

Utopian Horizon Value Theory: A Transformative Power at the Heart of Human Futurity

Glen T. Martin, Ph.D.
Professor of Philosophy
Radford University
Virginia, USA

Abstract

This paper argues that human temporality as articulated by a number of recent thinkers has not yet been generally understood or assimilated. It reviews several philosophers on temporality, ending with Heidegger's argument that the future has an ontological priority over the past and present. However, far beyond Heidegger, it also identifies a "utopian horizon" in all normal persons as a feature of that "futurity" that defines for us the values by which we should be living and the efforts we should be making to transform human existence. It reviews several models of human value-development pointing to a value-laden "cosmic consciousness" and describes the "transpersonal" nature of mature values, or "being-values." It identifies the "transcendental ego" as a fundamental non-personal, non-temporal feature of our consciousness that elicits the values appearing on our utopian horizon. It recognizes, with Hegel, Panikkar, Teilhard de Chardin, and several other thinkers, that this utopian horizon may be the action of the finite-infinity at the heart of both the evolving cosmic totality and the human situation, placing evolution in the hands of human freedom. Finally, it argues that the Constitution for the Federation of Earth is a key to the next step in actualizing the "practical utopia" demanded by our utopian horizon.

Key Words. Utopian horizon, temporality, radical futurity, being-values, self-transcendence, cosmic consciousness, cosmic evolution, freedom, transformation, transcendental ego, *Earth Constitution*.

1. Human Temporality and the Priority of the Future

Like many other dimensions of human existence, time remains a deep cosmic and human mystery. No one knows what time is or what it means within human life or the cosmos. In his *Confessions*, Book X, St. Augustine famously explored the mystery of time, and the more he explored it, the greater the mystery and his astonishment: "What, then, is time? If no one asks me, I know; if I want to explain it to someone who does ask me, I do not know. Yet I state confidently that I know this: if nothing were passing away there would be no past time, and if nothing existed, there would be no present time, and if nothing were coming, there would be no future time. How, then, can these two kinds of time, the past and the future, be, when the past no longer is and the future as yet does not be?" (in McDermott, 385).

But time is not merely a mystery when we attempt to objectify it, as St. Augustine does here. It is also a deep mystery because it coincides with the mystery of our human Being-in-the-world. Time is not only a phenomenon of past, present, and future, the first and last of which mysteriously do not exist, since only the present moment exists. We humans are *constituted* by time. *We are time* in some fundamental senses.

Each of us appropriates a personal past within a dynamic expansive, living present, and projects our lives into a yet to be realized future, a future that can only ever become actual as an aspect of the living present within which we will continue to exist until our death. Time is fundamental to history, to freedom, to civilization, to the meaning of our lives, to what we are as human beings, and to the possibilities of self-transcendence.

Yet with the mystics of all the great religious traditions of the world we need to understand that eternity, the timeless depth of the present (*nunc stans*), the infinity permeating all present experience, permeates our lives and urges to live from the depths of the present moment in what philosopher Raimon Panikkar (1993) calls “transhistorical awareness.” We must not ontologize the future in such a way that we lose the “tempiternal” fullness of the present moment from which we live within the profound intersection within the present moment of God, the Earth, and Man.

Nevertheless, it appears that time and its dynamic futurity has not been generally understood in relation to what we are as human beings, for time is commonly *objectified* as something external to our lives. We speak of “time passing” as if we stood by and watched a passing railway train. This leaves out that human beings themselves appear to be time, to be a living embodiment of temporality, of becoming, a major part of which is our futurity. We are constituted as time (and eternity within the depths of the present). We live in an extended, dynamic present that includes both the past (as memory) and the future (as anticipation).

Panikkar declares that “Becoming belongs to the very essence of Being.” This, of course, is also true of our human “Being-in-the-world.” “Were an entity not to become what it is at each moment that it is,” he writes, “it would cease to be. The entity exists and this existence is its becoming” (2013, 98). Our own becoming, Panikkar affirms, is linked to the destiny of the universe. What is the “omega point,” the destiny of being? “This destiny also, to a certain extent depends upon us. This is our human dignity, and our responsibility” (*ibid.*, 104).

We exist, like all of Being, as temporality, as becoming. To be so constituted means that futurity is part of our Being-in-the-World (as Heidegger names us). To have a reality that includes futurity means that we have no predetermined “essence” but live as openness, as possibility, as freedom. The question posed in this essay is how great is our freedom? What values are implied by or emerge from this freedom? Have we not misconceived and largely ignored the significance of human futurity and freedom? How can we increase our freedom so that we can move forward to ever-greater modes of self-realization?

The fact of becoming, the structure of temporality, I want to emphasize, does not supplant or ignore the dimension of eternity, the timeless now, spoken about by mystics and sages of all centuries and all the great world’s religions. As Ralph Waldo Emerson declared human beings can only be fulfilled when we “live with nature in the present, above time” (in Wilber 1985, 65). We will also emphasize anon that the transcendental ego identified by Kant is transtemporal. But the reality of the absolute present moment, itself beyond time, should not blind us to the dimensions in which we also exist *as temporality*. Some form of absolute monism, like that of Sankara, may claim that time is an “illusion.” But there is no need to absolutize eternity to the point of denying or diminishing the fundamental reality and value of time. To do so, we will see, ignores the deep meaningfulness of the emergent evolutionary *telos* of the Cosmos (cf. Harris 1988).

In *Concluding Scientific Postscript* Søren Kierkegaard sees our temporality (as finite creatures moving from past to present to future) as confronting us with the “paradoxical” character of the truth. For if we externalize the truth as something independent of our subjective temporal existence, then this “objective” truth becomes something independent of us, similar to an objective sequence of temporal “nows” that have little or no relation to my own futurity. Kierkegaard finds that the objectification of truth leaves out the meaning of truth for the existing individual, that is, for subjectivity: “For a subjective reflection, the truth becomes a matter of appropriation, of inwardness, of subjectivity, and thought must probe more and more deeply into the subject and his subjectivity” (1968, 171). He concludes with his famous definition: “An objective uncertainty held fast in an appropriation-process of the most passionate inwardness is the truth, the highest truth attainable for an existing individual” (*ibid.*, 182).

Here we find an indication of the issue with which we are confronted regarding temporality. To think of time as an external “objective” passing of “nows” as measured by the clock is to leave out something fundamental about being human. And the question of who we are as human beings is perhaps the most fundamental issue we can address, seeing that our very existence on this planet is now threatened by developments during the past 75 or more years. If we exist as a temporality that embraces not only the past but also a futurity that is undetermined and open to what could be truly new, then we must consider in what ways truth can be “subjectivity” rather than merely “objectivity.”

As our awareness of the dynamic of temporality increases, we begin to see the possibilities of real transcendence buried within the mystery of time. In *The Creative Mind*, Henri Bergson transforms the misleading idea imposed by “clock time” into the meaningful dynamic of “duration” in which the creative upsurge of the universe finds its focus in human temporality. He writes: “in duration, considered as a creative evolution, there is perpetual creation of possibility and not only for reality” (1965, 21). The consequence of this “intuition” of the deep, creative movement of duration is that “reality no longer appears then in the static state, in its manner of being; it affirms itself dynamically.... Everything comes to life around us, everything is revived in us.... We are more fully alive....” (ibid., 157).

Emmanuel Levinas remarks that, “it is Bergson who taught us the spirituality of the new....” (1985, 28). Being temporal creatures means that we live in a perpetual openness to the new, an ever-living movement in which not only new realities are created, but new possibilities. Levinas affirms that “time is...a dynamism which leads us elsewhere than toward the things we possess. It is as if time were a movement beyond what is equal to us” (ibid., 61). He indicates the self-transcendence at the heart of human temporality. Lived time, duration, is a perpetual movement “beyond what is equal to us” toward a future that transcends the past and the present.

Human beings live within a dynamic and evolving present that embraces both past and future. In our present, we appropriate the past dynamically into a present oriented to the future, toward a future that we want to be better, that transcends the past and transcends it always and indefinitely. No matter where we find ourselves in the progression between birth and death, the future is never realized, it remains transcendent of the past and present.

