Chapter 1

Philosophy of Hope

Edward Demenchonok[1]

"War and Peace" III (5.10.51. II), Pablo Picasso's surreal war scene, depicts a warrior with a dove, fighting with only a sword against a tank, with an innocent human face superimposed on the scene. That stark image confronts us on the cover of Fred Dallmayr's aptly titled *Against Apocalypse: Restoring Humanity's Wholeness* (2016). The image symbolically expresses the main theme of the book and its key message, which warns about the risk to innocent humanity in our "nuclear age": the threat of war pushing the world to the precipice of apocalypse, opposed to the hope for peace that yet remains inherent in the human spirit.

Dallmayr's deeply humanist position, with its opposition to violence and war and its commitment to human dignity secured by justice and peace, is the leitmotif of his numerous books and articles. His arguments reflect not only the intellectual reasoning of a philosopher, but also the traumas of a wounded human being (he was barely ten years old when World War II started). He tries to regain mindfulness and social consciousness and to warn of the problems plaguing our world. He implores us to seek solutions before it is too late. He confronts not only the external problems of injustices and violence, but also the internal problems that keep us mired in the status quo—stereotypic thinking, dogmatic mind-sets, and the internalized dependence of conformist "slave mentality." From his ethical position,

---

[1] Edward Demenchonok, "Philosophy of Hope," in *Cosmopolitan Civility: Global-Local Reflections with Fred Dallmayr*, ed. Ruth Abbey, 11-27 (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2020) https://books.google.com/books?id=HNjODwAAQBAJ&pg=PA11&source=gbs_toc_r&cad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false

Dallmayr undertakes an uncompromising critical assessment of the current global situation, characterized by global disorder. He shows the groundlessness of neoconservative and neoliberal theories that preserve the status quo. He critiques the economic-political system that results in violence and human suffering and is pushing humanity toward the precipice of nuclear or ecological catastrophe.

To realize its transformative potential in a conflicted world and to respond constructively to internal theoretical and external social-cultural challenges, philosophy itself needs to undergo a self-transformation. The emerging philosophy introduces a new perspective on our understanding of what philosophy is, of its history, methods, and forms of articulation. In dialogue with other philosophers, Dallmayr actively contributes to this transformative endeavor. He presents a philosophy that is dialogic, intercultural, and cosmopolitan, and one which invokes religious, spiritual, and ethical resources for positive global transformations.

In this chapter, I analyze Dallmayr's creative elaboration on Martin Heidegger's philosophy of history and on the conception of "event of Being," articulating the view of human existence (*Dasein*) as potentially transformative, a being moved by care (*Sorge*) in an ongoing search for meaning and truth. Dallmayr's contributions to the intercultural philosophical dialogue between Western and Eastern thought traditions are surveyed. I examine how Dallmayr's intercultural analysis has led him to conclude that the concept of world care is shared by virtually all cultural and religious traditions around the globe. Finally, I briefly describe Dallmayr's conception of the cosmopolis to come.

In Dialogue with Heidegger's Legacy

Among influential philosophers such as Hans-Georg Gadamer, Karl-Otto Apel, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, and Raimon Panikkar, Dallmayr holds a special regard for Martin Heidegger. He first published on Heidegger as early as in 1986 and was among the first in the English-speaking world to realize that Heidegger's philosophical work "was much broader than the particular Nazi episode."1 In 1993 Dallmayr published *The Other Heidegger*. He uncovered fruitful contributions of Heidegger's work to contemporary social and political thought and delineated the contours of an alternative political perspective therein.

Heidegger lamented Western "mass society," mass culture, and the depersonalized "they" (*das Man*), and criticized the instrumental reason

and abuse of technology that inaugurated the "nuclear age." He saw this

as a crisis of Western civilization that threatens the future of humanity. He was concerned about the freedom and welfare of individuals as well as the whole of humanity and tried to identify alternatives for their rescue. As Dallmayr tells us, Heidegger "seemed to address precisely the questions that troubled me," such as the question of "being." In opposition to traditional formulations, Heidegger noted that "being could no longer be grasped as a substance or fixed concept but needed to be seen as a temporal process or happening, an ongoing 'disclosure' (and sheltering) of meaning in which all beings participate."2 Dallmayr explicates Heidegger's concept of *Dasein,* defining human existence as "being-in-the-world," as well as his other key concepts, such as care (*Sorge*), solicitude (*Fürsorge*), letting-be (*Seinlassen*), event (*das Ereignis*), and dwelling (*Wohnen*), to move his political philosophy beyond the traditional paradigm, rooted in individual subjectivity, toward a view of human beings and society that emphasizes connectedness and "relationality."

