CHAPTER TWO

THE COMMON GOOD IN PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE AND EGO TRANSCENDENCE FOR THE COMMON GOOD IN PSYCHOLOGICAL LITERATURE

Since this dissertation examines the development of an extraordinary commitment to the common good and illuminates an educative outreach on behalf of the common good, a look at this construct is in order. What exactly is the common good? How is it operationalized? To answer these questions, Chapter Two examines philosophical literature for the dynamic qualities of the common good and traces historical incarnations of the common good from which Pinkerton's commitment and educative outreach emanate.

As mentioned previously, Pinkerton's commitment is extraordinary--fueled by a spirituality that recognizes an interconnectedness of all things. For Pinkerton, this interconnectedness necessitates attention to a global common good as well as a national common good. A unifying vision of interconnectedness often arises from wisdom deep within a person and is a subject of study in the field of transpersonal psychology. So Chapter Two will also examine the literature of transpersonal psychology to better understand the relationship of this inner wisdom to the common good. But, of what benefit is this information to the field of adult education?

Adult Education, Autonomy, and Homonomy

Adult education facilitates the individual's ability to be self-directed in learning and meaning-making in life's experiences. Individuals with this ability are described as autonomous or self-governing, and independent. Autonomous people, Brian Fay says, are free, "able to ordain for themselves the principles by which they live."[1] To facilitate the development of autonomous people is indeed a goal of adult education, but current research citing the need for attention to the common good indicates need for an expanded focus. Fay, as a critical theorist, proposes the idea of collective autonomy which involves a "group of people determining on the basis of rational reflection the sorts of policies and practices it will follow and acting in accordance with them."[2] Michael Welton says Fay includes in collective autonomy the "understanding of true interests and proper goals which are continually reassessed and reestablished as situations change."[3] Collective autonomy takes into account the social aspects of life and necessitates the dialogic practice called for by advocates of the common good. Stubblefield and Keane in their adult education history text present examples of collective autonomy; i.e., the Woman's Club Movement, Woman's Rights, Woman's Suffrage, The National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry, and Knights of Labor among others.[4]

The Sisters of Saint Joseph of Cleveland developed a collective autonomy as a result of self-reflection, theological reflection, discernment through dialogue, and change from a

---

[1] Brian Fay, *Critical Social Science: The Limits of Liberation* (NY: Cornell University Press, 1987), 76; Michael R. Welton, "The Critical Turn in Adult Education Theory," in *In Defense of the Lifeworld*, ed. Michael R. Welton (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 37.
[2] Fay, *Critical Social Science*, 77; Welton, "The Critical Turn," 37.
[3] Welton, "The Critical Turn," 37.
[4] Stubblefield and Keane, *Adult education in the American Experience*, 152-69.

structure-centered living of community to one that is person-centered. These women religious determine their own policies and practices and, to a surprising degree, are not dominated by the institutional church. Collective autonomy, while social in nature and often corrective of hegemonic abuses, could be restrictive in perspective, however, if used only for the benefit of the group irrespective of the larger society. The expanded view of these women religious does not fall into this trap and includes recognition, critique, and work to change systems that constrain or block autonomy for all humans. This work for many of the women and certainly for Pinkerton stems from an homonomous view of creation. An homonomous understanding of life involves an awareness of the interconnectedness of all things. Such awareness expands the idea of collective autonomy and expands a vision of the common good from local or even national understanding to a global perspective. Boucouvalas describes homonomy as "the meaning derived in life by feeling and being parts of greater wholes."[5]

Pinkerton's writing indicates a meaning making that is cognizant of an individual, local, national, and global common good. One sees in Pinkerton's writing awareness of an interconnectedness with all things--an understanding of life that expands from collective autonomy to homonomy. Homonomy, in a sense, builds on collective autonomy, which in turn, builds on the foundation of autonomy, but not in a totally hierarchical sequence. According to Boucouvalas, awareness of and development of self and self in relationships takes place in a more open system of balance, each with its own trajectory.[6] Recall that all learning is continuous – built on previous learning. Pinkerton's ego-transcendent understanding of the common good evolved just as societal interpretations of the common good have evolved over time.

The Common Good

While the common good is based on the importance for the other as always being included in the whole, this concern since antiquity still defies definition. The etymological origin of the word common is the Old French *commun* and Latin *communis* meaning with service "as if serving each other."[7] Determination of the best way to serve each other, however, is tied to social issues and the issues of the times, conditions that indicate a dynamic quality to the common good. The common good changes with social conditions and political issues. In addition to changing social and political issues, evolving spiritual views have affected its operationalizations throughout the centuries. Mortimer Adler explains that the view one takes of one's social nature and one's relation to God affects both an understanding of the common good and one's view of the proper role of the state or government in attaining the common good.[8] In other words, Michael Smith writes, "The ways in which we understand ourselves as persons have a direct bearing on the ways in which we organize ourselves collectively in political communities."[9]

---

[5] Boucouvalas, "The Transpersonal Orientation."
[6] Boucouvalas, "The Transpersonal Self," 7; Boucouvalas, "The Transpersonal Orientation."
[7] Rev. Walter W. Skeat, *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1995), 124.
[8] Mortimer J. Adler, editor in chief, *The Great Ideas: A Syntopicon of Great Books of the Western World*, ed. Mortimer J. Adler and William Gorman (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), II.
[9] Michael Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good in the Aristotelean-Thomistic Tradition* (Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1958), 2.

