



Utopia Without Labels: Ethics, Identity, and Global Justice

Yi He*

University of Sussex, UK

*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.

Abstract: *This essay explores the concept of utopia in the contemporary social context, focusing on the interplay between social structure, gender equality, and individual identity. Drawing on historical perspectives and global case studies, this research attempts to construct a new social system that promotes equity, sustainability, and inclusion. Through a multidisciplinary synthesis, this paper also identifies the challenges and opportunities in building an equitable future, focusing particularly on the role of resource allocation and cultural values. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of how utopian ideals can guide social reform and global cooperation.*

Keywords: Social; People; Utopia; Society; Gender; System, Identity; Global; Future; Equality; Resources.

Cited as: He, Y. (2025). Utopia Without Labels: Ethics, Identity, and Global Justice. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 7–10. Retrieved from <https://woodyinternational.com/index.php/jtphss/article/view/300>

1. Introduction

Utopia is often regarded as an ideal country that exists in the ultimate fantasy of mankind. Although it seems to be an unattainable pursuit in the current social productivity, the sparks of thought that collide on the road to pursue it are bright enough. A hypothetical utopia seems to provide humans with moral guidance for the future. This article will try to build a society based on “de-identification” — a future world that transcends gender, physiological roles and fixed social labels, and further emphasizes the unity of individual freedom and group solidarity. Through deep reforms of institutions and technology, a social concept of “relative equality” rather than absolute egalitarianism will be established. In the next step, the article will also explore the economic structure that this future world should have from a global perspective. Finally, this article will reflect on the ethical contradictions and limitations hidden in this social blueprint, and further infer its infinite possibilities in the future.

2. A De-Labeled Utopia: From the Abolition of Gender to the Fluidity of Social Identity

The concept of utopia originates from people’s yearning and pursuit for a fair, free and happy future. In contemporary society, people’s pursuit of equality and the defense of individual rights, although well-intentioned, often fall into “overcorrection of political correctness”. As criticized by Nancy Fraser, “identity recognition politics” has gradually become a kind of “label compensation” for individuals (Fraser, 2001). Nowadays, there are too many races, genders, classes, and sexual orientations. Humans seem to be labeled one by one. Countless people choose to fight for their labeled social identities and groups with a sense of belonging. For example, in the current LGBTQ + movement, excessive gender division only further weakens the power of the group, and the masses are divided and ruled instead of united. Then this kind of compensatory protection of minority groups under procedural justice will further marginalize and differentiate people, indirectly prompting people to have the idea that “difference is privilege”, and can only lead to “reverse discrimination”. I believe that true equality should often be the public’s true acceptance of people with differences after labeling is removed.

The utopia I envision will first promote the abolition of the current symbolic gender system. For example, referring to Judith Butler’s theory of “gender performativity” (Butler, 1990), gender should not be completely determined by biology, but a behavioral process repeatedly constructed by society. Therefore, we can try to remove gender markers from the education system and cultural system, and then use the law to assist. For example: establish gender-neutral toilets, promote the use of neutral pronouns in public contexts, and delete gender role narratives

from the education system (for example: the practice of the Swedish “Egalia” kindergarten), etc.

At the same time, medicine and biotechnology will also provide significant structural support for gender equality. For example, external uterine technology (ectogenesis) will further promote fertility from biological sex (Cavalieri, 2018). This is the liberation of women’s social responsibility for childbirth and further reshapes the division of labor in society. At the same time, combining in vitro embryo cultivation and gene editing technology can help us establish a “socialized childcare mechanism” in which children will be raised by a matched “non-blood caregiver community” for socialized care. This will help weaken the role of family and gender in social reproduction. But at the same time, gene editing technology should be strictly regulated and can be used to prevent and treat congenital diseases, but it should never be overly abused.