Heidegger's writing powerfully expresses the fragility of human existence and acknowledges not only the possibility of the end of the human race, but also the fact that *das Man* has effectively created the means of its own self-destruction. Dallmayr embraces Heidegger's personalistic defense of individual persons, seeking to liberate them from depersonalizing influences exerted by the social system. In Heidegger Dallmayr finds a thinker able to realize the dramatic situation of Western civilization and to see the root causes of its problems, which had burgeoned during the World Wars and the Cold War and have continued to escalate ever since. He creatively continues Heidegger's line of thought. The qualitatively new perspective he highlights is that contradictions and perilous tendencies in Western society are now escalating to the level of being global problems, which brings us to the precipice of self-destruction—nuclear or ecological.

While recognizing the importance of Heidegger's admonishments, Dallmayr, in a more hopeful vein, emphasizes the positive alternatives to the possibility of self-destruction. He brings together insights and ideas found scattered or latently present in Heidegger's works, creatively developing them in the light of our contemporary situation. He relates what he gleans to some concepts of political philosophy and tries to find answers to such questions as "What is the status of individualism and of traditional Western humanism?" and "How should one construe the relations between self and other human beings bypassing the options of contractual agreement and simple rational convergence?"3 Dallmayr highlights Heidegger's contributions

to studies of the status of the "subject" as a political agent; the character of political community; the issue of cultural and political development; his notion of a "homecoming through otherness," and the perspectives of emerging cosmopolis.4

Another connection between Dallmayr and Heidegger is the philosophy of history. In studies about Heidegger, scant attention has been paid to this topic, yet his critical revision of traditional conceptions and attempt to ground a radically new approach underlie his fundamental ontology. It is latently present in *Being and Time* (1927/1996), which analyzes the modern concept of time underlying the teleological representations of society and history. The book was a reaction against "temporal fetishism" and G. W. F. Hegel's historicism, where history is viewed as a teleologically determined rational system. Within this framework, an individual's role is limited by conformity to existing social trends and power structures. One can see the main features of historicism lurking behind contemporary theories of industrial-postindustrial society, of the "invisible hand" of neoliberal market economy, of the postmodern concept of the "end of history," as well as of the neoconservative doctrine with its "imperial designs" and the messianic role of a "chosen nation."

Being and Time is polemically directed against the concepts of historicism that Heidegger saw as the main error of European philosophy. He argues that "Da-sein *and only* Da-sein is primordially historical."5 Only the human being as an individual really has history: "Temporality reveals itself as the *historicity* of Da-sein. The statement that Da-sein is historical is confirmed as an existential and ontological fundamental proposition. It is far removed from merely ontically ascertaining the fact that Da-sein occurs in a 'world history.' "6 Heidegger believes that philosophy should liberate itself from this historicist aberration and open people's eyes to the value of individual agency: "The existential and ontological constitution of historicity must be mastered in *opposition to* the vulgar interpretation of the history of Da-sein that covers over."7 He continues, "*the analysis of the historicity of Da-sein attempted to show that this being is not 'temporal,' because it 'is in history,' but because, on the contrary, it exists and can exist historically only because it is temporal in the ground of its being*."8 Individuals exist in time, but are not manipulated by it: by the very mode of their being, individuals themselves are time. Society "has" history, but human persons have the ontological privilege of "being history." *Dasein* means that the individual is included in world history but not reduced by its temporary movement,

is not predetermined by it, and has internal independence from it. From *Dasein* emanates the historicity of any other processes that result from human activity. *Dasein* is opposed not only to the vulgar view of history, but also to the sociocentric, sociological "being-from-society"; that is, the socially predetermined being. This approach aims to be a radical change in the philosophy of history.