Adding yet another dynamic dimension, James Collins notes that the ways in which we organize ourselves in political communities also change with each age, each having its own characteristic philosophy.[10] The evolution of humankind precludes the common good in the age of antiquity being the same as the common good in today's age of awareness of global interconnectedness. This fluidity of definition, explains Marcus Raskin, co-founder of the Institute for Policy Studies, makes the common good both "a victim and beneficiary of process; we bring to it our constantly unfolding understanding of what the good is, for society is a system of relationships that produces a common and changing understanding."[11]

An examination of the evolution of thought regarding the common good can be helpful in understanding its dynamic quality and in understanding the origins of Pinkerton's concept of the common good. The philosophers and examples included here are surely not inclusive but are representative of the evolution of thought on the common good. In addition, some insights of each author are used, and others are set aside, limiting discussion to the common good.

The Common Good in Antiquity

In ancient Greece, Plato (c.428-348/347 B. C.) and Aristotle (384-322 B. C.) emphasized the priority of society over man. The state was thought to be a creature of nature and prior to the individual because the individual could not be self-sufficient in isolation. Therefore, Adler clarifies, "…man was like a part in relation to a whole."[12] Society provided the context to meaning. Charles M. Sherover elucidates this view of the priority of society: "Society is the means by which individuals come to see themselves as those whom it has nurtured and developed; society teaches its members to seek their own matured responsibilities as members of a polity, the activities of which are to be justified as the instrument enabling them to seek their common good together."[13]

Plato wrote of the common good as the virtue justice, and justice in Plato's Ideal State was inseparable from the other three virtues of temperance, courage and wisdom. Tham Dilman's citation of Socrates in Plato's *The Gorgias* (269d-270c) elucidates the importance Plato placed on the virtue justice and its embodiment as the common good. Socrates said, "It [justice] is the source of the life of the soul, the condition necessary for its flourishing. A man who... devotes his life to activities which quicken his compassion and deepen his concern for others is said to have 'gained inwardness,' to have deepened his spirituality."[14] Injustice, by contrast, Plato scholar, Irving Zeitlin, writes, was social unrighteousness--"the failure to observe the system of ethics and morals on which the system rests . . .. The perpetrator of injustice possesses a diseased soul."[15]

---

[10] James Collins, "Book Review of The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell," *The Modern Schoolman* XXII, no. No. 2 (January 1945): 107.
[11] Raskin, *The Common Good: Its Politics, Policies, and Philosophy*, 32.
[12] Adler, *The Great Ideas: A Syntopicon of Great Books of the Western World*, II:826.
[13] Charles M. Sherover, *Time, Freedom, and the Common Good* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1989), 14.
[14] Tham Dilman, *Morality and the Inner Life: A Study in Plato's Gorgias* (New York: Harper and Row, 1979), 23.
[15] Irving M. Zeitlin, *Plato's Vision: The Classical Origins of Social and Political Thought* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1993), 85.

In Plato's Ideal State, justice is present when each person is able to perform his best in the job for which he is best suited. Grecian emphasis on the priority of society over man, however, restricted individual choice of job. The choice of job for each person was the task of the just guardians of the society. Only the guardians had a knowledge of goodness and justice and thus could always act for the good of the community. According to Irving Zeitlin, the guardians gained knowledge of goodness and justice through the dialogic method of dialectics, a process of questions and answers used to determine the relations among separate subjects.[16] The virtuous guardians then developed laws to direct the communal good for the greatest happiness of the whole. Because insight and choice were denied to all but a select few for the end product of the common good, Michael Novak says man was a means for the common good.[17]

Aristotle turned to the best form of government for the common good, but the same hierarchical understanding of humans affected his view of a governmental structure organized for justice. Not all humans could enjoy justice. H. Rackham writes that, for Aristotle, justice could only exist between men who are free and "who enjoy either absolute or proportional equality;"[18] hence, injustice toward things that belong to man such as children and slaves did not exist.

Aristotle also assigned justice a different hierarchical status, according to McKeon.[19] While Plato believed justice was inseparable from temperance, courage, and wisdom, Aristotle believed justice was the highest virtue because it always involved 'the other' in its practice.

