

# Conscious evolution, social development and environmental justice

Luke R Barnesmoore

Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Canada

**Abstract:** Moving from Barnesmoore's (2016) theorization of humans as beings with the potential for conscious (epistemological) evolution, this article argues that a revolution in the ideas by which ('world view' in which) we conceive of potential practice must necessarily precede a revolution of academic and social practice (that theory necessarily precedes practice). Revolution *must* be rooted in revolutionary ideas and cannot be facilitated by practices that rise from (are rationalized within) the hegemonic essence (ideas, axioms and logics) of the regime against which revolution is being waged.

**Keywords:** conscious evolution; social development; environmental justice; Modernism; Postmodernism; hegemony; emotion; truth; order

Correspondence to: Luke R Barnesmoore, Department of Geography, University of British Columbia, Canada, luke.barnesmoore@geog.ubc.ca

**Received:** August 30<sup>th</sup>, 2016; **Accepted:** October 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016; **Published Online:** January 10<sup>th</sup>, 2017

**Citation:** Barnesmoore, L. R. (2017). Conscious evolution, social development and environmental justice. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 2(1), 11–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18063/esp.v2.i1.94>.

## Introduction

—Precisely because there exists such a world [in which humanity has chosen to neglect the significance of religious [spiritual] understanding of the cosmos—namely the modern world, ... which bears the primary responsibility for the global destruction of the environment—we have sought to delve into a historical study of both philosophy and science in the West that, beginning with views similar to the philosophies and sciences of other civilizations, developed in what can only be called an anomalous manner from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries onward [as Modernism]. It moved away from the almost universally held view of the sacredness of nature to one that sees man as alienated from nature and nature itself as no longer the progenitor of life (the very root of nature being from the Latin *nascitura*, meaning to give birth), but rather as a lifeless mass, a machine

to be dominated and manipulated by a purely earthly man. It also divorced, in a manner not to be seen in any other civilization, the laws of nature from moral laws and human ethics from the workings of the cosmos," (Nasr, 1996, p.4).

-S. H. Nasr

—Idealism and matter of fact are... not sundered, but inseparable, as our daily steps are guided by ideals of direction," (Geddes, 1915, p.vii).

-Sir Patrick Geddes

Barnesmoore (2016a) problematizes biocentrist, materialist conceptions of *humans*, *human nature* and *social order* in Modernity and subsequently provides a new theory of humanity and human evolution that is sensitive to the potential for rational beings to direct free will towards *conscious evolution* (*towards epistemological evolution*) and to, in so doing, transcend reflexive articulation by the form of mechanical evo-

lution (‘biological evolution’). In short, we re-conceptualize the biological animal-human of Modernity as an epistemological rational-human. Moving from this conception of humans as epistemological beings, this paper highlights the necessary role of ideas (theory) in expanding and constraining potential for action (practice) as well as the implications of this relationship between theory and practice for social and academic revolutions (*i.e.*, for counter-hegemonic movements). In other words, we argue that a revolution of ideas (theories) must necessarily precede a revolution of practice as our ideas (theories) expand and constrain our potentials for conceptualization of practice (in the words of Geddes (1915, p.vii) —our daily steps are guided by ideals of direction”). After providing a theoretical framework for understanding the contemporary dynamics of academic and social revolution through discussion of the terms ‘hegemony’ and ‘dialectical hegemony,’ we turn to a review and critique of debates between Positivism and Postmodernism in contemporary Planning Theory and Practice so as to demonstrate the *truth* (truth and fact are indeed different things...) that (r)evolution at the level of axioms and associated logics—in the context of our study, those concerning *order in manifestation* and the potential for epistemological truth—from which we plan society must occur before we have the potential for planning truly (r)evolutionary modes of social and academic practice.

### Ouspensky on Psychology

A brief overview of contemporary (Modernist) psychology is necessary before we enter into our core discussion. Ouspensky’s views on the evolution of human psychology and the history of psychology are worth taking a moment to expound upon as they set the stage for our analysis of contemporary academic conceptions of the relationship between theory and practice (mind and matter) and their implications for Planning Theory and Practice. Ouspensky argues:

—...practically never in history has psychology stood at *so low a level* as at the present time [the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century]. It has lost all touch with its *origin* and its *meaning* ... And this is so in spite of the fact that never in history have there been so many psychological theories and so many psychological writings. [(*This problem has been compounded by the rise of neuroscience in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century...*)],” (Ouspensky, 1951, p.6).

Ouspensky notes that while —Psychology is sometimes called a new science ... this is quite wrong,” (Ouspensky, 1945, p.4). Indeed,

—Psychology is, perhaps, the *oldest science*, and, unfortunately, in its most essential features a *forgotten science*. For thousands of years psychology existed under the name of philosophy. In India all forms of *Yoga*, which are essentially psychology, are described as one of the six systems of philosophy. *Sufi teachings*, which again are chiefly psychological, are regarded as partly religious and partly metaphysical. In Europe, even quite recently in the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, many works on psychology were referred to as philosophy. And in spite of the fact that almost all sub-divisions of philosophy such as logic, the theory of cognition, ethics, aesthetics, referred to the work of the human mind or senses, psychology was regarded as inferior to philosophy and as relating only to the lower or more trivial sides of human nature....

Parallel with its existence under the name of philosophy, psychology existed even longer connected with one or another religion ... There are many excellent works on psychology in quite orthodox religious literature of different countries and epochs. For instance, in early Christianity there was a collection of books of different authors under the general name of *Philokalia*, used in our time in the Eastern Church, especially for the instruction of monks.

During the time when psychology was connected with philosophy and religion it also existed in the form of Art, Poetry, Drama, Sculpture, Dancing, even Architecture, [which] were means for transmitting psychological knowledge. For instance, the Gothic Cathedrals were in their chief meaning works on psychology.

In the ancient times before philosophy, religion and art had taken their separate forms as we now know them, psychology had existed in the form of *Mysteries*, such as those of Egypt and of ancient Greece. Later, after the disappearance of the *Mysteries*, psychology existed in the form of *Symbolical Teachings* which were sometimes connected with the religion of the period and sometimes not connected, such as Astrology, Alchemy, Magic, and the more modern: Masonry, Occultism and Theosophy,” (Ouspensky, 1945, p.4).

Continuing on to the relationship between evolution and psychology, Ouspensky divides the study of psychology into two camps:

—First: systems which study man *as they find him, or such as they suppose or imagine him to be* [as a seed in of itself]. Modern ‘scientific’ psychology or what is known under that name belongs to this category. Second: systems which study man not from the point of view of what he is, or what he seems to be, but from the point of view of what he may become; that is, from the point of view of *his possible evolution* [as the seed in of its potential to grow into a tree].

These last systems are in reality the original ones, or in any case the oldest, and only they can explain the forgotten origin and the meaning of psychology.