In addition, I believe that in this utopia, personal identity will no longer be determined by innate physiology, culture or ethnicity, but will be reshaped in the process of self-construction and social choice based on interests, moral concepts and public participation. As described by Amartya Sen in *Identity and Violence*, if people are simplified into a single identity, violence is likely to occur (Sen, 2006). Therefore, for the future utopia, it should be advocated that under the system, individuals should be guaranteed the freedom to have multiple and switch identities at any time.

3. Relative Equality: Just Distribution Should Be Demand-Oriented

True justice is not that everyone has the same resources, but that everyone can get support “just enough to climb over the wall in front of him”. People should be able to see the scenery behind the box equally. However, under formal equality, perhaps everyone should be given the same height box, while under substantive equality, people with different needs should be provided with boxes of different heights so that everyone can see the same scenery. This concept is very consistent with John Rawls’s “difference principle”, that is, institutional inequality must also benefit the most vulnerable (Rawls, 1971).

And the assistance of technology can further improve and realize this dynamic resource allocation mechanism. Drawing on Gustafson’s reconstruction of utilitarian ethics (Gustafson, 2013), we should build a distribution algorithm based on “maximizing human welfare” rather than maximizing economy and profit. At the same time, we should also pay attention to the warning raised by Michael Sandel in *The Tyranny of Merit: Algorithms should never become a new moral elitism* (Sandel, 2020).

When it comes to the distribution of basic resources, such as housing, medical care, education, etc., people should be unconditionally guaranteed in the system, and these should be provided by public institutions recognized by all, and the resources of the institutions themselves should be shared by all. As for creative industries or artistic resources, the maximum degree of freedom of individuals should be retained. For example, a very interesting dystopian Calhoun’s “Universe 25 Experiment” warns: when a society has sufficient resources but lacks social structure and meaning mechanism, it may collapse (Calhoun, 1973; Ramsden & Adams, 2009). In the utopian vision of the future, which should have almost unlimited resources, perhaps humans need sufficient social structure and meaning support to avoid nihilism.

4. Economic Utopia Design from a Global Perspective

A true utopia should not be limited by national borders, but should also propose an adaptive repair mechanism for today’s global structural inequality.

In the utopian society that represents future expectations, the economic system should not be based on competitive growth and resource plunder. As mentioned above, it should perhaps turn to a collaborative distribution structure based on human dignity and combined with ecological environmental constraints. This idea is borrowed from the “Donut Economics” theory proposed by economist Kate Raworth (Raworth, 2017). It means that the human economy should operate within a double boundary — the inner ring should guarantee the basic needs of all people, while the outer ring is used to limit the critical point of ecological disasters. This framework is consistent with the concept of “relative equality” mentioned above, and while setting the minimum living bottom line, it can also achieve distribution on demand and dynamic adjustment.

At the same time, technology is the basic support of this structure. Through blockchain and AI, a “Global Resource

Dashboard” (GRD) can be built. This dashboard allows countries to report the inventory of basic resources such as energy, food, weapons, and medical care in real time. Perhaps further attempts can be made to use quantum computing to optimize the global distribution path. For example, in 2023, the European Union tried to use the AI system to dynamically dispatch natural gas to alleviate the energy crisis caused by the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. At that time, if it was found that the per capita calorie intake of a country was less than 2,000 calories, the global food reserve would provide automatic assistance fairly.

At the same time, this concept of “dynamic collaborative utopia” has a precedent of micro-experiments in reality. For example, Iceland refused to repay its foreign debt through a referendum after the 2008 financial crisis, and the result was to transform fisheries and geothermal resources into a public trust asset, and these revenues would be used by all people. This is a kind of “reconstruction of anti-capitalism”, and the effect of this is significant. At that time, Iceland’s Gini coefficient was once reduced from 0.45 to 0.25, which was undoubtedly conducive to the improvement of social security. However, such success is closely related to ethnic homogeneity, which may be difficult to replicate in today’s global diversified environment.