> And it [justice] is complete virtue in its fullest sense, because it is the actual exercise of complete virtue. It is complete because he who possesses it can exercise his virtue not only in himself but towards his neighbor also; for many men can exercise virtue in their own affairs, but not in relations to their neighbour. … and the best man is not he who exercises virtue towards himself but he who exercises it towards another; for this is a difficult task. Justice in this sense, then, is not part of virtue but virtue entire. Justice is perfect because it is our mode of practicing perfect virtue; (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1129b, 30-1130a, 10).[20]

All things were believed to aim at the good, but the good of the community was of utmost importance. Sherover cites from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* 1252a: "Every state [*polis*] is a community [*koinonia*] of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good; for mankind always act in order to obtain that which they think good."[21] The highest form of community, to Aristotle, was the political community formed in justice and friendship for the common advantage of all.[22] The common advantage of all, continues McKeon, implied a sort of equality. Thus, citizens of lower social status were not excluded from governing roles. Those people who were best suited for governing, whether rich or poor, should govern the just political

---

[16] Zeitlin, *Plato's Vision*, 114.
[17] Michael Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good* (Lanham, MD: Madison Books, 1989), 26-28.
[18] H. Rackham, *Aristotle's Ethics for English Readers Rendered from the Greek of the Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. H. Rackham (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1943), 96-97.
[19] McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 1003.
[20] Ibid. , 1003-04.
[21] Sherover, *Time, Freedom, and the Common Good*, 16.
[22] McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, 936.

community. In fact, if both weren't represented, according to Aristotle, government would not be just with laws fostering the common good (*Politica* 1281b 20-40).[23]

Aristotle, as did Plato, saw the common good as a final cause, an end in itself. The common good was happiness, which could not be found from an individual perspective, only from a life shared with others. In Book 1, Chapter 2 of *Nicomachean Ethics* (1049b8-11), Aristotle wrote, "For even if the end is the same for a single man and for a state, that of the state seems at all events something greater and more complete whether to attain or to preserve; though it is worthwhile to attain the end merely for one man, it is finer and more godlike to attain it for a nation or for city states."[24] Community fostered the highest good, and justice could only be assured through public civil communication to communicate "the expedient and inexpedient" (1253a 13-15).[25]

The Judeo-Christian Tradition Unfolds A New Understanding

In the Judeo-Christian tradition, the highest form of community was not the political community, but the communion of all people under God. In the Jewish tradition, God so loved His people that He entered into a covenant with them. Michael Novak saw this covenant as significant in developing a new understanding of the nature of man:

> Judaism's notion of the One God and of the human side of consent to the Covenant led to its emphasis upon the human will, and this in turn led Western culture to reflect upon the sacredness of the human individual, known to God and loved by Him before history began.[26]

Belief in the sacredness of the human individual, known and loved by God, further intensified when some believers saw Jesus as the Son of God and the Messiah come to live among them. These followers of Jesus, who were later called Christians, placed a high value on the common good of its members with a distribution of goods determined by need. From Acts 2: 44-45 we read: "The faithful all lived together and owned everything in common: they sold their goods and possessions and shared out the proceeds among themselves according to what each one needed."[27] Also in Acts 4: 32, 34-35:

> The whole group of believers was united, heart and soul; no one claimed for his own use anything that he had, as everything they owned was held in common.
>
> None of their members was ever in want, as all those who owned land or houses would sell them, and bring the money from them, to present it to the apostles; it was then distributed to any members who might be in need.[28]

---

[23] McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, 1191.
[24] Ibid. , 936.
[25] Ibid. , 1129.
[26] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 26.
[27] *The Jerusalem Bible*, Reader's Edition (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Ltd., 1968), 159.
[28] *The Jerusalem Bible* , 161.

The common good clearly was immensely important to the early Christians, but now recognition of its importance came not from guardians or governing bodies of society as before. Rather, a desire for the common good emanated from within the individual. Humankind's desires, interests, and aptitudes now had priority over society, and humankind willfully chose to use them for the benefit of society – an interesting phenomenon. Michael J. Schuck explains that these early Christians' structure of society stemmed from their spiritual views. Schuck notes that life was lived out of a pastoral metaphor of a shepherd and his flock. Society for the early Christians was "the flock's spatial milieu with areas of nourishment and security and also areas of wilderness with wolves."[29] The person was to have the virtues of a lamb in the flock and those of Christ, the Good Shepherd: simplicity, obedience, and long suffering.[30] Jesus had told them as often as they had fed the hungry, clothed the naked, visited the sick or incarcerated, welcomed strangers, etc., they had also done that for Him.

From the Christians' belief that Jesus is both God and man, Novak says theologians then began to understand person differently from individual:

> An individual is merely a member of a species . . .. A person designates an individual with a capacity for insight (inquiry) and choice (liberty). This means a self-starting capacity, a seat of responsibility, a being that is responsible for understanding and directing its own activities, independently of any other.[31]

James Collins' states that each age has its own characteristic philosophy of organization into communities.[32] The ancient Grecian priority of society became unacceptable to the Jewish people, when, in their tradition, God entered into a covenant with man. The individual with a human will was seen as sacred and loved by God.