When we understand the importance of the study of man from the point of view of his possible evolution, we shall understand that the first answer to the question: What is psychology? —should be that psychology is the study of the principles, laws and facts of [humanity’s] possible evolution.”(Ouspensky, 1951, p. 6).

As we know a seed in its potential for evolution into a tree rather than as a seed in and of itself, so too shall we know humanity.<sup>1</sup> For Ouspensky — in a similar vein as authors like De Chardin below — it is psychology (soul-mind) rather than biology (body) that forms the central object of human evolution. Changes in our state of mind brought on by the energy of ideas — rather than changes in our biological makeup or the physical environment it inhabits — act as the evolutionary catalyst for conscious, potentially rational beings.

Regarding normative Evolutionary Theory in Modernity, Ouspensky notes:

—A regards ordinary modern views on the origin of [humanity] and [it’s] previous evolution I must say at once that they cannot be accepted....

We must deny any possibility of future *mechanical* evolution of [humanity]; that is, evolution happening by itself according to laws of heredity and selection, and without man’s conscious efforts and understanding of his possible evolution.” (Ouspensky, 1951, p.6).

In short, humanity represents the entrance into what thinkers like De Chardin labeled ‘the Noosphere’ (a new stage of evolution beyond the two previous stages of evolution that we know as the Geo- and

Bio-spheres). As such, we cannot model the future of evolution based on the past (as we cannot model hydrodynamics based on the study of solid matter) (De Chardin, 1965; Levit, 2000). Such moments, where the inability to model the future based on the past as a function of changes in the dimensional quality of the object of study, have been labeled ‘singularities’ in contemporary social movements like the Transhumanism (Barnesmoore, 2016b). In more traditional regimes of thought these moments were known as ‘The Apocalypse’.

Noospheric beings are dimensionally incommensurable<sup>2</sup> with Biospheric beings as Biospheric beings are dimensionally incommensurable with the Geospheric beings, and so we must understand that evolution will take on new dimensional qualities as it did in the shift from Geo- to Bio-sphere (these changes in dimensional quality are akin to state changes in matter). Evolution in the Geosphere can be understood as planar (2D) as it evolves in a relatively closed, stable cycle. Evolution in the Biosphere can be seen as a solid (3D) in that it evolves in a spiral (*i.e.*, it changes through cycles). The Noosphere, then (accepting the hermetic dictum ‘as above so below’), ought to take on a temporal (4D) quality (or, more aptly, a relation to ‘the mastery of time’).<sup>3</sup>

What does this mean? While biology evolves over many scales, from short-term responses to dramatic changes of environment to long-term evolutionary trends like the development of the spinal cord or the transition from single to multi-celled organisms over hundreds of thousands, millions and even billions of years, consciousness evolves in a moment (however long that moment takes to come about) — the flash of lightning — and in so doing transcends temporal constraints.

On a different note, as evolution is stripped of its reflexive articulation by passing time, evolution is no

<sup>2</sup> We derive our use of the term ‘dimensional incommensurability’ from P. D. Ouspensky’s *Tertium Organum*. In short, dimensional incommensurability can be explained in the relationship between two and three dimensional objects; while you may be able to sketch a three dimensional object onto a two dimensional plane, the mass of the three dimensional object is dimensionally incommensurable with the dimensional quality of two dimensional reality and thus cannot ‘manifest’ into the two dimensional ‘reflection’ of the three dimensional object. For a more thorough metaphor also see the ‘Flat World’ thought experiment.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Mastery of time’ is conceived here in terms of rational-epistemological transcendence of temporally reductive modes of thought (*i.e.* peripatetic reductionism) and associated modes of behavior/ conceptions of being.

<sup>1</sup> —Though originally devised by Maurice Nicoll in the 1950s, Jacob Needleman popularized this metaphor of humans as seeds in his book *Lost Christianity* and named it acornology”. We are reprinting the story from: (Bourgeault, C 2009)

longer assured and *devolution* becomes possible.

—Or fundamental idea shall be that [humanity] as we know [it] *is not a completed being*; that nature develops [humanity] only up to a certain point<sup>4</sup> and then leaves [it], either to develop further, *by its own* efforts and devices, or to live and die such as [it] was born, or to degenerate and lose capacity for development.

Evolution of [humanity] in this case will mean the development of certain *inner* qualities and features which usually remain undeveloped, *and cannot develop by themselves*,” (Ouspensky, 1951, p.7).

*Social Evolution* (i.e., Social Development), then, must be understood as a process that is catalyzed by the energy of ideas-theories. The history of Social Evolution cannot, in this lens, be understood as a reflexive response to the natural environment (or worse, and more ironically, as a response to the labor requirements of a given mode of production stripped from its foundation in ideas-theories...). Instead, we must understand the history of Social Evolution as one in which practical responses to changes in environmental contexts are mediated by a given society’s theory (the essence of its ideas, logics and axioms or world view) and where modes of production (and all such systems of practice) are developed contingently in relation to (as *ontologically dependent upon*) a society’s theories. Our capacity to conceive of systems of practice (be they environmental, social, spiritual, etc.) has always been contingent upon the theories by which we assign meaning to the world. As such, counter-hegemonic or revolutionary change must be rooted in a (r)evolution of world view (the essence of our society’s ideas, logics and axioms).

## Hegemony in Modernity

As this article interrogates the role of ideas, axioms and logics (world view) in revolution against hegemonic regimes, we take a moment for a short inquiry into our use of the term hegemony. Though the work of Italian social philosopher, Antonio Gramsci (1971) popularized the term in western academic literature, our understanding of hegemony is derived first and foremost from the work of British Social Theorist Stuart Hall (1988). Hall (1988) eschews definite, stat-

ic-definitional conceptions of hegemony for conceptions of hegemony as a *dynamic process* that includes *breaches* and *techniques* (in the Foucaultian sense of techniques of power) for sealing said breaches. Our understanding of hegemony as process has been influenced by debates on the nature of neoliberalism waged between authors like Jamie Peck and Aihwa Ong. In short, Peck’s (2010; 2016; Brenner *et al.*, 2010) camp (also moving from inspiration by Stuart Hall) argues that conjunctural analysis of neoliberalism’s contingent, contextual manifestations begins to bring an image of neoliberal hegemony into focus. Ong’s (2007; Ong *et al.*, 2008) camp argues that the contingent, contextual manifestation of neoliberalism belies classification as a hegemonic project. We conceive of hegemony (Barnesmoore & Wyly, 2016 [In Press]) — in a move more coherent with Peck’s camp — as a process where the essence (ideas, axioms and logics) of a hegemonic regime manifests in a contingent, contextual relationship with the environment (cultural, historical, physical, etc.) of manifestation. Revolution against a hegemonic regime, then, must be conceived of in terms of revolution against hegemonic essence (against the ideas, axioms and logics that form the essence of a hegemonic regime’s many contextually contingent manifestations) rather than in terms of practices that rise from the hegemonic essence of the hegemonic regime revolutionaries purport to fight.