Another real case that already exists is in Kerala, India, where more than 90% of dairy production is controlled by a women’s cooperative, and the profits generated are used for primary health care and education. This undoubtedly breaks the traditional gender power structure, and this economic system C itself is based on a cooperative-like federal system. This is also a manifestation of the feasibility of de-labeling division of labor and local small-scale autonomy. In addition, this move has other important benefits, that is, they use the local settlement currency “Kerala Rupee”, which may be conducive to getting rid of the hegemony of the US dollar to a certain extent at the time. This can be an interesting prototype of a centralized and decentralized sharing economy model.

However, the global economic utopia must come with a price. Under the mandatory ethnic integration regulations, achieving a multi-ethnic balance in corporate boards may promote economic growth and reconciliation between different cultures. But behind this “structural inclusion” there is also controversy that may sacrifice political freedom. These choices remind us that in a utopian economic system, freedom and justice, efficiency and ethics need to always maintain a dynamic balance.

5. Balancing Ethical Contradictions and the Limits of Utopia

Although this article seems to describe a de-labeled, equal and open ideal future society, all utopian designs will always have inevitable moral paradoxes. As Sandel (2012) warned us, true justice is absolutely impossible to be directly and correctly set like a computer program. It depends on the evolution and improvement of continuous value discussions between people.

At the same time, I think the complete removal of identity may also bring new problems. For example, Sen once pointed out that if personal identity is completely erased, individuals may inevitably fall into a state of cultural aphasia (Sen, 2006). Another problem comes from the “Universe 25” experiment that seems to reveal the fate of utopia. Even when society approaches perfection, when people feel a lack of challenges and missions, it is very likely to induce people to fall into nihilism and the decline and collapse of civilization. Therefore, perhaps a truly ideal society should retain space for imperfections, such as reasonable public debates, evolving ethical conflicts, and even new natural disasters, which can help rebuild the human community and maintain people’s sense of meaning and moral growth. Most importantly, perhaps the evolving thoughts and desires of human beings are inherently contradictory to a static and unadjusted society. Perhaps people will never be able to achieve the goal of utopia, and perhaps “perfection” is destined to be contrary to the nature of human society.

References

- [1] Butler, J., (1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- [2] Calhoun, J.B., (1973). Death Squared: The Explosive Growth and Demise of a Mouse Population. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 66(1), pp. 80-88.
- [3] Cavalieri, P., (2018). The Ethics of Ectogenesis. *Bioethics*, 32(5), pp. 309-317.
- [4] Fraser, N., (2001). Recognition Without Ethics? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(2-3), pp. 21-42.
- [5] Gustafson, A., (2013). In Defense of a Utilitarian Business Ethics. *Business and Society Review*, 118(3), pp. 325-360.

- [6] Martinez-Alier, J. et al., (2014). Between Activism and Science: Grassroots Concepts for Sustainability. *Journal of Political Ecology*, 21, pp. 19-60.
- [7] Menton, M. et al., (2020). Environmental justice and the SDGs: from synergies to contradictions. *Sustainability Science*, 15, pp. 1621-1636.
- [8] Ramsden, E. and Adams, J., (2009). Escaping the Laboratory: The Rodent Experiments of John B. Calhoun and Their Cultural Influence. *Journal of Social History*, 42(3), pp. 761-795.
- [9] Rawls, J., (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- [10] Sandel, M., (2012). *What Money Can't Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- [11] Li, H. (2024). LGBTQ and Politics: China and Japan Compared. *Trends in Sociology*, 2(2), 1-18.
- [12] Li, H. (2024). The Regime Durability of Communist Power in China: Three Approaches to Examine the Chinese Communist Party. *Trends in Sociology*, 2(2), 36-44.
- [13] Sandel, M., (2020). *The Tyranny of Merit: What's Become of the Common Good?* London: Penguin.
- [14] Sen, A., (2006). *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny*. London: Penguin.
- [15] Held, D., (1995). *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of Woody International Publish Limited and/or the editor(s). Woody International Publish Limited and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.