The understanding of humanness later expanded from individual with human will to person made in the image of God and, thus, able to direct his own activities. The early Christian community, without even guardians or legislation to direct activity toward the common good, willfully lived lives dedicated to the common good of all.

The Common Good in the Roman Catholic Tradition

Thomas Aquinas, (1224-1274), an admirer of Aristotle, combined classical notions of the common good with this Judeo-Christian concept of person created in God's image (having a capacity for insight and choice), according to Novak.[33] Novak says this characteristic of God, now understood to be in man, meant that man could never be a means to the end of a common good. Instead government must exist, or be the means, to allow people to reach their end–fulfillment of union with God.[34] Man must always have the right to exercise insight and choice in the common good.

---

[29] Michael J. Schuck, "Modern Catholic Social Thought," in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Judith A. Dwyer (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 624.
[30] Schuck, "Modern Catholic Social Thought," 624.
[31] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 27-28.
[32] Collins, "Book Review of The Philosophy of Bertrand Russell."
[33] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 26.
[34] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 26-28.

Aquinas, Smith clarifies, believed man's pursuit of personal happiness was guided by conscience toward the common good, and governments had a moral responsibility to serve people and help them lead virtuous lives. While consciences guided, Smith continues, Aquinas believed achievement of the common good would also need the Aristotelian view of civic friendship founded on virtue and distributive justice to correct inequalities among men.[35] Smith adds, "Where there is justice, friendship is possible. And where there is friendship, there is the pursuit of the common good."[36]

Aquinas invoked the Judeo-Christian hierarchy of community. While membership in a political community was limited to citizens only, all people were creatures of God and thus members of a community that transcended the political community. Smith explains that now God is the common good of the whole. Happiness is the good of the human species, and happiness is found in God.[37]

Schuck notes that with Aquinas, the pastoral metaphor changed to a metaphor of cosmological design: "Now God is imaged less as the Good Shepherd and more as the intelligent designer of the universe."[38] Society in this metaphor, Schuck continues, is a part of God's universal order with the person at "the apex of God's earthly order."[39]

Throughout the centuries, according to Novak, many incarnations of priority of society and priority of humankind evolve and exist in a state of tension. As humankind evolves, Novak says, differences arise among definitions of person, community, individual, collective, association, state, private and public.[40] The Roman Catholic Church's collective autonomy, sometimes with universal vision and sometimes with protective, particular interests, throughout the years has instructed its members to live their lives with a concern for the common good. The needs of the times determined which aspect of the common good the various popes emphasized.

Catholic social teaching embodies two themes: that of the dignity of the human person with certain inalienable rights and the common good, which perfects society. To pursue the common good without recognizing the rights of persons is impossible. According to Smith, the common good consists of an ethical life lived in common, "a life characterized by justice and friendship."[41] Even so, Catholic thought regarding the common good has evolved just as humankind has evolved. Pinkerton, in a 1997 speech, described Catholic social teaching as "dynamic, always evolving, critiquing the dynamics of each age, announcing what is pro-Gospel and denouncing what is contrary to the Gospel. It then announces an alternative, new way of being."[42]

---

[35] Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good*, 123-29.
[36] Ibid. , 167.
[37] Ibid. , 75-82.
[38] Schuck, "Modern Catholic Social Thought," 624.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 2.
[41] Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good*, 1.
[42] Catherine Pinkerton, "Global Spirituality" (Maryknoll, NY, March 17, 1998), 27.

When socialism arose in protest to the exploitation of workers in the Industrial Revolution, Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) saw an alternative way. Leo, according to Gerald Fogarty, S.J., took the middle road for the common good between "socialism's denial of private property and capitalism's denial of the rights of labor."[43] Stephen J. Pope said Leo XIII issued *Rerum novarum* (On the Condition of Labor) on May 15, 1891, to address the impact of industrial capitalism on the working class with "the enormous fortunes of some few individuals and the utter poverty of the masses (1)[44]. *Rerum novarum* rejected both the belief of economic liberalists that social progress would be achieved by a free market supplemented by Christian charity and the socialist position in which private property was to be abolished for social progress.[45] According to Pope, in *Rerum novarum*, (On the Condition of Labor), Leo XIII argued for a natural right to property and said that banishing private property would "reduce everyone to poverty rather than raise up the poor."[46]