It is not simply a matter, therefore, of living within an objective series of “nows” measured by a clock time external to our lives. What is created by the temporal dynamic is not simply more “reality” in the sense that future events become present and then past. What is created is “possibility.” We continually open up to possibilities in which something genuinely new can appear. Martin Buber captures this sense of the openness of the future in the following passage:

Man is the crystalized potentiality of existence. But he is this potentiality in its factual limitation. The wealth of possibility in existence from which the animals are kept away by their exiguous reality is exhibited in man in a sign that is incomprehensible from the standpoint of nature. Yet this wealth of possibility does not hold free sway, so that life might be able time and again to follow on the wings of the anticipation of spirit, but it is confined within narrow limits. The limitation is not essential but only factual. That means that man’s action is unforeseeable in its nature and extent, and that even if he were peripheral to the cosmos in everything else, he remains the centre of all surprise in the world. (1972: 437-38)

To be the centre of all surprise in the world means that the future contains possibilities that emerge beyond any causal determinism of the past over the future. Indeed, thinkers like Kierkegaard, Bergson, Levinas, and Buber challenge the dogma that emerged from an outdated early-modern science that the past causally determines all events as it moves through the present into the future. We see causality at work everywhere in the world, including within our own bodies and psychologies, and mistakenly apply it to ourselves in a totalizing way. But this overlooks the deep mystery of human freedom and futurity, and the fact that what emerges from the process are not simply causally determined results but radically new potentialities and possibilities.

In *Being and Time*, Martin Heidegger distinguishes the common attitude to time from a stance that recognizes its existential import and intrinsic relationship with human Being-in-the-world. To treat human beings as just another object within the world, another form of what is “present at hand,” parallels the “fallen” or common view of time as a series of “nows” occurring in the present some “becoming now” moving from future to presentness and others “becoming past” moving from the now into past existence. From this perspective time seems like a line infinite in both directions and human beings simply existing along this line between past and future.

However, the existential phenomenology used by Heidegger in *Being and Time* reveals something different. Human beings are not simply objects living within a time frame of before and after, we are “an entity for which this Being is an issue.” That is, we are constituted by time and move perpetually “towards one’s ownmost distinctive potentially for Being.” Dasein (literally: “being-there”) “comes toward itself in its ownmost possibility.” We confront the fact that our being has no definable essence, since we are primordially futurity, we confront “the future as coming towards.”

Human beings encounter themselves as “thrown” into the world, as factually just existing as they find themselves in certain circumstances in the world. However, because of their dynamic futurity, they can “take over” their thrownness, appropriating it in the light of their authentic potentiality for being: “Only so far as it is futural can Dasein be authentically as having been. The character of ‘having been’ arises, in a certain way, from the future.”

Human beings exist as temporality. Past, present, and future are not extraneous to what we are but comprise what we are. Heidegger does not bring into *Being and Time* the awareness that these dimensions of temporality do not exhaust what we are, since eternity/infinity also intersect our being in the world making our awareness a possible “tempiternity.” The theme of timeless “emptiness” or “silence” explicitly arises in Heidegger’s later writings (see Carter 1989), but our focus in this essay is on temporality and its utopian horizon.

Temporality makes possible the multiplicity of Dasein’s modes of Being, “and especially the basic possibility of authentic or inauthentic existence.” Inauthentic existence “levels out” the dynamic ecstasies of temporality to give us the sequence of “nows” mentioned above, as if human beings were simply objects coming into existence and going out of existence along a continuum between past and future. But authentic existence for Heidegger embraces the temporality of Dasein as living in and through its primordial potentiality for Being and recognizes that “the future has a priority in the ecstatic unity of primordial and authentic temporality....The primary phenomenon of primordial and authentic temporality is the future.”

It is often declared that Existentialism rebelled against the traditional western idea that “essence precedes existence” and replaced this with the idea that “existence precedes essence.” This challenges the classical idea that human beings have an intrinsic human nature, that like everything else, has a definable essence that then became instantiated in actually existing human beings. The idea that the essences of things are prior to their existence does not apply in the case of human beings because human freedom lays upon us an existence from which we then create an essence. *That we are* precedes what we are, and what we are or what we become is a consequence of human choices and decisions.

Although below I will emphasize a larger cosmic framework for this conclusion, Heidegger’s thought in *Being and Time* fits this definition of Existentialism. Inauthentic temporality, the common view of human being in relation to time, conceives of human beings as living along a continuum of an infinite series of “nows” and fails to encounter the finitude of primordial time in which “temporality temporalizes itself primordially out of the future.” We are precisely creatures for whom our being is not fixed as an essence, but because we are temporality structured as a whole our being is precisely an issue for us. Our primordial understanding means that we are “projecting towards a potentiality-for-Being for the sake of which any Dasein exists.”

In authentic understanding, we face a finite futurity, closed by our own death, with “anticipatory resoluteness” with the understanding that our human essence, our potentiality for Being, is what is at issue. “Dasein, existing authentically, lets itself come towards itself as its ownmost potentiality-for-Being—that the future itself must first win itself, not from a present, but from the inauthentic future.... Factually, Dasein is constantly ahead of itself, but inconstantly anticipatory with regard to its existential possibility.” (These selections from *Being and Time* are found in Sherover 1979, 519-547.)

Inauthentic futurity sees time as an infinite series of “nows” and fails to understand that human beings do not just have temporality but are finite temporality and therefore face death. Authentically we do not look away from our own death through the infinitizing of time in some general idea that death is what happens to “them,” as a general phenomenon, but rather realize that “death is in each case mine.” We each live in the openness of our own potentiality for being in the face of our own death. Futurity, that which has not yet come to be in the present or the past, is our most fundamental mode of Being-in-the-world. The astonishing mystery of human existence confronts us in this realization.

Heidegger makes an important contribution to our human self-understanding. If we truly exist as temporality, then openness to the new, the transformed, the revolutionary is part of our very being. The conservative clinging to the past or the positivist clinging to “facts” result from inauthentically retreating from our true human situation in which the future takes ontological priority over the present and past. Nevertheless, Heidegger does not give us Utopian Horizon Value Theory. Far from it. He speaks of our intrinsic openness to the future, to potentiality as a key component in the wholeness of human temporality, but he does not articulate values.

And, in general, his philosophy was a rebellion against the liberal-democratic tradition that had developed throughout the modern period. (It may be that this lacuna is what allowed him to embrace National Socialism in 1933 and become rector of Freiburg University under the Nazis (see Wolin 1993).)

2. Priority of the Future and Ethics

One of Heidegger's students who later became a well-known philosopher in his own right was Hans Jonas. Regarding Heidegger, Jonas writes, "ethics for him remained empty of real content" (1996, 47). Neither in *Being and Time* nor in his later philosophy, does Heidegger reflect in any significant way, on human values, on ethics. Nevertheless, Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of human temporality was the culmination of a number of western thinkers who had been focusing on human temporality, such as Søren Kierkegaard, William James, Charles Sanders Peirce, John Dewey, Josiah Royce, Henri Bergson, and Edmund Husserl (Heidegger's immediate teacher) (cf. Sherover, 1975).

Together, these thinkers elucidate the centrality of time and temporality within our human situation, culminating in Heidegger's emphasis on the ontological priority of the future and the open-endedness of our potentiality for Being. However, this is only the starting point, not the conclusion. Given the priority of the future, what then are the conditions of this futurity and what values can be linked with it? Hans Jonas went on to write a well-known book entitled *The Imperative of Responsibility* in which he argues that human beings need to preserve human life and freedom in the face of the great dangers to these values from modern technology and irrational movements such as fascism.

Ethics, Jonas emphasizes, arises from "Being's breakthrough into an unlimited realm of possibilities extending into the farthest reaches of subjective life and subsumed in its entirety under the rubric of 'freedom'" (1996, 61). Ethics demands human self-transcendence. Today, when the entire future of the human project and all life on Earth is endangered, he declares, "Our sense of responsibility must be commensurate with the magnitude of our power and therefore involves, like it, the entire future of humanity on this Earth" (ibid., 99).