Heidegger aims to dispel any notion of "historical necessity" to free individuals from their subjection to statist and hegemonic projects. An important concept is that of possibility (*die Möglichkeit*), which is related to other categories of fundamental ontology, such as understanding, project, destiny, existence, and Being. According to Heidegger, the category of possibility acquires its own adequate meaning only in relation to individuals or *Dasein*. Accordingly, "possibility as an existential is the most primordial and the ultimate positive ontological determination of Da-sein."9 Being-possible is related to "to know" and to "to be able to." Being-possible allows us to move from the sense of being powerless individuals subordinated to an inexorably predetermined future to one that embraces individual agency. Because it has a character of project and "because it *is* what it becomes or does not become, can it say understandingly to itself: 'become what you are!' "10 In other words, "realize your own possibilities!"

In an ontological interpretation of possibility, one can see a human being who has certain vocations or callings, who feels destined for a certain form of existence and the achievement of a unique life. The existential "possibility" implies that personal possibilities are the living forces of our being, its energy or potency. Possibility-vocation can be interpreted in the way that an individual may view him- or herself as being sent into the world with a unique, subconsciously perceived mission, the understanding and fulfillment of which should be the overarching goal of life. Self-realization is considered as a process of self-transformation, which results in a radical anthropological change in an individual's self-perception and views of people, of the world, and of time. In fundamental ontology, the personalistic idea of an individual's striving for authentic personality obtains a new impetus for self-transformation and subsequently as the way toward a more humane alternative to the existing world. Dallmayr follows Heidegger beyond any self-centered type of "existentialism." According to him, in *Being and Time* human existence (*Dasein*) is presented not as self-constituted or a fixed substance, but as open-ended and potentially transformative, a being moved by care (*Sorge*) in an ongoing search for meaning and truth.11

Heidegger characterized the decline of the Western world, quoting Nietzsche,

who said that "the wasteland grows."12 Dallmayr invokes this characterization, noting that with globalization, the wasteland is growing. Behind this desert-world there is, according to Heidegger, a deeper devastation, namely the abandonment and oblivion of Being. This leads to the possibility of global destruction:

> The unconditional establishment of machination and the aligning of mankind to this establishment constitute the installation of the abandonment of beings by being. . . . The machinational basic form of the devastation is the new world order, which can be fully carried out only in a struggle over the supremacy of ordering and of claims of order. . . . This blowing up of the globe by the *animal rationale* will be the last act of the new order.13

One of the most important challenges of our time for Dallmayr is to find antidotes or radical counterpulls to the global devastation and destruction. This requires "a radical change of paradigm or change of register, away from the hegemonic world view—not into mere negation or antithesis, but into 'another thinking' beyond dialectics."14 The first step is to depart from oppressive power (*Macht*) and manipulative domination or machination (*Machenschaft*). For the most part, people are involved in everydayness and servile entanglements; they succumb to the lure of wealth, power, and self-satisfaction. To exit from this mode of existence requires renouncing the triumphalism of human beings and changing hearts and minds. The relation of human *Dasein* to Being as "care" cannot just be a cognitive or neutral-analytical one. It requires a transformation of the entire human way of life.

The search for viable antidotes to our current perilous trajectory can fruitfully start with concepts put forth in *Being and Time*. However, as Dallmayr points out, in that work Heidegger did not yet clearly show "how *Dasein's* care related to Being and how, more generally, the 'difference' between Being and beings was to be conceived."15 To elucidate these issues, Dallmayr turns to the later works, such as "Building, Dwelling, Thinking" (1971) and *Das Ereignis* (*The Event*) (2013). In *The Event*, Heidegger sharpens his criticism of Western metaphysics as the course of thinking from Plato to

Nietzsche.16 He stresses the opposition between a historicist, or teleological, view of history and human individuals. As Heidegger writes:

> Humans are "present" to themselves by maintaining their inaugural essence instead of proceeding to a self-made task whose pursuit

> confirms them only in an unappropriated self-absorption. . . . In the current historical moment, the self-absorption of metaphysical mankind declares the ready-made historical task to be "the mission" "of " history. Historical mankind inceptually knows no mission, since it has no need of one, having been consigned enough in the arrogation of the truth of beyng [Being].17