Regarding working classes and capitalists, Leo said they both need each other, and each had a *duty* toward the other (19), laborers to perform the work they agreed to do and capitalists to respect the dignity of workers by providing them with reasonable hours of work, safe jobs suitable to their strength and age, and just wages (20).[47] Laws should be structured to minimize the need for charity to the poor. The state is charged with promoting the common good, and working class members are a part of the social whole (32, 33). According to Leo, "The state must intervene whenever the common good, including the good of any single class, is threatened with harm and no other solution is forthcoming" (35).[48] In general, however, Leo writes, "the law must not undertake more, nor proceed further, than is required for the remedy of the evil or the removal of the mischief" (36).[49] Leo endorsed the right of workers to organize in labor and trade unions to promote their own particular good within the context of the larger common good of society (48-61).[50] *Rerum novarum* defended workers' rights to receive a wage sufficient to support them and their families and provide enough to save for the purchase of property (9) (65). The state was to protect private property (55) and should "protect equitably each and every class of citizens, maintaining inviolate that justice especially which is called distributive" (49).[51] However, if the state failed in its protection and "change would threaten the established order, he exhorted the poor to seek comfort in their heavenly reward."[52]

Forty years after *Rerum novarum* was issued, in a period of worldwide economic depression, unemployment, and tension between the Vatican and Italy's Fascist regime, Pope Pius XI (1857-1939) issued the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno* (On Reconstructing the Social

---

[43] Gerald P. Fogarty, S. J., "Leo XIII," ed. Judith A. Dwyer (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 547.
[44] The numbers in parentheses indicate location of the passage within the encyclical, *Rerum novarum.* Stephen J. Pope, "Rerum novarum," in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Judith A. Dwyer (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 830.
[45] Pope, "Rerum novarum," 830.
[46] Pope, "Rerum Novarum," 831.
[47] Ibid. , 835.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid. , 836.
[51] Pope, "Rerum Novarum," 547.
[52] Amata Miller, IHM, "The Centennial Encyclical - Centesimus Annus," *Shaping a New World* (1991).

Order) on May 15, 1931.[53] Marie Giblin explained that Pius XI saw economic power as abusing political power and using it for private gain of a few and wrote that public authority (the state) needed to limit economic domination.[54] Giblin reflects that Pius did not condemn capitalism in the face of the alternatives of socialism and fascism. According to Giblin, Pius, like his predecessors, saw "self-centered atomism" in capitalism, but saw a greater danger in systems in which people were conceived of as means to the end of a state..[55] Socialism, according to Pius demanded such "total submission of people to society in the interest of production of wealth" that it violated the Christian view of persons "as placed on earth with a social nature under an authority ordained by God and with duties to fulfill in accord with one's station."[56] "Pius," Giblin continues, "saw the solution to regaining the common good as moral--a return to Christian moderation rather than as social or political, and he hoped that an educational program, Catholic Action, would develop new Christian leaders."[57] Catholic Action, however, often acted more in the role of activist for social change than as educator.

While Pius XI addressed the abuse of economic power with a call for Christian morality and charity, some people sought reform in totalitarian ideologies that demanded total conformity on the part of people. The intent of totalitarianism may have been reform, but the resulting racism, elitism, terrorism, and violence used to control others has been well documented. The common disappeared from the common good. Novak reports that the Fascist and Stalinist totalitarian regimes in Europe prompted a great deal of debate on whether the common good is a final cause or a means of attaining one's private good.[58]

The struggle for balance between man's freedom for insight and choice and the common good continued with the works of Jacques Maritain (1882-1973). Writing after World War II, Maritain believed "a misconception of the individual had led the bourgeois democracy to grief [and] a misconception of the common good had led Communist states into totalitarianisms."[59] To restore what he saw as the proper balance, Maritain returned to the teachings of Thomas Aquinas in which man was made in God's image and the supreme good as being union with God.[60] Ralph McInery says Maritain was one of the major figures in a Thomistic revival. His thought reflected that of Aquinas, but it also reflected the times in which he lived.[61]

Totalitarian regimes of the time focused on the economic good, but Maritain, seeing the abuses of these regimes, focused on the political common good.[62] The abuses, Smith wrote, caused Maritain to make a distinction between the State and the political community and evoke the common good in the political order.[63] Maritain referred to the state as "an administrative

---

[53] Marie J. Giblin, "Quadragesimo anno," in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Judith A. Dwyer (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 803.
[54] Ibid. , 809.
[55] Ibid. , 810.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid. , 812.
[58] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 3.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good*; Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*.
[61] Ralph McInery, "Jacques Maritain," in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Judith A. Dwyer (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 563.
[62] Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good*, iv.
[63] Smith, *Human Dignity and the Common Good,iv*.

apparatus designed to serve the community," and the political community is composed of persons. As such," Maritain continued, "the State may even set itself against the good of the whole community and become a super-individual."[64] In response to this "super individual" state, Maritain explained that man is a whole; society is a whole of wholes, and the common good of society cannot sacrifice its parts to itself. Rather, "it [the common good] is therefore common to both the whole and parts into which it flows back and which, in turn, must benefit from it."[65] The common good, Maritain continued, must have as its principal value, "the access of persons to their liberty of expansion."[66]