The term dialectical hegemony elucidates the dangers posed by revolution against a hegemonic regime via practices derived from (rationalized by) the hegemonic essence of said hegemonic regime. Dialectical hegemony refers to a mode of social control wherein two (or more) sides of a conflict are created and controlled so that the conflict can be directed to produce a desired outcome. We argue dialectical hegemony is facilitated by creating (or simply empowering and appropriating) seemingly oppositional-autonomous groups whose thoughts, behaviors and conceptions of being rise from the same hegemonic essence (from the same ideas, axioms and logics); this technique of power ensures that the outcome of the staged conflict necessarily includes the hegemonic essence (which is rendered banally invisible or commonsensical by ubiquity through the conflict between the seemingly autonomous actors). In normative US military and political practice this strategy was derived from Carl von Clausewitz work on dialectical military strategies and Sun Zi’s *The Art of War* (Burnet, 2016).

<sup>4</sup> Here we see the fundamental conception of the Order of Nature, as womb, in the Matriarchal, Goddess Oriented traditions that spanned much of the globe before the rise of the patriarchal, paternalist tradition of light...

Philip Abrams (1988) theorized the state as ‘a mask’ for elite power. The State is seen as effective in achieving the interests of the elite class precisely because it seems to be *autonomous* from the elite class. We (Barnesmoore & Wyly, 2016 [In Press]) have subsequently theorized the news media, when conceived as a seemingly autonomous ‘fourth branch of government’, as a second mask for elite power. The news media, in its seeming autonomy from the state and from the elite class, is able to reinforce the basic ideas, axioms and logics (hegemonic essence) by which the elite class epistemologically subjugates the general public from a seemingly autonomous perspective. From this point of departure we can see regimes of thought or practice that purport autonomy from the hegemonic core of a society while rising from the hegemonic essence of said society as masks for elite power.

## Planning: Theory and Practice

### Hegemonic Essences in Modernity

Planning Theory and Practice provide an interesting and elucidating perspective into the influence of Modernist axioms and associated logics (of the Modernist ‘world view’ or hegemonic essence)—especially concerning the ‘production’ of order in manifestation—upon Modernist social systems. Martin Krieger proposes a move away from Catholic Formalism of Modernist Planning Theory and Practice towards a more Talmudic Planning Theory and Practice wherein planners are ‘continually fixing their plans so that they fit the vagaries of situation and event [(of context)] without giving up their commitments to order and wholeness and goodness’ and, in so doing, elucidates the role of the role of ‘world view’ (in this case ideas, axioms and logics concerning the nature of order) in Planning Theory and Practice (Krieger, 1995, p.217). Krieger conceives of Planning Theory and Practice within a Talmudic ontology that accepts the difference, change, imperfection, contingency, etc. of manifestation’s implicit dimensional quality as negating the potential for static, unitary Truth and Order therein without denying the reality of *Infinite Substance* and its *Emanations* as well as their ability to provide an objective standard for Truth and Order in manifestation. Krieger, then, is proposing a model of

planning in which the dimensional incommensurability of the uncreated (Infinite Substance and its Emanations) and the created-manifest is accounted for without stripping one or the other of their essential dimensional quality (as was done by Positivism, which attempted to strip manifestation of its order of difference through domination of difference to create unitary Truth in manifestation, and Postmodernism, which attempted to strip reality of Truth (Infinite Substance and its Emanations) through axiomatic relegation of Truth to the sphere of unreality, irrationality, ‘madness’, etc.<sup>5</sup>). In more practical terms, the dimensional incommensurability of ideas (soul-mind) and matter is accepted and we allow our ideals—rather than fixed articulations of those ideals as practice—to guide our steps through the many contexts of the material world.

In another important note Krieger argues that ‘the scientific’ and ‘the spiritual’ cannot be aptly differentiated as is evident in the ‘serious and self-conscious’ mysticism of the Pythagoreans and in the works of Descartes, Spinoza, Leibnitz and Durkheim (Krieger, 1995, p. 218). Krieger, then, is proposing a return to a conceptualization of rationalism and relations between ideas, axioms and logics (soul-mind) and material context (between environment and psychology) that is sympathetic with the model expounded by Barnesmoore (2016a, p.83). In summary, Krieger’s article makes an attempt at providing a new set of axioms and associated logics (a new ‘world view’ or hegemonic essence) in which we can conceive of Planning Practice; this is the kind of theory that can expand potentials for conceptualization of practices that are counter-hegemonic and, or revolutionary.

### Modernist Planning: Positivism & Postmodernism

To provide ideational context for our discussion we provide a theoretical overview of the contemporary history of Planning Theory and Practice (and Social Science Theory and Practice more generally) by theorizing the relationship between Positivism and Post Modernism. We conceptualize the relationship between Positivism and Post Modernism as a process of transformation from a system (Positivism) that at-

<sup>5</sup> Postmodernism, in short, presumes that all metaphysical realities are simply opiates of the masses by reducing all viewpoints that transcend dogmatic materialism to the perversion of paternalist religion.

tempts to impute the Order of Truth to manifestation through dominating difference to a system (Postmodernism) that attempts to combat the Positivist imposition of Truth (the order of Infinite Substance) upon the world of fact (manifestation, which in its motion, change, difference, *etc.* is dimensionally incommensurable with the unitary dimensional quality of Infinite Substance) by accepting the Positivist reduction of reality to passing time and physical space (i.e., to the world view of Newtonian Physics) and extending this conception of reality to the logical theoretical conclusion that there is *no Truth*. Rather than illustrating the perversity of the Positivist attempt to impute the Order of Truth (Infinite Substance) to manifestation through domination of difference by reviving sensitivity to the reality and epistemological role of the Infinite Substance and its Emanations — which is to say problematization of the Modernist reduction of reality to passing time and physical space and of the foundation of reason to fact — and highlighting the dimensional incommensurability of Infinite Substance and its Emanations (i.e., of infinite-unity) with the change, motion, difference, *etc.* (the multiplicity) of finite manifestation, Postmodernism instead simply accepted the Modernist reduction of reality to passing time and physical space and took it to its logical, nihilist conclusion that *there is no truth*.

In the framework of this study we can argue that Postmodernism accepted the hegemonic essence of Modernity that undergirds Positivism. In so doing, and in symptoms of Postmodernism like obfuscating aversion to any form of generalization (clearly manifest in Aihwa Ong's visceral<sup>6</sup> aversion to the term hegemony) and discernment (clearly manifest in the (anti)critique (Noys, 2014) of Bruno Latour), Postmodernism can be seen as attempting to axiomatically dominate unity out of difference and can thus be understood as a countervailing force to Positivism that rises from the same hegemonic essence as Positivism. In its seemingly autonomous identity and articulation by the same hegemonic essence as Positivism, Postmodernism can be understood as forming a dialectical-hegemonic relationship with Positivism that ensures the sustention of Modernism's hegemonic essence (in this case the reduction of reality to the world of Newtonian

Physics).