The imperative inherent within human civilization, for Jonas, is protecting ontological freedom, becoming active custodians of freedom, which also involves protecting the biosphere of our planet and all life on Earth. Contemporary philosophy, he declares (as also evidenced in Heidegger's thought) has so far failed to bring the statement "I am hungry" truly within its purview (ibid., 47). Indian thinker Swami Agnivesh (2015) asks the same question: How does philosophy address the here and now misery of the enslaved and hungry millions? Jonas writes:

Just as we should not know about the sanctity of life if we did not know about killing, and the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" had not brought this sanctity into focus; and just as we should not know the value of truth without being aware of lies, nor of freedom without the lack of it, and so forth—so also, in our search after an ethics of responsibility for distant contingencies, it is an anticipated distortion of man that helps us to detect that is the normative conception of man which is to be preserved from it. And we need the threat to the image of man—and rather specific kinds of threat—to assure ourselves of his true image by the very recoil from these threats.... We know the thing at stake only when we know that it is at stake. (1985, 26-27)

Jürgen Habermas similarly makes an argument that we know the right through our perception of its distortion:

A universalistic understanding of law and morality rests on the assumption that there is no definite obstacle to egalitarian interpersonal relations. Of course, our societies are marked by manifest as well as structural violence. They are impregnated by the micropower of silent repression disfigured by despotic suppression, deprivation of political rights, social disempowerment, and economic exploitation. However, we could not be scandalized by this if we did not know that these shameful conditions might also be different. The conviction that all actors, as persons, obtain the same normative status and are held to deal with one another in mutual and symmetrical recognition rests on the assumption that there is, in principle, a reversibility to interpersonal relationships. (2003, 63)

In both cases these thinkers see a dynamic of human temporalized rationality in which we can discern in the present and past phenomena that "scandalize" us for their violation of human freedom and dignity. The right that we recognize is significantly counterfactual, but there is a "normative conception of man" contained within it, what Habermas terms "the ethical self-understanding of the species" (ibid.). But "temporalized rationality" must be understood here in a broad sense, not just in the sense of philosophical argumentation.

We need to comprehend the depth and meaning of the emergence of free, rational beings within the cosmos. Jonas writes:

With the appearance of man transcendence awakened to itself and henceforth accompanies his doing with the bated breath of suspense, hoping and beckoning, rejoicing and grieving, approving and frowning—and, I daresay, making itself felt to him even while not intervening in the dynamics of his worldly scene: for can it not be that by the reflection of its own state as it wavers with the record of man, the transcendent casts light and shadow over the human landscape? (1996, 127)

Human beings have emerged from the cosmos as freedom, that is as temporalized creatures with futurity, with the capacity to create, to transform, to make the future different from the past. As Heidegger put it, our very being is what is at issue within the scope of our futurity. We are “scandalized” by the past precisely because we see that it does not have to be that way. We can envision a future fundamentally different from the past because our very being is marked by “transcendence” and its potentialities.

Our situation is quite different from that commonly envisioned by many Natural Law theorists. John Locke says that our reason knows the moral law given by God, which means that there are external objective value determinants for our existence. Contemporary philosopher John Finnis (2011) takes a more holistic, Aristotelian, approach arguing that your practical reason can value at are intrinsic goods to being human. It may well be that case that the seven goods he identifies are objectively good and knowable by practical reason. These are life, knowledge, practical reason, friendship, play, aesthetic experience, and religion in the sense of a meaningful worldview.

However, our radical futurity does not come into play in Finnis’ thought. His thought is liberal and democratic without being transformative or revolutionary. Here is where Utopian Horizon theory supersedes Natural Law theory and lends greater hope to our human condition. The fact that we are made for transcendence since we transform and create our human essence through our choices, visions, hopes, and dreams means that we do not have to endure forever living with the negatives of our values: with lack of life, lack of knowledge, lack of practical reason, lack of friendship, or lack of fulfillment.

Sure, we must contend with limitations of the body, of emotions, passions, and desires that frustrate and inhibit the actualization of our utopian hopes and dreams. But, qua futurity, these are not decisive limitations. We know as well that such things can be transcended, and we see in history many who have accomplished this. Utopian Horizon theory means that we have an open-ended capacity to actualize the counterfactual values that are always present within our futurity. Our capacity for self-transcendence means not simply that we can overcome greed, lust, hate, and fear in the pursuit of self-actualization. It means that we can significantly eliminate greed, lust, hate, and fear. We can become, not angels, but fulfilled, loving, and civilized human beings living sustainably and justly on our beautiful planet Earth.

3. Growth Towards Transpersonal Values

During the mid-twentieth century, psychologist Abraham Maslow developed his now famous “hierarchy of needs” (2013). Maslow argues that there are five levels of needs that human beings must satisfy. The first level involves “physiological needs” such as food, sleep, sex, etc. These function as our first priority. After these needs, the second fundamental concern of human beings involves “safety needs” such as income, sufficient resources, and security of persons.

If these basics are obtained, then we have a third level of needs to satisfy that can be termed “belongingness,” such as needs for family, love, friendship, and intimacy. The fourth level of needs in human beings involves “esteem needs.” These include gaining respect from others, development of self-confidence, friendships, etc. At the fifth and highest level is “self-actualization” in which a person may blossom in creativity, morality, and possible self-transcendence. Transpersonal values, or what he calls “being values,” arise only at these highest levels.

This schema recognizes the need for self-transcendence in human beings. It places this need, generally speaking, after more basic survival, social, and psychological needs have been satisfied. We can easily recognize truth in this, of course, in that people desperate to satisfy basic needs are not likely to listen to Mozart, read Dostoevsky, or even participate in democratic political processes. We require a global society that maximizes the conditions for the self-actualization and self-transcendence of human beings.

Maslow himself has spent his career studying experiences of self-actualization and self-transcendence, which he calls “peak experiences.” He argues that this study has provided us with an objective picture of our human situation, social scientifically confirmed. If this is the case, then we need a world system directed toward self-transcendence, something fundamentally different from our contemporary world disorder and chaos. Our present world disorder in no significant way reflects our human potentialities. As psychologist and philosopher Eric Fromm expresses this, we need transformed institutions that enable and make possible human self-transcendence (1996, 9-10).

The word “experiences,” as Maslow uses it, is not to be understood as indicating idiosyncratic subjective moments of isolated individuals, but rather as contributing to a view of our common human potentialities and an objective set of values that can be linked to healthy human growth and development. He affirms that, “A new vision is emerging of the possibilities of man and his destiny, and its implications are many, not only for our conceptions of education, but also for science, politics, literature, economics, religion, and even our conceptions of the non-human world” (2014a, 157).

“All this implies a naturalistic system of values,” Maslow affirms, “a by-product of the empirical description of the deepest tendencies of the human species and of specific individuals” (ibid., 169). He calls these values “B-values” or “Being values,” and elucidates them a number of places in his works. They include such values as wholeness, perfection, completion (fulfillment), justice, beauty, goodness, truth, and self-sufficiency (autonomy) (ibid., 75-76). They are derived from the overwhelming consistency of responses from people who have experienced self-actualization and self-transcendence.

Maslow concludes that the “characteristics of Being are also the values of Being” (2014b, 64). These possible “perfections” of our human nature are available to all people, he affirms, and as such should supply the goals for culture, education, and government. They constitute “the far goals of all ideal, uncovering (Taoistic, non-interfering) psychotherapies; the far goals of the ideal humanistic education; the far goals and the expression of some kinds of religion; the characteristics of an ideally good environment and of the ideally good society” (ibid., 95).

What Maslow calls the “far goals” of human civilization I have named the “utopian horizon” of human temporality that we will discuss below. This horizon is embedded within the *immediate present* of each of us. Therefore, as Maslow’s own work asserts, none of these values are really far away. They are all implicit in the very structure of the living present with its implicit possibility of actualization, of breakthrough to its utopian dimension. I will argue that our human temporal structure itself opens us up to the quest to address all our need levels simultaneously, and that, by moving to higher levels through self-transcendence, we can alter the entire dynamic of our needs.

The holism of our lifeworld, therefore, demands a process of transcendence in relation to all these needs as defined by Maslow. If we become more fully aware of our intrinsic temporalized human structure and its implications, the immense potential of human self-transcendence will open up for us. Before explicating this dynamic further, let us consider several other thinkers who have modeled stages of cognitive, moral, emotional, and spiritual growth in human beings that may play a role in the perpetual reevaluation of our needs as we move to higher levels of maturity.