> Liberty of expansion was not meant to include greed, however. Maritain wrote:
> If a person's actions follow the bent of material individualism, his development will be oriented to the ego with intent to grasp for itself. But, if development occurs in the direction of spiritual personality, man will be oriented towards the generous self of the heroes and saints. Thus man will be truly a person only in so far as the life of the spirit and of liberty reigns over that of the senses and passions.[67]

However, warned Maritain, if education denied the role of ego by trying to "excise it" and replace it with "the heart of an angel," the result could never be an authentic person, but one wearing the mask of the Pharisee.[68]. Later in this chapter, the reader will find more about the danger of denying the ego found in the literature of transpersonal psychology. The art of education, Maritain continues, is not excising but pruning and trimming, "operations in which both the individual and the person are interested-in such wise that, within the intimacy of the human being, the gravity of individuality diminishes and that of true personality and its generosity increases."[69]

Twentieth century popes continued calling for an increase in generosity and denouncing the evils they saw in society. Nancy Sylvester, I.H.M.,[70] and Carol Coston, O.P.,[71] refer to these social teachings of the church as "the prophetic tradition of denouncing and announcing."[72] In 1961, Pope John XXIII deplored the widening gap between rich and poor nations and denounced the arms race.[73] His encyclical *Mater et magistra,* (Christianity and Social Progress), defined the common good as "the sum total of social conditions of social living, whereby persons are enabled more fully and readily to achieve their own perfection" (MM 65).[74] John XXIII's 1963

---

[64] Ibid.
[65] Jacques Maritain, *The Person and the Common Good*, First paperback edition 1966, trans. John J. Fitzgerald (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1946), 51.
[66] Ibid. , 55.
[67] Ibid. , 44-45.
[68] Ibid. , 45. Pharisees, in scripture, are alternately referred to as a brood of vipers (Matthew12: 34), frauds (Matthew 24: 13), blind fools (Matthew 24: 17), whitewashed tombs, beautiful on the outside but inside full of filth and dead men's bones (Matthew 24: 27), and filled with hypocrisy (Matthew 24: 28).
[69] Ibid. , 46.
[70] Immaculate Heart of Mary Community
[71] Oblate Sisters of Providence
[72] Nancy Sylvester and Carol Coston, "The Prophetic Tradition of Denouncing and Announcing," *Shaping a New World* (1991).
[73] Network, *Shaping a New World* (Washington, D. C.: Network, Inc., 1991), 5.
[74] SJ Hollenbach, David, "Common Good," in *The New Dictionary of Catholic Social Thought*, ed. Judith A. Dwyer and Elizabeth L. Montgomery (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 193.

encyclical *Pacem in terris,* (Peace on Earth), again called for disarmament and also a worldwide public authority to promote a universal common good.[75]

In 1965, still decrying world poverty, Pope John issued yet another encyclical, *Gaudium et spes,* (The Church in the Modern World). *Gaudium et Spes* stressed distributive justice in the common good and an expansion of the role of the Christian, writes Amata Miller. Miller says the document stressed that "almsgiving from superfluous income is no longer enough for the nonpoor . . . justice requires a new economic order in which poor nations have a more equal share of the world's goods."[76] Pope Paul VI (1897 - 1978), responding to the famine, disease, illiteracy, poverty and disease of the Third World, wrote in *Evangelii nuntiandi* (Evangelization in the Modern World) that social justice is integral to faith. Social teaching needed to translate into action, and his 1971 *Octogesima adveniens* (A Call to Action) called for political action for economic justice.[77] At a 1971 Synod of Justice, the U. S. Bishops declared, "for those who had ears to ear," says Pinkerton, that "justice was a constitutive element of the preaching of the Gospel."[78]

Increasingly, Catholics who advocate the common good address economic justice. John Paul II (1920 –) called for the transformation of economic structures in *Redemptor hominis,* (Redeemer of Humankind) (1979), and for workplace justice in *Laborem excercens,* (On Human Work) (1981).[79] His 1991 *Centesimus annus* (The 100th Year), Miller writes, detailed "Western capitalist nations' ills: consumerism, materialism, exploitation, alienation, marginalization, environmental damage, and deterioration of social bonds and calls for individual and societal conversion."[80]

As Western nations rely on market forces for economic growth, Catholic bishops in the United Kingdom remind Catholics that the social teachings of the Catholic Church reject the belief in the "automatic beneficence of market forces."[81] According to the British bishops, without Marxist Communism, however flawed it was, to act as a "balancing factor or crude brake on some of the excesses of which capitalism is capable," promotion and application of the church's social teachings is more necessary than ever.[82]

In summary, Plato, Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Popes Leo XIII, Pius XI, John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul II, and Jacques Maritain all saw humankind as social in nature and society as necessary for the development of the individual. The Christian influence falls more strongly on the dignity and wholeness of the individual, but nonetheless, the social dimension of the human condition is emphasized. Let us now look at the common good within our own shores.