Dallmayr examines Heidegger's use of the term "event" (*Ereignis*) and offers his own interpretation. He pays special attention to the term "*Zueignung*" (arrogation), which he translates as "dedication" or "handing over a gift," which is a central feature of the event. Being hands itself over to the care of human beings, constituting the humanity of *Dasein*. In Heidegger's words, "In arrogating and adopting the essence of the human being out of the beginning and for the beginning, the event first allows humans to come to themselves, i.e. to their essence as that essence in appropriated in the appropriating event."18 Dallmayr further elucidates how such arrogation or handing over occurs and how the event (*Ereignis*) can reach human beings. The event does not approach human beings with categorical imperatives. Rather, Being in *Ereignis* can try to reach human beings through a voiceless voice, a word sheltered in silence. As Heidegger continues, "The voice disposes in that it adopts the essence of the human being to the truth of beyng [Being] and thus attunes that essence to the disposition in all the attitudes and comportment which are thereby first awakening . . . The word, in its event-related [*Ereignis*-related] essence, is soundless."19

Heidegger writes about "the responsibility (*Verantwortung*) of the response (*Antwort*), which prepares the word (*Wort*) of language for the claim of the event. 'Responsibility' is meant here not in a 'moral' sense but, rather, with respect to the event and as related to the response." The response is the human counter-word of language to the voice of being, "to the disposition, in which guise the soundless arrogation and adoption claim the essence of the human being for the preservation of the truth of the inceptuality."20 As Dallmayr explains, the voice of Being extends not a command but a graceful greeting. He tells us that event discloses in

Being an uncanny potency—beyond power—to nurture and sustain beings without force, through an appeal or "greeting." It is through sounding that a certain "tuning" is established, which, given human responsiveness, may lead to "attunement." In handing itself over to *Dasein*, Being comprises the very core of human beings. According to Dallmayr, "its voice comes not so much from the outside or beyond, but dwells in the innermost heart of humans."21 Nevertheless, Dallmayr concludes, it is still up to us to listen

to this voice and decide a proper response.

Intercultural Philosophical Dialogue: Theory and Practice

Dallmayr once told me that since Plato, philosophy is always questioning, it is a question and answer—a dialogue. Such a dialogical approach permeates both his philosophy and his life. In his work on other philosophers, he tries to elucidate their underlying dialogical motifs, which helps to better understand their meaning. The dialogism of Heidegger's works is more clearly shown against the background of his contemporary Mikhail Bakhtin, who is well known for his dialogic philosophy. In one of his innovative early works, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, which was written around 1920 (but could not be published until more than six decades later), Bakhtin expressed some ideas similar to those of Heidegger's *Being and Time* (1927). Without knowing each other, both were working in the same philosophical area and defended human personality from a depersonalizing domination. Bakhtin viewed dialogue as a universal phenomenon, permeating all human relationships. For him, dialogical relationships between I and the other (and ultimately between I and the Absolute "Other") constitute the structure of Being understood as "the unitary and once-occurrent event of Being."22 "Being as event" also means "co-being" or an event that is shared simultaneously—coexistence. Bakhtin held that dialogism is a constitutive characteristic of language and expanded the meaning of dialogue to include intercultural relations. One can see in Heidegger's conceptions of Being and of event (*Ereignis*), interpreted as a radical ontological relationality, their dialogical underpinning. He stressed the crucial role of language in human knowledge and understanding and laid the groundwork for a dialogical interaction.

Dallmayr has also elucidated the dialogism of Hans-Georg Gadamer, Emmanuel Levinas, and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. He stresses the importance of an "authentic dialogue" and elaborates on Raimon Panikkar's conception

of "dialogical dialogue" and interreligious dialogue.23 Dallmayr emphasizes Gadamer's ideas that every interpersonal encounter and every interpretation of texts (hermeneutics) involves dialogue in search for the meaning, and that the ethical precondition to genuine dialogue is goodwill and the recognition of the other as equal. Dallmayr sees the problems of Western modernity in the monologic mind-set, which was rooted in Cartesian cogito and became an instrumental rationality coupled with egocentric "will to power" and

domination. He passionately promotes dialogue as theory and practice as a means for overcoming the monologic unilateralism and for establishing relationships of mutual understanding and collaboration, aiming for peaceful coexistence and justice.