Fromm and others of his generation pioneered the idea that human beings need to grow as individuals and a species toward a worldcentric maturity based on the fullness of “being” rather than the selfishness of “having” (1996). Psychologists such as Lawrence Kohlberg (1984), whose perspective on growth was affirmed by Jürgen Habermas (1979) and other philosophical thinkers, developed a model of growth leading from childhood toward an adulthood of “autonomy,” independence, and, ultimately, harmony with the cosmos.

A very similar schemata of human individual and species growth, derived from the works of psychologist Carol Gilligan and integral thinker Ken Wilber, traces human development from childhood to an awakened actualization of our potential using the following stages. Here I have synthesized a variety of schemata presented by Wilber in *Integral Spirituality* (2007).

GENERIC STAGES OF GROWTH TOWARD MATURITY

Egocentric (egoistic)—the orientation of childhood and immature adults.

Ethnocentric—thinking that remains largely limited to one’s own culture, religion, or nation.

Worldcentric—developing compassion, care, and universal rational principles applying to all humanity (and often to all life on Earth).

Kosmocentric-Integral—harmonizing masculine and feminine elements within the whole of one’s being, integrating a dynamic cosmic consciousness of unity in diversity within our historical and personal lives, living with ever-greater direct awareness of the holistic, depths of existence, the ground of Being.

There is no need here to discuss more detailed versions of this schema. It is simply used as one example of the growing consensus of psychologists and spiritual thinkers. Scholars like Ken Wilber in *Integral Spirituality* have gone into the multiple thinkers and complex stages of development in detail. The simplest form of this model used here is commonly reproduced as development from egocentric, ethnocentric, worldcentric and kosmocentric. The first three stages, where an overwhelming consensus lies, describe the process of human growth from immature egoism through an ethnocentric focusing on one’s own culture, kind, or background to a mature, worldcentric perspective: seeing the human project and our life on this planet as a whole.

But “growth,” here, can be misleading, since moving from one stage to another may characterize the beginning stages (as the child’s brain grows and the socialization process proceeds), but the higher “awakened” stages may require a leap, a breakthrough to what in spiral dynamics is called the “second tier” (Beck and Cowan 2006). It may require an “OUT” as they shout in Zen. Transformative thinker Eric Gutkind declares rightly that “the present crisis of humanity is no longer susceptible to gradual cures” (1969, 63). We need to become global citizens now, not in some distant future. We need to actualize the genuine unity and freedom that lies beneath the multiplicity of nations, races, and cultures on planet Earth.

The process of human awakening moves through periods of discontinuity, leaps, or temporary regressions because the process, both in individual development and in human history, is in its depths profoundly dialectical, and dialectical processes cannot be modeled on any neat progressive schema such as the one outlined above. Nor can our human futurity forget the past with its immense suffering and injustice, for this is fundamental to our practical-utopian vision of a transformed future. The bourgeois or positivist amnesia of the past and its dynamic struggles amounts to an attempt to preserve a profoundly unjust and fragmented status quo. It amounts to a maturity-fear as well as an egoistic grasping for power and possessions over against our common human dignity and equality.

4. The Utopian Horizon

Above we saw Heidegger distinguish between “inauthentic” conceptions of temporality that center around ideas of ordinary “clock time” and “authentic” temporality that understands our human Being-in-the-world as constituted by its own openness to the future, its own potentiality for Being. The latter understanding does not see human beings as just another creature among living things in the world that lives from past through present to future within an external temporal framework. Other living things do not have a future as a component of their being. For us, as temporality open to a future that has priority over present and past, our human Being-in-the-world can take on ever-ascending, ever-higher levels of ontological existence.

In the language of Beck and Cowan, it may be that the first six levels of human development (in the chart below) in one way or another assume “inauthentic” clock temporality. Beck and Cowan color-code this development. People move from group mentality (Purple) to leader domination (Red) to duty-based societies (Blue) to achievement-materialist societies (Orange) to participation and peer-based societies (Green) as part of a “First Tier” in which meeting basic physiological and social needs is the focus. These six levels may correspond to the first four levels in Maslow’s “Hierarchy of Needs.” For beyond these basic survival needs, he says, arise “being values” being takes precedence over having values and quality of life takes precedence over quantitative measures.

LEVELS OF DEVELOPMENT IN BECK AND COWAN’S SPIRAL DYNAMICS

- Beige: Semi-stone age and group identity
- Purple: Tribal, spirits, spells, gods and goddesses
- Red: Exploitative, dragons, beasts, and powerful people
- Blue: Authoritarian, systems and dominators prescribe what is right and wrong
- Orange: Entrepreneurial, materialism, the world as will and machine
- Green: Communitarian, collectivism, reciprocity, equality
- Yellow: Awareness of the existence of this entire process on a spiral of levels of complexity
- Turquoise: Holistic: Universal evolutionary forces of the cosmos permeate all existence

“Second tier” orientations include Yellow and Turquoise. Here the evolutionary process becomes aware of itself and we become capable of what Barbara Marx Hubbard and others have called “conscious evolution.” Robert Ornstein and Paul Ehrlich, for example, write: “The time has come to take our own evolution into our hands and create a *new* evolutionary process, a process of conscious evolution” (2018, 12). We need to become ever more fully aware of the power of human futurity and the immense possibilities that it presents. Temporality is both the mode of personal being and of our collectively shared life. At these systemic and holistic levels, the power of the utopian horizon to transform persons increases geometrically, giving rise to even greater utopian expectations and possibilities.

The utopian horizon is there at every level of human existence, for human beings always act toward a future that they see as improving on the past and the present, a future that is intrinsically counterfactual and functions as a horizon for human values and actions. The degree of futurity may vary somewhat from culture to culture, but generally speaking, temporality appears as the ontological structure of human beings in general.

At some point development can become aware of the entire process and of all the levels through which it has already traversed. Awareness becomes “second tier.” Human awareness can become worldcentric and cosmocentric, seeing the world-process itself as suborning these developmental processes and fostering “being values” in which the ecstasy and joy of living, thinking, doing, creating, and being becomes fundamental over subsistence and need-fulfillment levels.

Here we may be encountering Heidegger’s “authentic temporality” in which consciousness transcends its subjective and egoistic bias and begins to express itself as an embodied manifestation of the cosmic evolutionary process and a self-aware incarnation of the cosmic *nisus* for harmonic transformation into an as yet to be determined future. As Raimon Panikkar observes:

We are all co-responsible for the state of the world. Today’s powers, though more anonymous and more diffused, are quite as cruel and terrible as the worst monsters of history.... In this just elapsed century of “civilized Man” and “planetary civilization” there have been over a hundred million people slaughtered in wars. We have not progressed—not even economically.... The problem is urgent.... We must assume that the role of the philosopher is to search for a truth (something that has saving power) and not to chase after irrelevant verities.... We are dealing with something that is more than an academic challenge. It is a spiritual endeavor to live the life that has been given to us. (2013, 4-5)

On the subsistence levels, we have not yet encountered “the life that has been given to us,” for that life involves an emergent incarnation of the cosmic principle that often remains almost entirely outside the vision of the first six stages of development. The problem of actualizing our co-responsibility for the state of the world through the transformation to “being values” is a problem that reveals itself on the utopian horizon of “second tier” persons and groups. “The problem is urgent” since we are facing a possible terminus of the entire human project through nuclear holocaust or environmental collapse. Our utopian horizon now discerns our human potentiality for a world of peace, justice, and environmental sustainability.

“Philosophy,” Frederik L. Polak writes, “at its highest level is intimately integrated with thought about the future” (1967, 284). Throughout its history, the philosophical quest has very often involved self-conscious reflection on human temporality, which necessarily involved the question of human self-transcendence toward a better future. Philosophy can thereby help articulate and interpret the utopian horizon implicit within our temporality and fundamental to the process of self-transcendence. Polak declares that, “Utopian thought always relates to the future, whether near or far away, and a future quite different from present reality. . . . The conceptualization and visualization of change (a colossal change in itself) is the precondition of actualized social change” (ibid. 282).