## Positivist Modernism

### Positivist 'High Modernity'

James Scott's discussion of High Modernist Planning illustrates an archetypally Positivist manifestation of the Modernist world view. Scott defines High Modernism as:

—A strong ... version of the beliefs in scientific and technological progress that were associated with industrialization. ... At its center was a supreme self-confidence about continued linear progress, the development of scientific and technical knowledge, the expansion of production, the rational design of social order, the growing satisfaction of human needs, and, not least, an increasing control over nature commensurate with scientific understanding and natural laws.

Society became an object that the state might manage and transform with a view towards perfecting it," (Scott, 1998, p.89).

In the High Modernity of positivist planning society is to be organized by institutions that are typified by —hierarchy, discipline, regimentation, strict order, rational planning, [and] a geometric environment" (Scott, 1998, p.195). Other constituents include: dogmatic atheism (whose basic axiom is the reduction of reality to passing time and physical space); social ethics articulated by —the cult of technology and science"; —time consciousness, efficient work habits, and clock-driven routine"<sup>7</sup> (Scott, 1998, p.195). —the organizers described it in rational symmetrical terms, in the mathematical language of planning, control figures, statistics, projections and precise commands," (Scott, 1998, p. 196; Sites, 1989). We argue the practices of Positivist High Modernity rise from Modernism's reduction of reality, meaning, truth, ontological dependence, etc. to the material world of passing time and physical space (as well as the nihilism necessitated therein). As such, Positivist High Modernity can be described (in essence) as the attempt to create a unified order in manifestation through domination of difference that is rendered possible by axiomatic relegation of Infinite Substance, its Emanations and thus the implicit order of manifestation to the sphere of unreality, unreason and madness and the subsequent neces-

<sup>6</sup> We audited Ong's graduate anthropology seminar at UC Berkeley and noticed that she had a distinct physical and emotive reaction to the term hegemony...

<sup>7</sup> See Foucault, *Discipline and Punish* for a discussion of domination by time in Modernity.

sity of creating (rather than actualizing) order derived therein.<sup>8</sup>

### The River

Dunaway's reading of Lorentz's *The River* provides a robust empirical example of 'Positivist High Modernity'. Dunaway frames the film (and New Deal infrastructure planning regimes in general) as an attempt to produce a new norm of socio-political engagement with nature by creating an *image* of humanity as *unified with nature*. Dunaway's reading of the film and its relationship to the 'regionalism' of authors like Louis Mumford works to illustrate the potentials of socializing general publics within new 'world views' in order to create the potential for acceptance and participation in the conceptualization of new systems of social organization (systems of practice) as well as the implicit shortcomings of Positivist, Modernist Paternalism.<sup>9</sup> By "enforcing the ecological idea of the interdependence of humans and nature," Lorentz represents "the land as an interdependent system," (Dunaway, 2008, p. 62). In a similar vein, the Mississippi Valley Committee submitted a report in October of 1934 that "urged readers to consider all resources as interrelated. 'When one strand in the interwoven web... is touched, ...every other strand vibrates'" (Dunaway 2008, p. 64). "Lorentz wanted to reveal the unity in diversity, the often unrecognized connections between different parts of nature..." in order to "reconcile the practical with the poetic, the spiritual with the utilitarian," (Dunaway, 2008, p.76).

Louis Mumford describes the new 'world view' in which the practices of the New Deal were conceived as "committed to engaging with the practical realities of modern life and reformulating a more vital tissue of ideas and symbols," (Dunaway, 2008, p.62; Mumford, 1926, p.114). Mumford also argued "what is needed for political life... is not mere factual knowledge: for this by itself is inert: what is needed are those esthetic and mythic impulses which open up new activities and carve out new themes for construction and contemplation" (Dunaway 2008, p. 78; Mumford, 1938). Mumford and the New Deal Government, then, were clearly aware of the reality that

new ideas, axioms, logics, *etc.* are necessary to create the potential for public acceptance of and participation in new social systems and the practices therein (to make it possible for, in a Foucaultian ethos, the public to 'think the that' of New Deal Modernism and the importance of its environmental infrastructure projects).

While there is some wisdom to be gleaned from Lorentz and Mumford's attempt to create a new 'world view' in which humans and nature are unified and in their sensitivity to the role of ideas in producing a new social order, the conception of unified order implicit in *The River* is distinctly Modernist-Paternalist (and thus negates the potential for producing the harmonic order in human relations with nature it purports to foster).<sup>10</sup> In *The River*, the flooding of the Mississippi was conceived of as *nature's revenge* (as the revenge of the feminine, chaotic other).<sup>11</sup> As such, unity with nature comes in imputing order to nature that is suitable for human interests via modes of technological domination.

Given the Abrahamic-Paternalist 'world view' that was secularized to form the Modernist 'world view' (Barnesmoore, 2016a; Barnesmoore, 2016b)—a 'world view' in which God created the earth and all living things therein with the purpose of being dominated by Man—the best interest of nature is conceived in terms of subservience to human interests. Given the Modernist reduction of reality to passing time and physical space and the necessity of creating order derived therein (Barnesmoore 2016b), unity with nature is conceived in terms of building Dams, Levees, Commercial Farms, *etc.* (i.e., in building technological apparatuses for dominating the forces of nature). In more general terms, by stripping reality of its eternal dimensions—the dimensions of reality from which nature derives its actual, eternal order (i.e., Infinite Substance and its Emanations)—Modernism strips nature of its implicit order and thus views it as a chaotic, feminine other (as difference) to be brought into order through technological domination (Barnesmoore, 2016a; Barnesmoore, 2016b) — "the sublime power of the New Deal controlling the unruly forces of nature," (Dunaway, 2008, p.62). Order in nature is not

<sup>8</sup> See Barnesmoore (2016b) for a discussion of the relationship between the Modernist 'world view' and notions of 'creating order'.

<sup>9</sup> Paternalism is the nexus of bio-reductive traditions that conceive of human nature as evil and thus of social order in terms of hierarchical domination by 'the father'.

<sup>10</sup> See Meng Zi's 2A2 for an illustrative demonstration of Modernist-Paternalism's negation of the potential for producing harmonic order with nature.

<sup>11</sup> As *the wrathful feminine other of the archetypal paternalist imagination*.

to be created through domination.<sup>12</sup>

### Unity for Whom?

Unsurprisingly (given its American cultural context...), *The River* does a very poor job of addressing racial politics in its attempt to construct an image of unified order (Dunaway 2008, p.82). This racism provides a useful lens for understanding the social implications of Modernist-Paternalist notions of unified order as something to be created through the domination of difference. Rather than grappling with the deep racial, gender, class, etc. divisions that have plagued the US from inception, Lorentz attempted to gloss over these issues (to dominate difference) by focusing on the unity of the white nation and its potential for harmony with nature (by creating an image of unity in the US public through dominating racial difference) in only showing images of white folks. In short, the Modernist-Paternalist reduction of reality to passing time and physical space and subsequent conception of order as something to be created through hierarchical domination of difference (Barnesmoore, 2016b; Foucault, 1970) lead Lorentz to create an image of unity (to create order) through reduction of the actual diversity (difference) in the US to the unitary order of White, Christian Nationalism.