---

[75] Network, *ShapingA New World*, 5.
[76] Miller, "The Centennial Encyclical," 11.
[77] Network, *Shaping a New World*, 7.
[78] Pinkerton, "Global Spirituality," 11.
[79] Network, *Shaping a New World*, 7.
[80] Miller, "The Centennial Encyclical," 9.
[81] United Kingdom Catholic Bishops Conference, "Morality in the Market Place," in The Common Good, <http://www.tasc.ac.uk/cc/cbc/cg004.htm>, 1997.
[82] Ibid.

The Common Good in the United States

The emphasis on the dignity and wholeness of the individual as a social being found a home in the founding of the new republic. The 1776 framers of the Constitution of the United States reflected an orientation toward the common good when they planned a government "by the people, for the people, and of the people." However, Alan Shain notes, there are two political philosophies, two competing visions, of what the Founding Fathers meant by the balance of individual rights with social responsibilities.[83] These visions are liberalism and republicanism. According to Shain, individualists of the liberal tradition believe that eighteenth century Americans were advocates of political individualism and thus "defended something like the modern concept of individual freedom--freedom to do what one wishes."[84] Shain has found a competing myth, however, in the work of revisionist historians of the 1960s and 1970s. According to Shain, revisionist historians saw a rich tradition of political thought that has been lost in "the myth of individualism."[85] Republican historiography, according to Shain, "evidences priority awarded to the good of the public rather than the individual."[86] Shain says this public good "was not an ultimate end, but an immediate and aggregate one that was valued ahead of the short-term and particular ends of the community's constituent members."[87]

Novak, a liberalist, disagrees and says the American experiment was an original conception of the common good with central to the common good the protection of individual rights.[88] "The framers wished to build an *ordo* worthy of free persons, each endowed with inalienable rights," and they sought to plan a government that would accomplish this.[89] The Preamble to the Constitution, Novak states, illuminates in civil discourse desired elements of the components of the common good: "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."[90] Thus, according to Novak, "The people, the society at large, not the state are the definers of the common good."[91]

Novak sees in liberalism a fostering of the communitarian individual where others have seen only an atomistic concept of the solitary individual. David Hollenbach, S.J., makes a distinction between liberalists and communitarians, however. Hollenbach says that when free, equal people have opposing visions about the common good, liberalists believe to enact laws "implementing a comprehensive vision of the common good is a violation of the rights of people to equal concern and respect."[92] Liberalists put the right prior to the good. Hollenbach describes communitarians as believing that human beings are social beings and their communal roles, commitments, and social bonds constitute their selfhood. "The determination of how persons

---

[83] Alan Shain, *The Myth of American Individualism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), xiv.
[84] Ibid. , xiv.
[85] Ibid. , 21.
[86] Ibid.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 39, 41.
[89] Ibid. , 43.
[90] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 44.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good* , 157.

ought to live," Hollenbach continues, "depends on a prior determination of what kinds of social relationship and communal participation are to be valued as good in themselves. Therefore the good is prior to the right."[93]

The balance between individual rights and the common good is often difficult to maintain, and communitarian Amitai Etzioni reminds, "Strong rights presume strong responsibilities."[94] Communitarians, according to Etzioni, believe that "societies, like bicycles, teeter and need continuously to be pulled back to center lest they lean too far toward anarchy or tyranny."[95] The center is the fulcrum for communitarians. Ezioni explains that in China, a communitarian would fight for expanding individual rights, but in the United States now, communitarians believe that social responsibilities need attention.[96]

Conflicting political views in the United States also exist on government's role in maintaining the common good. The Democratic Party tends to favor a strong national government in favor of public projects for the common good. Novak attributes the lineage for this view to the Progressive Movement of the early twentieth century, to the philosopher John Dewey, and to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.[97] But the liberal view, according to Novak, sees the United States as a community of communities and public-spiritedness as "rarely expressed in sweeping national projects (except in cases of national emergency), such as war, and even there with due regard for local control, state and local responsibilities, and rights...decisions most wisely made by the local agencies closest to the relevant daily realities, and by next-highest agencies only when beyond the capacities of actors at lower levels."[98] This model, claims Novak, is the older one in the United States, dating back to Madison and Jefferson.

Novak does not mention, however, that when the founders were trying to unite the colonies they stressed sameness among the citizens–not individualism nor even commonality. According to Marty, Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton feared that the diversity of immigrants' ideals would "corrupt the national spirit."[99] Imposing sameness was seen as a means to the desired end of commonality for the common good. Government, however, did not impose this sameness. By the 19th century, education, not government, was used to impose sameness via schoolbooks that gave the American child "an idealized image both of himself and of the history that produced the admired American type."[100] The common good was thought attainable through uniformity rather than unity.