We do not move into the future within an independent temporal framework of before and after. We move toward our utopian horizon as temporality and freedom, in which our very being becomes transformed in the process of actualizing that futurity. Philosopher Errol E. Harris affirms, “what one wills is always ideal. I will what I conceive to be a better state of affairs and of myself than what actually exists” (2008, 33). Philosopher James L. Marsh declares: “Rationality, in its capacity to raise further questions, conceive the ideal, conceptual universal, posit an ideal ethical community of ends, criticize an existing community for not living up to those ideals, and project a more human alternative, is essentially utopian” (1995, 9). He concludes: “reflection and freedom and praxis are essentially utopian in their full, unfolding life. Denial of utopia mutilates freedom and reason” (1995, 333).

G.W.F. Hegel sees authentic human thought as it takes place in the purity of speculative reasoning as expression of the finite-infinity that constitutes our humanity and the totality of the world. The finite and the infinite are not opposites that delimit one another, since a delimited “infinite” (which for him is Absolute Spirit or God) would by that token simply become another finite. For Hegel, the concept of man (humanity) is inseparable from the infinity that embraces and actualizes the totality of existence. In *Hegel’s Concept of God*, Quentin Lauer, S.J. describes Hegel’s concept, in this respect, which is:

...antecedent to its finite exemplifications in isolated individuals, such that the concept of the human serves as the criterion for the reality of the humanity of each individual, then as the foundation of the reality of the humanity in each isolated individual, the inexhaustible, infinite concept has to bespeak more reality than the particular exemplifications it unites in a totality which only mind can grasp. The *universal* “man” is the concrete, determinate totality of the human. (1982, 173)

Liberation thinker Paulo Freire writes of our need to transcend the “to have” model of being human and liberate our lives into the “ontological vocation to be more fully human” (1990, 43-61). There is a reality in us (or a utopian call placed upon us) proceeding from the foundations of the world to actualize the concept of being fully human implicit in our utopian horizon. As Hegel recognizes, there is an “infinity” implicit in the concept of humanity that is inseparable from the infinity embracing the concrete totality of the universe. We are capable of ascending to “cosmic consciousness,” experiencing the links between the groundless-ground of Being and our temporalized human being.

The ideals that populate our utopian horizon do not exist extraneously to our fundamental human situation and open-ended nature. They are as much a part of us as our memory of the past or the intensity of the present. “Denial of utopia mutilates freedom and reason” because freedom and reason are inseparable from the utopian horizon that embraces and animates them. The utopian horizon does not present images of the endpoint of our journey. Freedom, reason, infinity, and utopia are transformational aspects of the journey itself, making it potentially a different journey undertaken by a different traveler in the very process of moving into the future. Our “ontological vocation” is built into the very structure of our human situation. Denial of utopia brings our temporality down to clock-time, to the positivist or realist denial of authentic futurity. Panikkar writes:

There is a domain where Man has a very special autonomy: himself. Man is more than an artisan who constructs himself as he fashions nature: He is his own artist, and this precisely when he acts freely, when he forges his own destiny. Human creativity is to produce the future, not from mere previous conditions, but with a spontaneity that neither follows a path mapped out in advance nor simply discovers a hidden but already existing road. The production of the future is a true creation inasmuch as it is not conditioned by the past or influenced by anything prior. Non-free beings have no future, they have only a fate. Man, as a free being, is a being with a future: His being shall be; he has a ‘future tense’, he can attain being. (1979, 448)

Here we find a clear vision of the synthetic functioning of freedom, reason, and utopian horizon in the process of living authentically as embodiments of the cosmic evolutionary process. We are artists, creators, of the future, not preordained along any existing road but rather making the road by walking, creating ourselves by traveling, actualizing a future for being through the futurity of our own Being-in-the-world. We attain the fullness of being through actualization of the conscious futurity that we are. Part of what we actualize through this process is an ever-greater awareness of the depths of the present moment, the eternity/infinity that permeates all existence.

Another way of expressing the concept of utopian horizon is to see it as embracing an objective dynamic of demands inherent in our existential futurity. The future is not separable from what we are, since all that exists for humans is the dynamic present embracing both past (memory) and future (anticipation). Yet through what we are (as temporality), the future demands radical transformation. In the words of philosopher-theologian Paul Tillich:

The demand calls for something that does not yet exist but should exist, should come to fulfillment. . . . Human life involves more than a mere development of what already is. Through the demand, humanity is directed to what ought to be. And what ought to be does not emerge with the unfolding of what is; if it did, it would be something that is, rather than something that ought to be.... It is something unconditionally new that transcends what is new and what is old within the sphere of mere development. . . . This is human freedom, . . . that one is subject to a demand that something unconditionally new should be realized through oneself. (1987, 143)

Implicit in this quotation is the distinction between inauthentic clock time that believes the future must be a development of the past along a sequence of “nows” independent of our human temporality and the authentic realization that what ought to be “does not emerge from the unfolding of what is.” The utopian horizon demands something “unconditionally new,” a demand already implicit in the nature of human freedom as futurity directed toward our utopian horizon. In the recognition of and movement toward “what ought to be” we are simultaneously transformed in the process. Our pursuit of what ought to be simultaneously transforms the Being-in-the-world of those that pursue.

5. Counter-Factual Ideals

Anthropologically, for humans all values and all legitimation require a counterfactual projection into the future within which values discerned as lacking in the present can be actualized. Hence, in all areas of human cognition and endeavor, the future plays a normative role in the present. Values need not be envisioned as metaphysical realities apart from human temporality. It is not that there are static Platonic essences that beckon to us from an independent intelligible dimension of existence. Rather, at the heart of our temporality there is an emergent call to transform, a utopian horizon open to truly new possibilities, intrinsic to our temporalized situation and not ontologically set apart.

In political theory, such concepts as democracy, freedom, social justice, due process of law, legitimacy, and common good operate in this way. Democracy as the recognition of the intrinsic dignity and fundamental freedom of each and every person before the law, remains largely a failure the world over as immature popular prejudices of ignorant majorities colonize the process of freedom through self-defeating and regressive political dogmas. However, democracy functions as a dynamic element of our utopian horizon as an ideal “Kingdom of Ends,” as Kant expressed it, as a utopian political expression of the intrinsic freedom and dignity of each.

These are all counter-factual ideals that arise as rational beings recall their past within a dynamic present that simultaneously projects itself into the future. This temporality lies at the heart of our human existential situation. Values need not be conceived as metaphysical principles as natural law theory often asserted, whether coming from God or from reason. Rather, value is intrinsic to the temporal dynamics of each existential human being. We all live within a “utopian horizon” of counterfactual ideals. As Paul Tillich concluded, we experience transformative values as a “call” from the future upon our present condition: “through the demand, humanity is directed to what ought to be” (1987, 143-44).

Philosopher John Dewey, for example, developed a broad, value-based concept of “democracy” even larger than the concept of government. Democracy for Dewey is a *moral ideal* of the state of affairs that should obtain in all human relationships, a condition symbolized by the French revolutionary slogan of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*. Dewey writes: “The key-note of democracy as a way of life may be expressed, it seems to me, as the necessity for the participation of every mature human being in formation of values that regulate the living of men together: which is necessary from the standpoint of both the general social welfare and the full development of human beings as individuals” (in Sherover, Ed. 1974, 461).

Dewey’s description of how this ideal functions conforms to the Utopian Horizon Value Theory. Although the moral ideal of democracy as a universal framework for all human relationships is indeed utopian in the sense of a perfect counterfactual ideal, human reason can discern the difference between imaginative future utopias that may well be in reasonable conformity with our “human nature” and fantasies incapable of realization. Reason can recognize relative practical validity of the ideals that inform human futurity in relation to present conditions and human potential. The wide disagreements among ethical thinkers often has to do with their assessment of our human potential and our possibilities for approximating these ideals, not necessarily the ideals themselves.