### Postmodern Modernism

#### Love and Planning in 'Postmodernity'

Porter's special issue —What's Love Got To Do With It? Illuminations on Loving Attachment in Planning" in *Planning Theory and Practice* provides an example of an admittedly well-intentioned postmodern attempt to critique Positivism that fails to escape the ideas, axioms and logics (world view, hegemonic essence) of Modernism and thus reinforces Modernist Hegemony. Porter *et al.* valiantly attempt to revive sensitivity to love in Planning Theory and Practice, but not without the chagrin of Modernists (mostly positivists) who have, by and large, relegated all forms of intuitive and emotive knowledge to the sphere of unreality, irrationality and madness. Karen Umemoto argues

—Attachment involving human emotion is often seen as problematic by many in academia who frown upon emotional bonding between a researcher and

subjects of research, assuming that it bars our ability to seek an objective understanding of phenomena. Loving attachment involving our social identity is especially seen to have a corrosive effect on critical analysis, as it is assumed we can go native and lose the ability to speak from an unbiased perspective.... We in fact can substantially enrich our understanding of planning by taking advantage of the unique insights that loving attachment to people and places of our research can yield, knowing there are moral and perspectival challenges to address," (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p.595).

Loving attachment is useful for planning, if we may paraphrase Umemoto's argument, in its capacity to unify us with (render us as intimate with) people and places, and thus to, in so doing, intuitively *feel* their truth and manifest ~~the~~ love in which high intuition supplements knowledge, and arouses [one's] own fullest intensity of expression, to call forth the latent but not less vital possibilities [at hand]," (Geddes, 1915, p. 397)—~~or~~ empathic attachment to people and places may inform our multiple senses and give us a better feel not only for what thoughts might be traveling through the minds of people but also what they may feel in their guts," (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p. 598). Put in more traditional philosophical terms, loving attachment allows individuals to bring emotions (passions) enlivened by rational intuition to bear in development of Planning Theory and Practice. Lisa Bates and Marisa Zapata make an argument similar to Umemoto's concerning the usefulness of love in planning. —oving attachment to our racial/ethnic heritage communities aims to produce knowledge that is emancipatory for communities and transformative for planning practice. Love energizes our work," (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p.599).

Umemoto, Bates and Zapata are right in pointing to the epistemological importance of love for Planning Theory and Practice, but the postmodern understanding of emotive-intuitive knowledge (of feelings and intuition) as nothing more than *subjective belief* (i.e., in terms that ignore their potential connection with the uncreated) negates the potential for counter-hegemonic or revolutionary outcomes in regards to Modernity as a whole. While Umemoto's observations concerning positivist relegation of love and other emotions to the sphere of irrationality in of their sub-

<sup>12</sup> See Barnesmoore (2016a) and Zhuang Zi's story of the bell stand maker therein for a view of order in nature as implicit and the human role in actualizing that implicit order.

jective bias' and the subsequent evisceration of intuitive-emotive forms of knowledge from the sphere of truth are elucidating (Porter *et al.*, 2012) correct and indeed revolutionary, her response of attempting to legitimate the subjective' within the nihilism of the Modernist world view (i.e., in a model that accepts feelings and intuition as opposed to objectivity) rather than arguing that the feelings and intuition of the subject (when enlivened by a subject that is resonant with the uncreated) are an elevated mode of knowing that gives us a perspective on Truth that is (as we see below) inaccessible through the materially rational (peripatetic) mind is counter-revolutionary and allows her argument to fall into a dialectical-hegemonic relationship with Positivist-Modernity .

Returning to our central argument, before we can aptly rationalize necessary social changes like the integration of intuition and emotions like love into planning theory and practice, we must first transcend the Modernist hegemonic essence lest our rationalizations for the use of love and intuition in planning (like Umemoto's above) reinforce the world view' that produced the hegemonic regime we purport to challenge. Umemoto's rationalization can be understood as akin to attempts at removing weeds' from the garden by only pulling out the *stalk* (practical') part of the plant and leaving the root (world view') behind; if the root (ideas, axioms and logics, hegemonic essence, world view') remains, a new, seemingly autonomous, stalk will grow from the old root. In other words, if we only pull the stalk of positivism and leave its root (its hegemonic essence of ideas, logics and assumptions) to form the foundation of critiques like postmodernism we will continue to produce seemingly autonomous stalks that actually reinforce the root of the problem that is Modernity. There is no counter-hegemonic or revolutionary potential if our challenges to *'the system'* rise from the same hegemonic essence as *'the system'*.

### **Intellectual Love and Planning**

—Possibly, in our intuitive perceptions, which may be truer than our science and less impeded by words than our philosophies, we realize the indivisibility of the earth — its soil, mountains, rivers, forests, climate, plants, and animals, and respect it collectively not only as a useful servant but as a living being, vastly less alive than ourselves in degree, but vastly greater than ourselves in time and space — a being that was old when the morning stars sang together, and when the

last of us has been gathered unto his fathers, will still be young,"(Leopold, 1949, p.95).

—Aldo Leopold

The above attempts to rationalize the value of love and other emotions in Planning Theory and Practice — in revitalizing the importance and meaning of subjective difference through denying Truth altogether rather than reasserting the connection between rational intuition, emotion and Truth — simply accept the Modernist hegemonic essence (its reduction of reality to passing time and physical space, its reduction of humanity to discrete, biological individuals, its reduction of mind to matter therein and its reduction of the potentials for social order to hierarchical domination therein) like other Postmodern (anti)Critiques' (Noys, 2014). Postmodern (anti)Critiques are incommensurable with the potential for counter-hegemonic or revolutionary outcomes against Modernism and indeed have further compounded the hegemonic dominance of Modernism by sealing the breach in hegemony caused by the fall of Positivism from a seemingly autonomous perspective that rises from the same Modernist hegemonic essence as Positivism. Rather than accepting the implicit nihilism of the Modernist World View', we must argue for the importance of love and other emotions in Planning Theory and Practice from a world view' that recalls the relationship between rational intuition, emotion and Truth.