In his words, dialogue means to approach alien meanings of life-forms in a questioning mode conducive to a possible learning experience. He tells us, "pursued in a genuinely dialogical mode, some questioning is liable to call one's own perspective in question, triggering a modification or correction of initial assumptions."24 With this dialogical disposition, openness to the other, appreciation of cultural diversity, and studies of non-Western cultures, Dallmayr was well prepared to be engaged in dialogue with the philosophical traditions of India, China, and the Islamic world. This was not a mere cerebral awareness of similarities and differences of traditions of thought as separate entities, but a dialogical personal engagement with different culturally embedded intellectual-spiritual universes. His encounter with Eastern philosophical cultures resulted in a transformative "turn," like *Kehre*, in Dallmayr's philosophical path. This strengthened his critical views of Eurocentric self-enclosure, anthropocentrism, and cognitive self-sufficiency. At the same time, his appreciation of the best in Europe's philosophical traditions served as "possible springboards to broader, cross-cultural or transcultural explorations."25

Dallmayr saw the end of the Cold War as opening up "new possibilities of human and social life, that encouraged and required creative social imagination."26 This involved new interpenetrations of universality and particularity, of identity and differences, which were inspired by the emerging field of intercultural studies. One of Dallmayr's theoretical contributions to the intercultural movement in political philosophy was what he called "comparative political theory" from a global cross-cultural perspective. To that end, he edited and contributed to a special issue of *The Review of Politics* titled "Non-Western Political Thought" (1997), which was followed by his *Alternative Visions: Path in the Global Village* (1998), *Border Crossing: Toward a Comparative Political Theory* (1999), *Achieving Our World: Toward a Global and Plural Democracy* (2001), and *Post-Liberalism: Recovering a Shared World* (2019).

One way Dallmayr applies the idea of dialogue in his political philosophy is in the conception of democratic politics as "relational praxis." This lays the groundwork for a new understanding of democracy, challenging its equation with the pursuit of individual or collective self-interest and insisting that more ethical conceptions are possible and that different societies should nurture democracy with their own cultural resources.27 Ideas of dialogue

operate at all levels—from intersubjective and social to intercultural and intercivilizational—as means for peace and humane transformation of the world. Dialogic philosophy also stands for dialogue among civilizations and provides a theoretical basis for a new, dialogical civilization.28

Recovering Humanity's Wholeness

Dallmayr approaches issues from an eagle-eyed civilizational perspective in dialogue with both Western and Eastern philosophical traditions. Studies of these philosophies have led him to see some common trends in the variety of culturally diverse ways of philosophizing. Both are generally characterized by two contrasting perspectives. One is the sober assessment of the realities of the world and of the situation of human beings, expressing a grave concern about humanity's future. The other, the "idealistic," is more focused on the search for possible solutions to the problems and a hopeful alternative. Humanity has reached a historical "turning point" and is at the crossroads. One endeavor tends toward preserving the status quo, with the escalation of social and global problems, heading toward a nuclear or ecological apocalypse. The other leads toward alternatives—through the awakening of the global consciousness and mobilization of the intellectual-spiritual resources for necessary changes, for transformation of minds and hearts of individuals and of societies.

Similar themes can be found in the *Bhagavad Gita*, which speaks to two human "natures" in the world: the one aims for bliss and goodwill, the other for destruction, striving "by unjust means to amass unlimited wealth."29 Dallmayr evinces courage to face these problems and confront hegemonic ideologies and politics in order to try to wake people up. It also takes an even greater courage to hope—not to escape into an illusory dream of powerlessness as suggested by historicism but to assert belief in real possibilities for averting such tragedy.

This mind-set is expressed in Dallmayr's conceptions of "world maintenance" and "cosmopolis." He embraces Heidegger's definition of human existence as "being-in-the-world," where existence and world are intimately connected and world includes fellow-beings, nature, and the (divine) cosmos. Dallmayr elaborates on the Heideggerian notion of "care," which means concern about Being or what it means to be. Because, in the case of human beings, *Dasein* as being-in-the-world is part and parcel of being human, then care for Being also means care for world and care about humanity or

humaneness. This can lead to well-being-in-the-world, which in the end coincides with the quest for peace and justice.

Such caring attention to world maintenance can be found in Western and Eastern religious and philosophical traditions. As religious examples, Dallmayr mentions the Jewish mystical traditions (*Sohar*), Sufi mystical poetry in Islam, and Christian mystical writings about a promised land, with peace and justice. The philosophical example is Kantian universalism, especially Kant's *Perpetual Peace*. To this, one can add examples from Russian religious-philosophical thought, such as Vladimir Solovyov's ideas of "Godmanhood," "positive wholeness," and "unity-of-all," which mean that in the divine order, all individual elements of the universe complement each other and form a harmonious organism.