Similarly, Immanuel Kant, in his *Groundwork to the Metaphysics of Morals* (1964), argues the Categorical Imperative, the principle of universal law constituting the basic form of all moral judgements, generates out of itself a social goal that is at the same time a duty, namely that our behavior in the present should conform to the actualizing of a possible “Kingdom of Ends.” The Kingdom of Ends is the ideal of a society in which all persons treat one another as “ends in themselves, never merely as a means.” In other words, it is the counterfactual ideal of perfectly moral society. The Utopian Horizon model sees this utopian ideal as inherent in the very structure of human temporality. But reason can make this into a “practical utopia” by assessing how we can best actualize it in the here and now as well as in the immediate and long-term future.

As stated above, in *Global Democracy and Human Self-Transcendence* (2018), I called this ability of human futurity to generate a counter-factual ideal our “utopian horizon.” This label will fit with many forms of Natural Law Theory, including the ethical ideas of Kant, Gewirth, and Habermas discussed above. Its advantage is that it does not have to bring in the seeming metaphysical idea of “natural law.” Positivism is mistaken because the ‘is’ and the ‘ought’ are inseparable in human life. They are both intrinsic features of human temporality.

6. Utopian Horizon and Transcendental Ego

The Rationalist Tradition on modern Western thought, supplemented by contemporary emergent evolutionary theory (including such thinkers as Spinoza, Kant, Hegel, Errol E. Harris, Jean Gebser, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Ken Wilber and Ervin Laszlo) has illuminated aspects of human consciousness that bear directly on Utopian Horizon Theory. Kant (1965) clearly articulated a central insight when he recognized that the *unity of consciousness* is a *necessary condition* for there to be any experience at all, including any experience of time. He famously called this unity of consciousness “the transcendental unity of apperception.”

Kant understood that the unity of consciousness was a transcendental requirement for there to be either self-awareness or awareness of a world outside ourselves. The transcendental ego, he maintained, was correlative to there being an experience of *one world*, one universe outside the self and in relation to the self. Emergent evolutionary theory added to this insight the idea that this transcendental ego represented the fundamental organizational principle of the universe come to consciousness of itself in us. Harris writes: “The self-conscious unity of the ego, coordinate with the synthetic unity of its experience, is the principle of identity in and through difference that governs the systematic structure of any and every whole. It is, in short, the universal principle of organization and order which has all along been differentiating itself throughout the *scala naturae*, and which has, at this stage, come to fruition in human mentality, where it becomes aware of itself” (1992, 12).

Harris goes on to argue that this principle of holism, which is the *nisus* guiding the evolutionary process of the universe, is the foundation of human moral, social, and political order (*ibid.*, 12 ff). Its fundamental imperative is the principle of harmony through the unity in diversity of all phenomena. In human life it demands, as Kant has shown, that we treat every person as an end in themselves and never merely as a means and that we strive to make human society “a kingdom” of such ends in themselves. Human reason, Harris affirms, which embodies and operates from the universal organizational principle of the universe, is integral to the transcendental ego.

The unity of consciousness cannot be part of the phenomenal world that we experience because it is the condition of there being any experience at all. Hence it is transcendental, beyond time and all phenomenal characteristics. In speaking, we appear to refer to the transcendental unity of consciousness when we use the word “I” as in “I see” or “I think,” but it is important to realize that this reference to the unity of a consciousness that sees or thinks is not to the empirical self. Of course, in ordinary life the two are typically amalgamated in an unconscious way and confused in conversation. The empirical self has characteristics, unique qualities, likes and dislikes, propensities, etc., but the unity of consciousness has no such content. It has no content at all. It is simply presupposed by all possible experience. We experience the whole of the world, as Kant elucidated, and all possible experience, including time and space, through this unity of consciousness.

The transcendental ego is not temporal and changing. In his *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus* philosopher Ludwig Wittgenstein later calls it “the philosophical self”: “The philosophical self is not the human being, not the human body, or the human soul, with which psychology deals, but rather the metaphysical subject, the limit of the world—not part of it” (1974, 58). He compares this “metaphysical self” to the human eye, which cannot see itself, and “nothing in the visual field allows you to infer that it is seen by an eye” (*ibid.*, 57). Consciousness cannot see itself. It is the presupposition of there being any world at all. Nothing in the world allows us to infer that it is seen by consciousness. To realize the fact that this unity of consciousness is not the psychological self that each of us refers to as “I” can evoke a major awakening, or a progressive series of awakenings, as we grow away from the psychological ego and identify more and more with the transpersonal transcendental ego. As Ken Wilber expresses this:

But there is one thing you cannot see: you cannot see the Seer. You see thoughts, things, clouds, mountains, but never the Seer, never the Self, never the Witness. Precisely because it sees thoughts, it is not itself a thought; precisely because it sees things, it is not itself a thing—it is radically free of all such objects, all such sights, all such ripples in the stream....But the Seer itself is not an object, and thus it can never be seen. (1996, 303-04)

We live from, and experience the world from, a unity that transcends space and time, a unity that is not the empirical self, a unity that Hegel terms “finite-infinity.” When some mystics describe the event of going beyond this duality of transcendental ego and world to complete non-duality, they do so when they have returned to the self-conscious transcendental consciousness. Otherwise they would be incapable of writing or speaking anything at all. Yet as Harris and others point out, one realizes that the world and its correlate the transcendental self are one and the same holistic process. Self and other together constitute the real self as Hegel had already determined. As Wilber declares: “That which witnesses, and that which is witnessed, are only one and the same. The entire World Process then arises, moment to moment, as one’s own Being, outside of which, and prior to which, nothing exists” (1996, 98).

Here we encounter a key to the utopian horizon. A human being is constituted as temporality, but we see now that we are also constituted as a transcendental unity of consciousness that accompanies and makes possible all temporal movement from past to future. In contemporary emergent-evolutionary theory, the source is the cosmic evolutionary principle of complexification and unification that operates behind the entire process. The moral imperative for transformation and perfection arises from this transcendental ego.

This unifying, originating principle has become self-conscious in us as the transcendental ego. The universe has become conscious of itself in us. No wonder the insight into the cosmic nature of the unity of apperception can be thought of as one aspect of “cosmic consciousness” or as “awareness of the universal evolutionary forces that permeate all existence” as discussed above. Each of us is a particular mind-body-spirit, an individual person, and at the same time, as Sri Aurobindo puts it, in us the universe “creates a self-conscious concentration of the All through which it can aspire” (1973, 49). As Teilhard de Chardin affirms: “Man discovers that *he is nothing else than evolution become conscious of itself*” (1961, 220, emphasis his).

However, evolution is conscious of itself in us *as freedom*, as we have seen Jonas and Panikkar affirm. It is no longer the immensely slow natural process moving through stages of emerging complexity-consciousness. It is now the utopian call, the demand that the future be better than the past in fundamental, transformative ways. We are now in a position to comprehend Utopian Horizon Value Theory.

We exist as temporality within the unifying framework of the transcendental unity of consciousness. We see that the “objectified” idea of time as something existing outside of us in which the past causally determines the future is a deeply mistaken and inauthentic view of our situation. We exist as radical futurity, as temporal creatures open in futurity and freedom to immense transformative possibilities. We comprehend our “ontological vocation” to become more fully human. The aspirations of the ground of being itself can be seen to be manifest in ourselves, in our temporal dynamism embraced by its utopian horizon.

We see at the horizon of our futurity the emergence of utopian values, what Maslow called “being values” such as “wholeness, perfection, completion (fulfillment), justice, beauty, goodness, truth, and self-sufficiency (autonomy).” Harris writes: “In human self-awareness, the nissus to the whole has become conscious of itself.... It is this self-realization that determines the ultimate standard of value” (2000, 251).

The trans-personal unity of consciousness is the seat of what Kant called “pure reason.” Pure reason sees the world in its wholeness and discerns the ultimate ground of values. As philosopher J.N. Findlay explains:

Inevitably, we form an ideal of pure reason, as Kant styled it, in which all the basic aspirations of consciousness are carried to the limit...of a sympathetic entry that surmounts all personal difference and understands everyone in every situation, of a judgment that can assess the value and disvalue of anything and every thing in the light of all facts and fundamental goals.... The values and disvalues, in fact, which recommend themselves to all...are, not surprisingly, values and disvalues that have a relation to anyone and everyone.... (1985, 68-71)

These values emerge from the transpersonal unity of consciousness which is the evolutionary nissus of the universe come to consciousness in us. They are independent of our personal ego and present us with a universal set of goals and ideals that have “a relation to anyone and everyone.” “The nissus of the cosmos drives toward perfection, completion, justice, beauty, goodness, and truth.” Our highest values emerge from the evolutionary upsurge of the cosmos. We become aware of them on our utopian horizon.