The true value of rationally enlivened love and other emotions (of the rational intuition) as an epistemological foundation for Planning Theory and Practice comes in allowing humans to (at least to some degree) *transcend subjective limitations*. This true value of rational intuition can only be known when we escape the hegemonic essence (ideas, axioms and logics) of Modernity and *remember* the Infinite Substance and its Emanations, their role as the eternal foundation for Truth (i.e., the true foundation of objectivity), the nature of humanity in relationship to infinite substance (which transcends the discrete, biological conception of humanity that undergirds Modernity) and the true relationship between mind' (consciousness) and matter therein. In intellectual love, and in rationally enlivened, emotive modes of being and knowing more generally, our intimacy with Infinite Substance and its Emanations allows us to *feel* the Truth of a situation (in more precise terms feel the sympathy of manifestation with the Truth it reflects in motion) in a manner

that transcends the sensory limitations of material rationality (of the peripatetic mind).<sup>13</sup> In short, when viewed from a perspective outside the Modernist ‘world view’ (hegemonic essence), the value of love and other emotions (when rationally enlivened by intimacy with the Infinite Substance) comes in transcending rather than simply validating the ephemeral reality of the subjective...<sup>14</sup> The value of love and other emotions cannot be restricted to the *undeniably important* problematization Positivist conceptions of Truth and denial-domination of subjective realities therein if we wish to revolt against Modernity.

Rational Intuition is valuable for Planning Theory and Practice because it is *more true, more real, more objective, etc.* than the ‘objective’ factual knowledge of positivism and the peripatetic mind (the mind of motion, linearity, factual accumulation, etc., which is to say ‘the maelstrom’ of classical mythology). Valorization of intuition as ‘subjective’ obfuscates the potential Truth of rational intuition (which derives its Truth in trending towards *a-subjective sympathy with the uncreated...*) and thus relegates intuition and other forms of emotive knowledge to the nihilism of Modernity. To aptly argue for the importance of loving-rational intuition in Planning Theory and Practice, then, we must develop (remember...) a ‘world view’ in which Infinite Substance and its Emanations are real and in which intuition and other modes of emotive knowledge have the potential for Truth when enlivened by intimacy with the resonance of Infinite Substance and its Emanations, which is to say the ‘simplest and most universal things’ of Descartes Rationalism. We must *remember* an epistemological framework in which Truth is assigned to rational intuition rather than following Umemoto in arguing for the importance of emotive-intuitive epistemology within the nihilistic hegemonic essence of Modernism where the emotive-intuitive node of our mind is reduced to subjective ‘belief’. We must grow our episte-

mology from a *new root* of ideas, axioms and logics and thus consciously evolve beyond the social woes of Modernity.

To put this argument in different terms, on the one hand the Modernist ‘world view’ precludes the potential for Eternal Truth (through relegating the eternal dimensions of reality to the sphere of unreality), and on the other hand the value of intuition, love and other emotions for planning lies precisely in their relationship to Eternal Truth (in facilitating our capacity to harmonize Truth with fact, form with manifestation, the infinite with the finite, *etc.*). As such, we cannot aptly argue for the importance of intuition, love and other emotions in planning practice from the perspective of the Modernist ‘world view’ (which requires that we reduce loving intuition-emotion to the nihilist, matter before mind hegemonic essence of Modernism and thus to a subjective belief whose cause and being are presumed to be contained within matter).

#### Practice-Theory Dogma

Beyond reduction of love and other emotions to subjective belief, the Postmodern acceptance of the Modernist hegemonic essence leads to conceptions of love (like all phenomena...) in terms of practice; rather than a state of being, an aeonian form or an energy with its own self-subsistent reality, love is reduced to the practices by which it manifests (i.e., the reduction of the force and form of attraction to the actual practice of atoms bonding). For example, Michelle Kondo (following bell hooks) presents a vision of love as ‘ethical praxis’ in planning. In this vision, love is rendered as ethical practice (as ‘—a value and way of being’) through three tenets: (1) love is without fear, (2) living by a love ethic requires the cultivation of awareness, and ability to critically examine one’s actions, and (3) love is a process rather than an ideal state.” (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p.603). In each tenet (and in viewing love as a value and way of being), love is understood as *practice* (i.e., mind is reduced to matter and emotional phenomena like love are stripped of their truth ‘beyond’ the linear temporal dimensional quality of manifestation in passing time and physical space...). While one dimension of love is surely becoming in manifestation, its most essential dimension lies in being (in its ‘ideal state’ that is reflected into motion to form the facts of the process by which love becomes manifest). Love in (post)Modernity is no longer a mode of being in Truth (which is to say

<sup>13</sup> Again, Foucault’s discourse on knowledge as resemblance in *The Order of Things* and the Daoist term ‘Wu Wei’ are illustrative.

<sup>14</sup> We should note that this is not a call for simply dismissing the importance of the subjective as understood by Porter *et al.* People’s individual perspective on the truth is, if nothing else, very real for them, and therefore has a distinct effect on the ways in which individuals experience the world; as such, simply ignoring the subjective is a sure route to cruelty. See the final battle (where Galbatorix is defeated by remorse brought on by the memory of the world seen through the subjective lens of a small and to Galbatorix’s mind, insignificant bird) in the Christopher Paolini’s *Inheritance Cycle* for an imagistic representation of the role of ignoring subjective truth in the production of cruelty.

that love is no longer intimacy with the Infinite Substance and its Emanations and subsequent transcendence of illusions concerning the absolute nature of discrete, biological, individual being we experience through our fourth dimensional senses) or a self-subsistent force; instead, love has been reduced to its manifestation (to its expression in practice) and thus stripped of the eternal, idyllic dimensional quality that allows it to form an epistemological lens into Truth.<sup>15</sup>

Annalise Fonza similarly argues that our understanding of love and attachment must rise through historical progression of “the nitty-gritty,” (Porter *et al.*, 2012, p.614). Again love and emotive forms of knowledge are reduced to the materialist terms necessitated by the hegemonic essence of Modernity. In reality reduced to passing time and physical space love must rise as a function of the historical development of intersubjective meaning — as nothing is thus thought to exist beyond history, all causes must therefore lie within history. This argument, however, is belied by the reality that (as Nietzsche so aptly noted) “only that which has no history is definable” because static Truth that is therefore amenable to static definition is necessarily without motion-time or, thus, ‘history’ (Nietzsche 2009, 516). While difference is ‘saved’ from the violent domination of difference implicit in the Fascist-Positivist-Modernist Project (we agree with Fonza that theory, ideology and unity have surely been weaponized by white, paternalist interests), the Eternal Truth that underlies reality (Infinite Substance and its Emanations) remains lost and the necessary nihilism of Modernism is reified in being rendered banally invisible by conflict between seemingly autonomous ‘camps’ and the dialectical-hegemonic processes unleashed therein...

## Conclusions

### Art and Intuition in Planning

Sir Patrick Geddes (1915) expounds a theory of Love and Intuition in Planning that transcends the positivist-fascist attempt to impose form (of practice, be it political, agricultural, environmental, *etc.*) upon environment without regard for context and rationalizes the importance of love and intuition for Planning without

accepting the Modernist Hegemonic Essence and thus reducing love and intuition to purely bio-subjective phenomenon:

—Each valid scheme should and must embody the full utilization of its local and regional conditions, and be the expression of local and of regional personality. ‘Local character’ is thus no mere accidental old-world quaintness, as its mimics think and say. It is attained only in course of adequate grasp and treatment of the whole environment, and in active *sympathy* with the essential and characteristic life of the place concerned. Each place has a true personality [(an essence)]; and with this shows some unique elements — a personality too much asleep it may be, but which it is the task of the planner, as master-artist, to awaken. And only he can do this who is in love and at home with his subject — truly in love and fully at home — the love in which high intuition supplements knowledge, and arouses his own fullest intensity of expression, to call forth the *latent* but not less vital possibilities before him,” (Geddes, 1915, p.396).