The *Bhagavad Gita* emphasizes the basic ethical and ontological obligation, namely, the caring attention to world maintenance or "welfare of the world" (*loka-samgraha*) as the highest perfection of righteous human conduct. Such conduct should be in conformity with the classical teaching about universal connectedness and harmony. This conformity can only be achieved through a distinction between selfish and unselfish conduct. Only in this way is it also possible to maintain a synergy or harmony between the paths of knowledge, behavior, and action. As Dallmayr demonstrates, these ideas continue in contemporary India. Mahatma Gandhi used the *Gita* as his source of inspiration, and in his political philosophy, world maintenance was closely linked with the ideas of *ahimsa* (nonviolence) and *swaraj* (self-rule). Today, this tradition continues in the so-called *Sarvodaya* Movement (movement for "universal uplift" or "progress of all"), as networks of popular self-organization, exemplifying the idea of world maintenance "from the bottom up."

Parallels can be found in many other traditions. In China, for example, these ideas can be seen in the concept of "All-Under-Heaven" (*Tian-Xia*). At the heart of Confucian teaching is mutual care and fidelity, a care that ultimately extends to the relational fabric of the entire world. Most

important in relationships is "*jen*"—goodness, benevolence, humaneness, a compassionate love for humanity or for the world as a whole. It remains as a "living metaphor" for an ethical and properly humanized way of life.

Dallmayr's intercultural analysis has led him to conclude that the concept of world care is shared by virtually all cultural and religious traditions around the globe. In collaboration with philosophers from India, China, Japan, Malaysia, Turkey, Iran, Egypt, Russia, and other countries, through conferences and publications, he promotes the idea that we need to work

to restore and safeguard our world, thus preventing an apocalypse. Indeed, it is important to regain the vital heritage of mankind, what Paul Ricoeur called "memory of humanity" (*mémoire d'humanité*), that always speaks to us again in an ethical sense and connects us with the best of human values and dignity.30 It is also important to revitalize intellectual and spiritual resources of humanity through intercultural and interreligious dialogue.

Dallmayr shows the pertinence of the conception of world care as articulated in Heidegger's "Letter on Humanism," where he characterized a human being as the caretaker or guardian of Being: "Humankind is not the master of reality, but rather the shepherd of Being."31 Hence human existence shoulders a responsibility and is called into caring service. In a way, Heidegger's notion of the "fourfold" (*Geviert*)—a convergence of relationships bringing together the earth, the heaven, mortals, and divinities—can be seen as a deepening of the relational character of human being. Dallmayr elaborates on this relationality and on human-ness as open-ended, pointing beyond itself, from actuality to potentiality or possibility: "This constitutive openness brings into view humanity's transformative quality: that is, its possible transformation into a more genuine or deeper humanity (*Menschwerdung*) or a being at the boundary of the divine (sometimes called '*theosis*')."32 These ideas resonate with some of the insights of a new philosophical anthropology, such as "synergic anthropology."33

In the discussions about "postsecularity," Dallmayr rejects any dichotomy of immanence and transcendence, which leaves one choice only between "materialism" and religious fundamentalism. He sees in Raimon Panikkar's holism a third possibility, pointing to the potential overcoming of the "transcendence-immanence" conundrum. Panikkar is critical of both an agnostic immanentism lacking spirituality and a radical transcendentalism indifferent to social-ethical problems. Inspired in part by the idea of the Indian *Advaita Vedanta* that we all belong to the cosmic unity, he holds the possibility of recovering a proper balance of life, which requires an acknowledgement that our belongness to a cosmic "rhythm of being" happens in a relational or

"cosmotheandric" mode, connecting the divine, the human, and nature. This view of holism is open to cultural pluralism, as promoted in his works on interreligious-intercultural philosophy. This is congenial to Dallmayr's own nondualistic views.34 He interprets the term "postsecularity" in the sense of an ethically and spiritually nurtured cosmopolitan commitment.