Our task is to direct our futurity toward these values, to think in terms of “practical utopia” and the possibilities on Earth for actualizing planetary peace, justice, and sustainability. Harris investigates these issues in depth in his book *The Reality of Time*. He writes:

As finite, we are engulfed in the passage of time, we are limited by evanescence and death, toward which inexorable end we are borne by the incessant process of becoming—of coming to be and passing away. But because the universal principle is immanent in us, and because we represent that stage of its self-development at which its activity becomes self-conscious, we become aware of all this, and of ourselves as participants in the process.... Our consciousness is self-transcendent, because it is the manifestation of the immanent principle of the whole becoming aware of itself. (1988, 103)

Harris rightly links these ideas with the views of Teilhard de Chardin in *The Phenomenon of Man*. The evolutionary process of holistic emergence from geosphere to biosphere to noosphere (the emergence of self-conscious mind) is described by both thinkers as animated by love. Teilhard writes: “Love alone is capable of uniting living beings in such a way as to complete and fulfill them, for it alone takes them and joins them by what is deepest in themselves” (1961, 265).

The idea of love is also there in the utopian horizon, perhaps penetrating and animating all the other utopian values such as perfection, justice, truth, and beauty. Harris writes:

Genuine rational love, therefore, must extend to the entire human race.... As human rational activity is socially organized and embodied in political institutions, love comprehends and transcends all political and social virtues. It is the emotional and sentimental counterpart and expression of the unity of the perfected human community.... Such love is experienced in many different ways besides between individual persons in communities. It is felt as joy in the contemplation of a landscape, or of the majesty and power of the sea, the yearning for unity with nature, and as aesthetic ecstasy of all kinds. (1988, 163)

Here we encounter an insight into the depth and breadth of utopian values. Our awe at the beauty of the world, our experience of the sublime dimensions of existence, or of the possibility of the perfected human community all exist as realities that animate human futurity and draw us forward beyond the quotidian tedium of everyday clock time toward the immense transformative possibilities that embrace our human reality through the utopian horizon. Our task is to live toward this utopian future as faithfully as possible, to transform our broken and degraded human condition on the Earth in the direction of the perfected human community, a community of love, peace, justice, and sustainability.

7. Our Utopian Horizon and the *Earth Constitution*

We have seen Maslow tell us that we need a “new politics” to reflect our “being-values.” We have seen Fromm declare that we need institutions that make possible a radical transformation of the human heart. What would a “perfected human community” look like? What would a world of “rational love” look like? What would it look like if we embraced our common humanity and realized that the human project is about all of us, not about this or that nation-state or this or that religion? Teilhard writes:

The outcome of the world, the gates of the future, the entry into the super-human—these are not thrown open to a few of the privileged nor to one chosen people to the exclusion of all others. They will open to an advance of *all together*, in a direction in which *all together* can join and find completion in a spiritual renovation of the earth. (1961, 244)

What would the world look like if *all together* took the next step toward the unification and perfection of the human project? Our utopian horizon includes the ideals of peace, justice, sustainability, and regeneration of our damaged Earth. It includes the ideals of a world without war, without starvation, without brutal economic exploitation, without child labor, without human trafficking, without fear and hate, a world where human rights and dignity are respected. It includes a world at last unified through rational love. The *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* points forward to this kind of world system (see Martin 2010).

As long as our planet is fragmented structurally (economically and politically fractured), we cannot expect love to predominate in human relationships. The *Constitution* lays the structural groundwork for the transformation of human consciousness. It not only unites humanity to address our lethal problems of war, poverty, and environmental collapse, it unites humanity in such a way as to make growth in conscious awareness possible.

The structural and spiritual are mutually interacting and interdependent. Fromm writes: “It follows that man will attain the full capacity for objectivity and reason only *when a society of man is established above all particular divisions of the human race*, when loyalty to the human race and to its ideals is considered the prime loyalty that exists” (1950, 58, italics added).

As with Panikkar, quoted above, Teilhard envisions the direction of our becoming in terms of “Omega.” For him, likewise, the destiny of the becoming of the Cosmos is linked to the freedom and responsibility of human beings. To realize our destiny on the Earth, I contend, requires ratification of the *Earth Constitution*. We can no longer afford to exist in our present condition of fragmentation, militarized and paralyzed, impeding further growth and self-realization. We need to take this crucial step into a unity in diversity that will allow our freedom and responsibility the scope to continue the process of growth. This is the key step necessary to overcome our present crisis in world history.

In his book, *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*, Ken Wilber affirmatively compares the “Enlightenment of the East” with the “Enlightenment of the West.” The Enlightenment of the East has to do with spiritual experience, spiritual enlightenment, and all these facets of the human spirit that have been elaborated in the East (even though, of course, there has been a corresponding tradition in the West as well). The Enlightenment of the West has been the political affirmation of individual human rights, democratic processes and, personal freedom (and, of course, there has been a corresponding tradition in the East). What the world needs, Wilber argues, is to unite both traditions. We need worldwide political, economic and social freedom and we need worldwide emphasis on human growth of spiritual awareness (1998, 210-14).

The *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* immeasurably enhances both these facets of human well-being. It embodies the Enlightenment of the West projected to the entire Earth, which is the only proper locus for political freedom, universal human rights protection, disarmament, and universal sustainable and regenerative practices. In the very act of instituting political, economic, and social unity in diversity for the Earth, the *Constitution* becomes a major factor in overcoming war, secrecy, greed, competition, suspicion, hate, and fear. In other words, it provides the preconditions for transcending our childish egoisms and growing toward worldcentric and cosmocentric levels of consciousness (the Enlightenment of the East).

The *Constitution* speaks to the transition of human Being-in-the-world toward an inner awakening making all these things possible. It does this because it speaks in a practical way about how we organize human civilization. If we create the peace, justice, and sustainability system that it envisions, then human inner transformation is not likely to be far behind. Spirit and system dialectically interact. Above, we saw James L. Marsh declare that “Denial of utopia mutilates freedom and reason.” Sociologist Karl Mannheim writes: “With the relinquishment of utopias, man would lose his will to shape history and therewith his ability to understand it” (2015, 236). The *Constitution* provides this vision of a liberated human future.

The sovereign nation-state system functions as a system of collective egoisms. “We” are Americans, or Russians, or Chinese, or Iranians. These immature egoisms have armed themselves with weapons of mass destructive power and have equipped themselves with competitive spy-powers and secret security services that institutionalize suspicion, clandestine operations, murderous corruption, and internecine warfare. It is long past time that human beings actualize the maturity of mutual recognition of our common species-being and civilizational project.

Article 1 of the *Earth Constitution* defines the “broad functions” of the Earth Federation to: (1) end war and secure disarmament, (2) protect human rights everywhere on Earth, (3) diminish social differences and end poverty, (4) regulate trade for equitable use of world resources, (5) protect and restore the planetary environment, and (6) find solutions to all problems beyond the capacity of national governments. We can see now that all of these six necessary functions of the Earth Federation go together; they are all necessary for human flourishing in dignity and quality. They are all interdependently necessary to planetary peace and a sustainable world system.

The *Constitution* goes on to set up an Earth Federation government that can effectively make all these transformations possible, pragmatically and practically. Values and system go together within the *Earth Constitution*, just as they go together in today’s world. Today’s world is organized in significant ways as a global war-system, and low and behold, the people and nations of Earth relate to one another as members of this war system, with hate, fear, manipulation, suspicion, and aggression. Change the system and you change the consciousness.