Manifestation is (in the words of a dear friend) ‘a dance between the finite and the infinite’, between creation and the uncreated, and it is only in the silence of loving intuition that we may come to know this dance from the perspective of its ‘eternal root’ (Infinite Substance and its Emanations). It is only in loving intimacy with environment that we can *see* resemblance as convenience, as it is only in loving intimacy with the uncreated that we can *see* resemblance as emulation, and it is only through *intuition* (made possible by the rational analogies drawn between convenience and emulation) that we can come into sympathy with (to *feel*) the eternal truth of manifestation in a single, silent movement of the mind (Foucault, 1970). In short, instead of attempting to *create* an image of unity through dominating difference or reducing reality to multiplicity and denying essentialism altogether, we must instead remember (and thus catalyze actualization of our latent potential for intimacy with) the Infinite Substance and its Emanations so that we may feel the eternal truth of manifestation and thus ‘plan a society’ (and our practices therein) that works to optimize the sympathy of manifestation with the uncreated Truth it reflects.

Geddes also makes the important note that modernist science is “too static and analytic to come in touch with art” and that the artist “... artistic virtues lay in expression of the vital emotions, ideals, and

<sup>15</sup> This movement can be understood as equivalent to reducing ‘force’ (a relatively ‘eternal’ dimension of manifestation) to its expression in an individual’s motions (a rather ephemeral dimension of manifestation...).

ideas of [the] day”; the artist’s —ask [is] to express the best of his own age,” (Geddes, 1915, p.398). We argue that the incommensurability of ‘Modernist Science’ (e.g., Social Science) with art comes precisely in the reduction of reality to the world of motion, passing time and physical space (which is to say denial of art’s eternal foundation, the Infinite Substance and its Emanations) that forms the root of the Modernist Hegemonic Essence. Restoring the epistemological potentials implicit in intellectual love and intuition to Planning Theory and Practice (and the Social Sciences more generally) can, then, be understood as reviving artistic ethos in Planning Theory and Practice—we must eschew the mechanical sociopathy of the peripatetic mind as divorced from loving intuition and the reduction of research to the accumulation, categorization and dissemination of facts therein and instead seek to engage readers with theories, symbols, metaphors, etc. that allow for transcendence of irrationality and indoctrination through conscious evolution (i.e., through remembrance-cultivation of intimacy with the dimension of self that is Self, the Infinite Substance and its Emanations). Recalling Ouspensky’s words above, —During the time when psychology was connected with philosophy and religion it also existed in the form of Art. Poetry, Drama, Sculpture, Dancing, even Architecture, were means for transmitting psychological knowledge” (Ouspensky, 1951, p. 5). We must (as an academy and as a society) return to an artistic ethos (in its traditional mode as a catalyst for conscious evolution) in development and dissemination of academic theory and practice, university teaching, public educational curriculum, news media discourse, political discourse, etc.

And thus we return to our initial discussion. Consciousness expands and constrains our potentials for action in the material world. Meaningful social reform must come through the evolution of human psychology. The evolution of human psychology can be catalyzed through returning to an artistic ethos in the development and dissemination of Social Science Theory and Practice. Critics might posit this as an idealists project, and indeed it is, as —dealism and matter of fact are ... not sundered, but inseparable, as our daily steps are guided by ideals of direction” (Geddes, 1915, p. vii).

### **Desire, Reason and the Goodness of Human Nature**

The biological man of Modernity, stripped of soul and

the potential for conscious evolution, has come to be known as an evil, self-serving being (Barnesmoore, 2016a). Love and community are reduced to a self-centered desire for biological survival (Haraway, 1989). Desire is evil, and order is to be created through the domination of desire by peripatetic reason; social order, civilization, progress and the many fantasies of Liberal Modernity — which is to say our escape from the Modernist Garden of Eden — are to be created through domination of our biologically derived desire for survival (Barnesmoore, 2016b). As Nature is conceived as evil, a chaotic feminine other to be brought into order through forceful domination, so too is human nature reduced to the ‘chaotic evil’ of competitive biological desire. This article endeavors to transcend the biocentrist social ontology (world view) of Modernity and its ravenous biological Man in order to rediscover (to remember) the goodness of Human Nature, of Terrestrial Nature, the implicit order of the uncreated (i.e. Infinite Substance and its Emanations) therein and the road to its actualization — we seek to remember and actualize rather than to create order.

Blake’s *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* is a dance between reason and desire. Shedding the paternalist desire to dominate desire with reason, to ‘create order’ through hierarchical domination, Blake turns to a unified vision of desire as the fire of reason — desire as what Meng Zi called ‘sprouts of goodness’ (Blake, 1790; Zi, 2016). In Blake’s words, —Those who restrain Desire, do so because theirs is weak enough to be restrained; and the restrainer or Reason usurps its place & governs the unwilling. And being restrained it by degrees becomes passive till by degrees it becomes only the shadow of desire,” (Blake, 1790, p.5)

—I indeed appeared to reason that desire had been cast out, but the Devil’s account is that Messiah fell & formed a heaven with what he stole from the Abyss. This is strewn in the Gospel, where he prays to the father to send the comforter or Desire that Reason may have ideas to build on...” (Blake, 1790, p.5)

In the words of Meng Zi

—What I mean by saying [human nature] is good is that there is that in our nature which is spontaneously part of us and can become good. The fact that we can become bad is not a defect in our natural endowment. All men possess a sense of commiseration; all

men possess a sense of shame; all men possess a sense of respect; all men possess a sense of right and wrong. The sense of commiseration is the seed of humanity; the sense of shame is the seed of righteousness; the sense of respect is the seed of ritual; the sense of right and wrong is the seed of wisdom. Thus humanity, righteousness, ritual, and wisdom are not welded to us from outside. We possess them inherently; it is simply that we do not focus our minds on them. This is the meaning of the saying, ‘Seek for it and you will get it; let it go and you will lose it.’ The reason why some men are twice as good as others — or five or countless times better — is simply that some men do not exhaust their endowment to the full. The Poetry says:

Tian gave birth to the teeming people,  
For everything there is a norm.  
The constant for people, within their grasp,  
Is love of beautiful virtue’s form.

Confucius said, ‘The man who wrote this poem certainly understood the Dao!’ Thus for every type of thing there is a norm; that is why the constant that lies within people’s grasp is inherently a love of beautiful virtue.’ (Zi, 2016, p.109)

We come to know the constants of Tian, of heaven,

which is to say the infinite substance and its emanations, through desire (through silence and the climax of motion to be found therein — through feeling from nothingness). In the Foucault’s (1970) rendition of knowledge as resemblance, we feel the sympathy of manifestation with this uncreated order. Indeed, as the climax of motion is desire, so too is the climax of silence motion. We find light in the darkness through the flame of reason as it shines through the lamp of reason.

