

Amir Muzur, Hans-Martin Sass (eds.)

## 1926-2016 Fritz Jahr's Bioethics: A Global Discourse

Zürich–Wien: LIT Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, 2017; 230 p.

LIT Verlag publishing house tightened its printing cogs to land the fourth collection of research papers on the central historical figure in the development of European bioethics. It was published in the series “Ethik in der Praxis. Kontroversen./Practical Ethics. Controversies.”, and the book connects to the broader research project that has been coded “Jahrology”, altogether implying a certain cultural dynamism that counters limits produced by other “mainstream” bioethics. In all of its fifty shades of grey, the watered down discourse on bioethical issues maintained by American bioethics, though still quite an industry of its own, showed some advancement in its sensibility for the complexity of bioethical field of problems when “global bioethics” emerged in a series of relevant publications, most notably Henk ten Have’s *Encyclopedia of Global Bioethics*, but also by the expansion of notions in the last edition of the only Encyclopedia of Bioethics, currently edited by Bruce Jennings. Although editors and contributors of this encyclopaedia began to realize the necessity for the expansion of terms, perspectives, and problems emerging in the field of bioethics, there is a number of articles within it that show that this encyclopaedia, somewhat iniquitously termed “Bioethics”, is in fact not up to date with global bioethical movements, and that it selectively generates knowledge stripped of projects such as Potter’s bioethics, European bioethics, and integrative bioethics, to number just a few. The *logia* behind these (cultural) projects is different, but it is quite stressful when we start to believe that its difference is for the worse, rather than it is different in so much as it contributes as the expansive corrective to bioethical sensibility. Precisely these kinds of books, books such as *1926–2016 Fritz Jahr’s Bioethics*, demonstrate two core barriers to progress that, although heavily enclosed under the mountain of effective work, mark American-style archetypical bioethics: a) the need for monoculture;

b) obsession with incommensurability. This collection of comments, rather than studies, still doesn't break the barriers, but it shows that it can be jumped over them, and points at the method of how.

The book focuses on central Jahr's paper and its bioethical imperative, and around the luminance of its campfire gathers disciplinary multitude of scholars, thirty of them, writing on Jahr's concepts in twenty-two papers in eighteen languages. All texts are provided in English as the primary language of collected papers, which is fully understandable, since English is the "common tongue of global discourse", yet precisely because of that, all the papers are also provided in author's native tongue, producing twofold result: a pragmatic solution to spreading the idea and the provided content supporting the idea, and a vivid demonstration of respecting cultural variety. German philosopher Martin Heidegger argued that language is the "house of being". By being he meant that which is all that is and can be, and in that sense it speaks from itself to itself. However, from another German philosopher, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, we learn how the ontological unity of Being comes forth as ontical network of concrete variances. In that sense, when we say that language is the house of being, we mean "here-being", from what spurs the multitude of cultures and psychosocial bioevolution of their traditions. In itself, the language holds the truth to meaning that was both devised and revealed by any cultural unit, and any shift, any "translation" from language to language also causes the meaning to be shifted. Some notions from one language are literally untranslatable to others, they are describable at best. But to us, this shows the dimensionality of here-being, thus it shows how being itself is in many ways still concealed, and how it offers itself in different ways to different people from different cultures. It is here, where incommensurability pitches its flag and asks for monoculture, and stops making any sense what-so-ever. No monocultural movement brought continuous fortune to anyone: let's just remind ourselves of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Because it is not about measuring anything, and it is not about producing perfect set, it is about mereological comparing. Unlike commensurability, which allows no remainder to exist, comparability allows us to notice both common ground and differences. It is then the dia-logos, which defines methodology of merging common ground with differences, making any relationship work in favour of different sides precisely because of the common ground. Commentators on Jahr's work, which contributed to this volume, did precisely that: from various cultural backgrounds they showed how Jahr's bioethical imperative strikes all our beings principally, but how we developed various approaches to dealing with it. In that sense, what this book does, is the following: with easily accessible dozens of details on various cultures and problems that will motivate us to explore these particular perspectives more directly, they show common ground of humanity, but not in terms

of biology, not in the simplistic terms of species, rather, in the here-being, where it is the most important, where *we care*.

Since the content is not and may not be available online, I henceforth provide readers with full transcription: Ayman Yasi Arat wrote “Bioethics in the Arab civilization after Islam”, Leonard D. de Castro and Jeanette Yasol-Naval wrote “Fritz Jahr’s Bio-ethik and respect for animals and the ecology in the Philippines”, José Roberto Goldim, Márcia Santana Fernandes wrote “Brazilian Bioethics perspective”, Sorin Hostiuc wrote “A commentary about the beginnings of bioethics in Romania”, Ganna Hubenko wrote “Integrative pedagogical bioethics: uniting beginnings and future prospects under the auspices of Fritz Jahr”, Samia Hurst wrote “Upcycling Fritz Jahr’s aging cloths with new knowledge”, İlhan İlkilic, Hakan Ertin, and Rainer Brömer wrote “Fritz Jahr’s term bioethics: an evaluation from the perspective of Islamic tradition”, Eleni M. Kalokairinou wrote “Fritz Jahr’s Bioethical Imperative”, R. R. Kishore wrote “Global Bioethics and Indian Perception: The Divine Path”, Frank J. Leavitt wrote “Compassion towards animals in the Talmud”, Fernando Lolas wrote “Fritz Jahr’s bioethical imperative: an anticipation of ethology and bioethics”, Gilberto Marzano wrote “Towards a new dimension of bioethics”, Irene M. Miller wrote “Reflecting on the bioethical imperative after three decades of medical practice”, Amir Muzur and Iva Rinčić wrote “A miracle called Jahr among the Croats”, Josephine Joseph Mwakisambwe wrote “My opinion on ‘sciences and the teaching of ethics’”, Renzong Qiu and Xiaomei Zhai wrote “Perspectives from Chinese tradition”, Hans-Martin Sass wrote “Old knowledge in new clothing”, Jiwon Shim wrote “Practical methodology for bio-ethical imperative of Fritz Jahr”, Michael Cheng-tek Tai and Ling Lang Huang wrote “Bioethical Imperative: Respect Every Living Being”, Tuji Takala and Matti Häyry wrote “Are some living beings more equal than others? Fritz Jahr’s position in the European debate on what matters morally”, Tomoaki Tsuchida wrote “A response from a Japanese point of view”, and Boris Yudin wrote “Ethics of life and global bioethics”. Finally, the last section is a supplement “Works of Jahr and about Jahr” compiled by Iva Rinčić, listing one hundred forty-one work on Jahr, eight translations of Jahr’s work, and five German editions of Jahr’s writings. In my final remark, I encourage readers to take a look at the book’s content: even if the content may not be of your interest, the methodological concept behind it certainly should be.

**Luka Perušić**