Synthetic reason, the organizational principle of the universe operating through the transcendental ego, not only articulates the substantive elements of our utopian horizon (for reason and human temporality are integral aspects of the same human phenomenon) but reason discerns the means to the actualization of the values arising within that horizon. That is why the goal is always *practical utopia* and not some wildly unachievable utopia violating immediate material means and circumstances. It is practical in that human reason can find ways to make it happen in concrete terms upon the Earth. But it is also utopian in that our futurity demands transformation, fulfillment, realization, actualization: real steps forward.

The *Earth Constitution* is itself a practical means to realizing peace, justice, sustainability, and regeneration in the world. It is a tool that embodies a transformative and transformed vision of how we can be organizing life on this planet. It derives directly from the utopian horizon of every mature and thoughtful human being. We all “know” how we should be living on this planet. It makes possible a real fulfillment. Its plans for ratification are quite “realistic” and its plans for Provisional World Government are likewise concrete and practical. They can be done and are being done right now.

Just as our personal utopian horizon calls us toward a unity of mind, body, and spirit and a resultant harmony of living and loving so the utopian horizon of humanity calls us toward a unity in diversity that includes political, economic, and civilizational unification. The *Earth Constitution* embodies that civilizational unification and points toward a new harmonic synergism among human beings directed to the solving of our most basic problems. Our personal image of a perfected unity in diversity is mirrored by the civilizational image of this same phenomenon.

The *Constitution* is both a culmination of the historical evolution of one humanity, one civilization, and one destiny for our species, it is also an opening into an ever-transcending future. In Article 13, the “second bill of rights,” the *Constitution* speaks of those rights of human beings that cannot be instantly realized upon ratification but become the coordinated focus, directed to their future actualization, though the united efforts of the Earth Federation government. One of these 19 rights, standing alone, states: “Assure each child the right to the full realization of his or her potential.” This symbolizes for me the practical utopian meaning of the *Earth Constitution*. Through ascending to a true unity in diversity at the heart of our human destiny, we can protect, empower, and enliven all—each child. We realize the significance of our human futurity.

Utopian Horizon Value Theory makes the *Earth Constitution* a centerpiece of its vision of human temporality and the priority of futurity within our Being-in-the-world. The *Constitution* bridges the gap between the dynamic present and the envisioned future. It allows us to interpret all of human history as moving toward this civilizational unification. It gives us an eschatological vision of human freedom and dignity coming to fulfillment.

It is high time that we stopped living in the impoverished world of everyday clock time for which the utopian dimension of our awareness appears absurd and seems reducible to merely subjective fantasies. We need to internalize and actualize the futurity that we are if we are to survive the endangered future much longer. We need to embrace the *Constitution for the Federation of Earth* as the practical utopian vehicle that can truly bring us to a transformed and fulfilled world system.

We need to spread the word about the *Constitution* around our planet. We need to work for its ratification and implementation before it is too late. Our utopian horizon demands nothing less. Tomorrow is too late. The time for actualizing the *Earth Constitution* is now. Indeed, there is no other time.

Works Cited

- Agnivesh, Swami (2015). *Applied Spirituality*. New York: Harper-Collins.
- Aurobindo, Sri. 1973. *The Essential Aurobindo*. Ed. Robert A. McDermott. New York: Schocken Books.
- Beck, Don Edward and Christopher C. Cowan (1996). *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering Values, Leadership, and Change. Exploring the New Science of Memetics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bergson, Henri (1975). *An Introduction to Metaphysics: The Creative Mind*. Trans. Marbelle L. Andison. Totawa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, & Co.
- Buber, Martin (1972). “The Question of the Single One.” In Joseph J. Kockelmans, ed. *Contemporary European Ethics: Selected Readings*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.
- Carter, Robert E. (1989). “Zen and Ontotheology via Heidegger.” In *Religion, Ontotheology, and Deconstruction*. Ed. Henry Ruf. New York: Paragon House, Chapter 9.

- Findlay, J.N. (1985). "The Varieties of Religious Knowing" in *Knowing Religiously*, Leroy S. Rouner, Ed. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Finnis, John (1983). *Fundamentals of Ethics*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Finnis, John (2011). *Natural Law & Natural Rights: Second Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fromm, Erich (1950). *Psychoanalysis and Religion*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Fromm, Erich (1996). *To Have or To Be?* New York: Continuum Publishers.
- Gutkind, Eric (1969). *The Body of God: First Steps Toward an Anti-Theology*. Eds. Lucie B. Gutkind and Henry Le Roy Finch. New York: Horizon Press.
- Harris, Errol E. (1988). *The Reality of Time*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Harris, Errol E. (2000). *The Restitution of Metaphysics*. Amhurst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Harris, Errol E. (2008). *Twenty-first Century Renaissance: From Plato to Neoliberalism to Planetary Democracy*. Appomattox, VA: Institute for Economic Democracy Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (1979). *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Trans. Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (2003). *The Future of Human Nature*. Trans. William Rehg, et. al. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heidegger, Martin (1962). *Being and Time*. Trans. Macquarrie and Robinson. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Jonas, Hans (1985). *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jonas, Hans (1996). *Mortality and Morality: A Search for the Good after Auschwitz*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel (1964). *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*. Trans. H. J. Paton. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kant, Immanuel (1965). *Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*. Trans. Norman Kemp Smith. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kierkegaard, Soren (1968). *Kierkegaard's Concluding Unscientific Postscript*. Trans. David F. Swenson. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence (1984). *The Psychology of Moral Development: Volume Two, The Nature and Validity of Moral Stages*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Levinas, Emmanuel (1985). *Ethics and Infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*. Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.
- Lauer, Quentin, S.J. (1982). *Hegel's Concept of God*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mannheim, Karl (2015). *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Mansfield Centre, CT: Martino Publishing.
- Marsh, James L. 1995. *Critique, Action, and Liberation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Martin, Glen T., ed. (2010). *The Constitution for the Federation of Earth: With Historical Introduction, Commentary, and Conclusion*. Appomattox, VA: Institute for Economic Democracy Press.
- Martin, Glen T. (2018). *Global Democracy and Human Self-Transcendence: The Power of the Future for Planetary Transformation*. London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Maslow, Abraham (2013). *A Theory of Human Motivation*. Mansfield Center, CT: Martino Publishing.
- Maslow, Abraham (2014a). *Toward a Psychology of Being*. Floyd, VA: Sublime Books.
- Maslow, Abraham (2014b). *Religions, Values, and Peak-Experiences*. Bowdon, UK: Stellar Books.
- McDermott, John J., Ed. (1985). *A Cultural Introduction to Philosophy: From Antiquity to Descartes*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf Publisher.
- Ornstein, Robert and Paul Ehrlich (2018). *New World: New Mind*. Los Altos, CA: ISHK Publisher.
- Panikkar, Raimon. 1979. *Myth, Faith, and Hermeneutics: Cross-cultural Studies*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Pannikar, Raimon (1993). *The Cosmotheandric Experience: Emerging Religious Consciousness*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Panikkar, Raimon (2013). *The Rhythm of Being: The Unbroken Trinity*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Polak, Frederik L. (1967). "Utopia and Cultural Renewal." In *Utopias and Utopian Thought: A Timely Appraisal*. Ed. Frank E. Manuel. Boston: Beacon Press: 281-95
- Sherover, Charles M., Ed. (1974). *The Development of the Democratic Idea: Readings from Pericles to the Present*. New York: New American Library Publishers.
- Sherover, Charles M. (1975). *The Human Experience of Time: The Development of Its Philosophic Meaning*. New York: New York University Press.
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre (1961). *The Phenomenon of Man*. Trans. Bernard Wall. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

- Tillich, Paul (1987). *The Essential Tillich*. Ed. F. Forrester Church. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilber, Ken (1985). *No Boundary: Eastern and Western Approaches to Personal Growth*. Boston: Shambhala Publisher.
- Wilber, Ken (1996). *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm. Third Edition*. Boston: Shambhala Publisher.
- Wilber, Ken (1998). *The Marriage of Sense and Soul: Integrating Science and Religion*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Wilber, Ken (2007). *Integral Spirituality: A Startling New Role for Religion in the Modern and Postmodern World*. Boston: Integral Books.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1974). *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*. Trans. D.F. Pears and B.F. McGinness. New York: Humanities Press.
- Wolin, Richard, Ed. (1993). *The Heidegger Controversy: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.