Dallmayr goes beyond traditional humanism, arguing for the need of "humanizing humanity" and developing a new, post-secular humanism with an emphasis on spirituality and religious dimensions. This "new" or "apophatic"

humanism should embrace the humanistic ideas from the various world cultures. He highlights the spiritual dimensions of religious-philosophical and theological thought as an intellectual-spiritual source for the search for a more humane alternative to the global disorder.35

Cosmopolis and New Horizons

Dallmayr's philosophical and ethical-political ideas culminate in his conceptualization of cosmopolis, an "emerging global city" or community. He expresses dissatisfaction with some of the interpretations of cosmopolitanism: empirical, focused on economic and technological globalization, while hiding ethical deficits; and normative, which refers to international law and a legal world order but ignores local and regional contexts. He favors an approach that gives primacy to practice, "pointing to the need for concrete engagements across national, cultural, and religious boundaries" for "the building of a pluralistic and dialogical cosmopolis."36 He thus views cosmopolitanism not just in legal and institutional terms but in a broader cultural and philosophical sense. He again finds useful insights in Heidegger's conception of temporality, meaning that human being-in-theworld is constantly "temporalized" in the direction of future possibilities. He also refers to Deweyan pragmatism, Alfred North Whitehead's process philosophy, hermeneutics, and other sources. Based on these, he develops his conception of "a 'becoming cosmopolis' beckoning from the future as a possibility and a promise."37

Dallmayr embraces the fresh dimensions of a "new cosmopolitanism" as reflexive, critical, democratic, rooted, dialogical, intercultural, and transformative. He develops his conception of cosmopolis in dialogue with the ideas of such theorists of cosmopolitanism as Karl-Otto Apel, Daniele Archibugi, Seyla Benhabib, Richard Falk, Raul Fornet-Betancourt, Jürgen Habermas, David Held, James Ingram, Martha Nussbaum, and Walter

Mignolo, among others. At the same time, his conception of cosmopolis has some distinctive characteristics that are related to his interpretation of being-in-the-world, care, relationality, democratic politics as relational praxis, world maintenance, and spirituality.

Dallmayr's thought—beyond both a conflict-ridden state-centric system and hegemon-centric dystopia—strives for an ideal of a domination-free, cross-cultural, dialogical world order of peace and justice. He examines the conditions for progress in the direction of such a cosmopolitan order. Gross material disparities, hegemonic domination, and violence are problems that

must be solved on the way to this goal. Equally important is regaining social ethics and cultivating co-responsibility and shared well-being. To homogenizing globalization he opposes the importance of the diversity of cultural traditions38 and education. It is necessary to go beyond instrumental rationality and be open to dialogue and listening, cross-cultural and interreligious interaction, ethics, and spiritual insight. In contrast to the idea of a uniform global imperial super-state dominating the world, cosmopolis means a shared aspiration negotiated among local or national differences.

Cosmopolitan reflections are futile if the only reality to be taken into account is the present, ignoring future horizons. According to Dallmayr, the opening of such horizons requires not just a change of individual attitudes but also "a change of the entire modern paradigm or frame of significance, that is, of our mode of 'being-in-the-world.' "39 One of the problems of the metaphysically encrusted categories of Western modernity is the concept of freedom, anchored in a fixed subject and dogmatically asserted privilege, which is the opposite of social solidarity. This requires a rigorous rethinking of the polar categories used in political thought. Dallmayr views freedom not as an exclusionary property but rather as "an openness to the unfolding horizons of truth challenging us to find our way in the world." Seen in this light, "solidarity is not the opposite, but rather the intimate corollary of our living freely in the world."40

A challenge we face is to reconnect freedom and solidarity. But this is extremely difficult in the prevailing political conditions of the super-Leviathan surveillance state, which seeks to subject the population to near-total control, of the atomization of social life, and of eroded ethics. Dallmayr explores the possibility of a transition from the modern paradigm toward a new beginning in which freedom and solidarity can be reconnected. This intimates a basic paradigm shift.41 It is a hope predicated on the progressive maturation and transformation of humanity.

Much inspiration for resisting disorder and for positive transformations can be derived from the great world religions and also from prominent philosophical and wisdom traditions around the world. Dallamyr's works invoke religious, spiritual, and ethical resources for global renewal. He also addresses the question of religion in public life. Religion and spiritual traditions, alongside moral ones, provide resources for encouraging a disposition toward the common good. He views the possibility of future horizons as a "promise," "to come." Cosmopolis cannot just be humanly manufactured by calculative rationality and social engineering, but also requires "spiritual guidance by pathfinders in the present desert."42