The Way of the Golden Flower reminds us:

—Everyone already has the lamp of mind, but it is necessary to light it so that it shines; then this is immortality.... Cognition is a function of mind, empty silence is the substance of mind.... Radiant light is the function of mind, empty silence is the substance of mind. If there is empty silence without radiant light, the silence is not true silence, the emptiness is not true emptiness—it is just a ghost cave.” (Cleary, 1991, p.66).

## Conflict of interest

The authors declare no potential conflict of interest with respect to the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

## References

- Akkerman, A. (2001). Urban planning in the founding of Cartesian thought. *Philosophy & Geography*, 4(2), 141–167.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10903770124810>
- Barnesmoore, L. R. & Wyly, E. K. (2016) *Media Imaginations of the City*. In Press.
- Barnesmoore, L. R. (2015). *Datascope and Dimensional Incommensurability in the History of Assemblages*, Association of American Geographers 111<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting, Chicago.
- Barnesmoore, L. R. (2016a). Conscious vs. mechanical evolution: transcending biocentrist social ontologies. *Environment and Social Psychology*, 1(2), 83–93.
- Barnesmoore, L. R. (2016b). *Nomad explorations v 2.1 : Genesis, Eden and the grail in modernity* (Master’s thesis). University of British Columbia, Canada  
<https://open.library.ubc.ca/cIRcle/collections/ubctheses/24/items/1.0308785>
- Bennett, J. (2004). The force of things: Steps towards an ecology of matter. *Political Theory*, 32(3), 347–372.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0090591703260853>
- Blake, W. (1790). *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.
- Bourgeault, C. (2009). *The Wisdom Way of Knowing: Reclaiming an Ancient Tradition to Awaken the Heart*, John Wiley & Sons, June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2016.  
<http://ecumenicus.blogspot.ca/2011/04/acornology.html>
- Brenner, N., Peck, J. & Theodore, N. (2010). Variegated neoliberalization: Geographies, modalities, pathways. *Global Networks*, 10(2), 182–222.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0374.2009.00277.x>
- Burnett, R. E. (2016). *Remotely Piloted Airborne Systems (RPAS), Ubiquitous Networks, and New Forms of Command and Control in National Security and Civilian Operational Spaces*, ISA Annual Conference 2016, Atlanta.  
<http://web.isanet.org/Web/Conferences/Atlanta%202016/Archive/34a88835-6cfb-4761-8663-824e878a3a11.pdf>
- Cleary, T. (1991). *The Secret of the Golden Flower*. Harper: San Francisco.

- De Chardin, P. T. (1965). *The Phenomenon of Man*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Descartes, R. (2002). *Meditations on First Philosophy*, (Bennett, Trans.), viewed July 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016.  
<http://www.vahidnab.com/med.pdf>
- Descartes, R. (2010). *The Passions of the Soul*, (Bennett, Trans.), viewed July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2016  
<http://www.earlymoderntexts.com/pdfs/descartes1649.pdf>
- Dunaway, F. (2008). *Natural Visions: The Power of Images in American Environmental Reform*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2006). *The History of Madness*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage.
- Geddes, P. Sir, (1915). *Cities in Evolution: an Introduction to the Town Planning Movement and to the Study of Civics*. London: Williams & Norgate.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci: Ed. and Transl. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell-Smith*. Nowell-Smith, G. & Hoare, Q. (Eds). International Publishers.
- Hall, S. (1988) The toad in the garden: Thatcher among the theorists. In Nelson, C. & Grossberg, L. (Eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, (p.55). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Haraway, D. (1989). *Primate Visions*. New York: Routledge.
- Krieger, M. H. (1995). What does Jerusalem have to do with Athens? Roles for the humanities in planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 14, 217–221.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0739456X9501400312>
- Latour, B. (1993). *The Pasteurization of France*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Leopold, A. (1949). *A Sand County Almanac: And Sketches Here and There*. Oxford University Press.
- Levit, G. S. (2000). The biosphere and the noosphere theories of VI Vernadsky and P. Teilhard de Chardin: A methodological essay. *Archives Internationales d'histoire Des Sciences*, 50(144), 160–177.
- Mitchell, T. (2002). *Rule of Experts: Egypt, Techno-politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Mumford, L. (1926). *The Golden Day*. W. W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Mumford, L. (1938). *The Culture of Cities*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Nadler, S. (2013). *Baruch Spinoza, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2013 Edition, In Zalta, E. N. (Ed.),  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/spinoza/>
- Nasr, S. H. (1996). *Religion and the Order of Nature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Needleman, J. (2003). *Lost Christianity*. Penguin.
- Nicoll, M. (1998) *Living Time*. Utrecht: Eureka Editions.
- Nietzsche, F. (2009) *Basic Writings of Nietzsche*, Gay, P. (Ed.), Random House Publishing Group.
- Noys, B. 2011, *The Discrete Charm of Bruno Latour, or the Critique of 'Anti-Critique'*, presented at the Center for Critical Theory, University of Nottingham.
- Noys, B. (2014). The discreet charm of Bruno Latour. In *(Mis)readings of Marx in Continental Philosophy*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, (p.195–210).
- Ong, A.(2007). Neoliberalism as a mobile technology. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 32(1), 3–8.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2007.00234.x>
- Ong, A. & Collier, S. J. (Eds.). (2008). *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics, and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ouspensky, P. D. (2005). *Tertium Organum*. Cosimo Inc.
- Paden, R. (2001). The two professions of Hippodamus of Miletus. *Philosophy & Geography*, 4(1), 25–48.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10903770124644>
- Peck, J. (2010). *Constructions of neoliberal reason*. OUP Oxford.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199580576.001.0001>
- Peck, J. (2016). The Urban Studies Journal Annual Lecture: Transatlantic City, Association of American Geographers Annual Convention 2016, San Francisco.
- Porter, L., Sandercock, L., Umemoto, K., Umemoto, K., Bates, L. K. *et al.*, (2012). What's love got to do with it? Illuminations on loving attachment in planning. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 13(4), 593–627.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2012.731210>
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Silverman, A. (2014). *Plato's middle period metaphysics and epistemology*, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Zalta, E. N. (Ed.), viewed August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2016

<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/plato-metaphysics/>

Stites, R. (1989). *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zi, M. (2016). *The Meng Zi*, (Eno, R., Trans.), viewed August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

<http://www.indiana.edu/~p374/Mengzi.pdf>

Zi, Z. (1968). *The Complete Works of Chuang Tzu*, (Watson, B., Trans.), Columbia University Press.

Zi, Z. (2004). *The Way of Chuang Tzu*, trans. (Merton, T., Trans.), Shambhala Publications.