what is thought to be a single topic, and instead emerges as nothing more than a vague suggestion, end up as a regrettable cacophonous ensemble of independent contributions. Instead, all the authors proved that a meaningful multidisciplinary dialogue can be achieved. This outcome goes to their own merit, as the editor did little to guide them in this regard.

I shall add some final words on the results the issue delivers.

The first result that we hopefully achieved is to support the idea that discussions around foundational issues like the redefinition of humanness always benefit from an exchange of views among the relevant disciplinary standpoints. That includes meta-reflections on the discussion itself (Figdor; Colaço; Białek; Batisti, this issue).

The second result is negative, in a way. Despite the commonalities that made this issue readable - i.e. understandable to a satisfactory extent - by any reader from the first to the last article, I cannot blame those who remain dubious about the identification of a single thread that may become a standalone research program. Would that be possible? Definitely. Would that be desirable? This is where skepticism arises. Perhaps it would make sense to think of a unified

study of the post-human. Post-human studies are indeed a growing field that attracts scholars with different backgrounds. However, after editing this journal issue, I find myself more inclined to endorse a multidisciplinary framework for this topic to be treated in a more fruitful and rigorous way.

Why? The philosophical reflection stemming from actual scientific practice, taken together with the feedback of the former directed to the latter, was here proven to have the potential to inform ethical thinking and political practices with a more robust foundation than the ones that do not necessarily relate so closely to scientific developments (Terragni, Cesaroni; Fizzarotti; Joy, this issue). This, of course, is not to endorse an alleged preeminence of science as opposed to speculative philosophical reflection, nor that scientific practices should remain untouched by science-informed philosophy. On the contrary, history and anthropology of science function as antidotes to similar ill-founded views (Raffaetà, this issue). To be clear, the most recent scientific and technological discoveries require an even stronger role of philosophy in public and institutional discussions. Their practical consequences for humans and non-humans cannot be ignored.

I do not assume that the authors I had the privilege of editing necessarily agree with my final assessment, or even with the first one. Nonetheless, this is a discussion we, as self-reflecting humans, need to have to better understand the bases on which we are called to re-think our place in an endangered world.