On a personal note, he has humbly remarked, "perhaps my life's journey and all my endeavors were nothing but a gloss on a single word in the Lord's prayer: *adveniat*, 'may it come.' "43 That is prayerfully soliciting to come "your reign." Such a reign "cannot be purely clerical nor purely secular; it cannot be purely 'transcendental' nor 'immanent.' " It must be for the whole, embracing all cultures and traditions, and allowing for "a multitude of differences and even for absences and the 'unknown.' " He adds that in scripture, "we are exhorted to 'seek your face' (*faciem tuam requiram*)—which is nothing but the radiant face of (transcognitive) truth, goodness, and justice."44 Dallmayr's work shines brightly against the grim background of recent hegemonic and neototalitarian degeneration. This confirms his prophetic warnings against the global disorder that threatens humanity's future. At the same time, this makes even more pertinent his vision of a positive alternative, predicated on mindfulness, relationships of dialogue and solidarity for the common good, spirituality, and the possibility of human transformation or "*metanoia*," aspiring to the cosmopolis to come.

Notes

1. Fred Dallmayr, *On the Boundary: A Life Remembered* (Lanham, MD: Hamilton Books, 2017), 43.
2. Ibid., 43–44.
3. Ibid., 45.
4. Fred Dallmayr, *The Other Heidegger* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993), 63.
5. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time: A Translation of Sein und Zeit*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 359.
6. Ibid., 305.

7. Ibid., 344.
8. Ibid., 345. Here and in all other quotations, emphases in original.
9. Ibid., 135.
10. Ibid., 136.
11. Fred Dallmayr, *Against Apocalypse: Recovering Humanity's Wholeness* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2016,) 83.
12. Martin Heidegger, *What Is Called Thinking?*, translated by J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 38, 46. The reference is from Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, 417. See *The Portable Nietzsche*, ed. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Viking Press, 1968).

13. Martin Heidegger, *The Event (Studies in Continental Thought)*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013), 85–66.
14. Dallmayr, *Against Apocalypse*, 88.
15. Ibid., 88.
16. Heidegger, *The Event*, 148.
17. Ibid., 132.
18. Ibid.
19. Ibid., 145.
20. Ibid., 134.
21. Dallmayr, *Against Apocalypse*, 96.
22. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*, ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. Vadim Liapunov (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1993), 12.
23. Fred Dallmayr, *Spiritual Guides: Pathfinders in the Desert* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2017), chapter 2.
24. Dallmayr, *On the Boundary*, op. cit., 64.
25. Ibid., 65.
26. Ibid.
27. Fred Dallmayr, *Democracy to Come: Politics as Relational Praxis* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); *Post-Liberalism: Recovering a Shared World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019).
28. He was influential in his decade-long service as co-chair of the international World Public Forum "Dialogue of Civilizations" and continues his important role as a member of the Supervisory Board of the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute.
29. Dallmayr, *Against Apocalypse*, op. cit., 2.
30. Paul Ricoeur, *Political and Social Essays*, ed. David Stewart and Joseph Bien (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1975), 70.
31. Martin Heidegger, "Letter on Humanism," in *Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings*, ed. David F. Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1993), 221–31.
32. Dallmayr, *Against Apocalypse*, op. cit., 84.
33. Sergey S. Horujy, *Practices of the Self and Spiritual Practices: Michel Foucault and the Eastern Christian Discourse*, ed. Kristina Stoeckl, trans. Boris Jakim (Grand Rapids, MI: William R. Eerdmans, 2015).
34. Fred Dallmayr, *Being in the World: Dialogue and Cosmopolis* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2013), chapter 8.
35. Dallmayr, *Spiritual Guides*, op. cit.
36. Dallmayr, *On the Boundary*, op. cit., 83.
37. Ibid., 82.
38. Fred Dallmayr, "After Babel: Journey Toward Cosmopolis," in *Intercultural*

Dialogue: In Search of Harmony in Diversity, ed. Edward Demenchonok (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 365–78.
39. Dallmayr, *On the Boundary*, op. cit., 84.
40. Ibid., 85.
41. Fred Dallmayr, *Freedom and Solidarity: Toward New Beginnings* (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2015). See also Fred Dallmayr and Edward Demenchonok, eds., *A World Beyond Global Disorder: The Courage to Hope* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017).
42. Dallmayr, *On the Boundary*, op. cit., 88; See also *Spiritual Guides*, op. cit.
43. Dallmayr, *On the Boundary*, op. cit., 86.
44. Ibid., 87.