Reconciling respect for the dignity of persons and the common good is a twofold problem according to Novak. It is, first of all, a moral problem: "Only a people practicing virtues of certain kinds can make such an experiment work."[101] It is, second, an institutional problem. The

---

[93] Ibid. , 157-58.
[94] Amitai Etzioni, "Introduction," in *Rights and the Common Good*, ed. Amitai Etzioni (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), 1.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.
[97] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 125.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Marty, *The One and the Many*, 49.
[100] Ruth Miller Elson, *Guardians of Tradition: American Schoolbooks of the 19th Century* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), vii; Marty, *The One and the Many*, 55.
[101] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 141.

virtues, the habits of the heart, Novak calls "the single most important part of the common good of a free society," and he says they are weakened today. "As these habits weaken," notes Novak, "the decay of institutions follows swiftly."[102]

> Through drugs, fanaticism, violence, and the aberrations of passion, human beings can and do destroy the image of God in themselves. In free societies today, millions of persons are betraying their own inner agencies of insight and choice. Liberals, focused upon external enemies, have paid too little attention to the threat of darkness from within every human heart.[103]

Because in a free society, every citizen depends upon the virtues of the other, Novak says, the common good will be found by turning to practices of cooperation in being "alert to goods not presently being attended to and to evils that are already choking the tree of common blessings."[104] According to Novak, the common good today cannot be a set of common aims, purposes, and intentions as is possible in a homogeneous society. Rather, "the essence in a pluralistic society consists in mutual cooperation."[105] Indeed, believes Novak, the chief social agencies, free associations of persons concerned with the moral and cultural dimensions of life, are far more basic to the achievement of the common good than the state.[106]

Whether one agrees or disagrees with Novak's liberalism, the importance he places on the virtues or habits of the heart for the common good are found in the writings of Plato, Aristotle, and Aquinas. Novak's belief that the essence of the common good is mutual cooperation seems to find support by authors mentioned in Chapter One. Martin Marty's advice for every citizen was to "start associating, telling, hearing and keep talking." Sherover says that from communal reasoning together we form common concepts of justice that bond us together. Marcus Raskin urges an empathic awareness of the Other, and George Rupp calls for collaboration between the academic and religious communities to foster a communal focus and civic participation for the common good.

This provides the perfect opportunity to discover and illuminate the development of the habits of the heart, the virtues of the common good in a member of a religious community who educates, calls forth from others an acceptance of their responsibility to "care for humanity and for the earth we call home."[107] Pinkerton notes how proudly, and rightfully so, we speak of our freedoms in the United States; we have freedom from unjust intrusions and the right to join groups designed to protect our freedoms.[108] "The circle of our freedom," Pinkerton adds, "is protected by the style of government which was designed by our founders and is set as an ideal for the whole human community. Whatever its shortcomings, we must be aware of and proud of that heritage."[109] According to Pinkerton, that is our civic freedom. "Our scriptural freedom (for Christians) is freedom *for* (Italics mine) rather than freedom from," and it is relational says

---

[102] Ibid. , 141-42.
[103] Ibid. , 142.
[104] Ibid. , 142.
[105] Novak, *Free Persons and the Common Good*, 82-83.
[106] Ibid. , 146-47.
[107] Pinkerton, "Evangelization," 38.
[108] Pinkerton, "NAWR: A Vision for the Future," 3.
[109] Pinkerton, "NAWR: A Vision for the Future," 3.

Pinkerton.[110] Addressing a Religious Education Congress, Pinkerton taught, "The relationship between Jesus and the person is both the launching pad and the frame of reference in all relationships."[111] Noting the mutuality, maturity, and responsibility which Jesus exemplified in His interaction with others, Pinkerton adds, "Jesus did not free us for ourselves but to enter into the task of transforming the earth, of building a Kingdom of Justice and Peace...a challenge to be for others as Jesus was for us."[112]

Robert Bellah, author of *Habits of the Heart* and *The Good Society*, would find hope in Pinkerton's remarks. According to William Raspberry of the *Washington Post*, Bellah hopes "that organized religion, however secularized and individualized, might again assert the transcendent truths–including the homely one that we need each other, that 'our precious and unique selves aren't going to make it alone'."[113]

The Transpersonal Perspective

Transpersonal psychology seeks to study people such as Pinkerton who live lives of service, are reconcilers and peacekeepers, and who are able to see a sanctity and interconnectedness among all things. Marcie Boucouvalas suggests that four levels of research exist in transpersonal psychology and study: (a) on the individual level, healthy individuals who have transcended ego boundaries and learned ways to nurture a balanced development of the whole individual, (b) on a group level, relationships as important means of transcendence, (c) on a societal level "ways to actualize the vision of a transformed society (based on transpersonal world views),"and finally, on a planetary/cosmic level, (d) "the developmental process of consciousness, including humanity's place in the evolution of the planet."[114] Thomas Berry, a Catholic priest, whom John F. Haught calls "one of our foremost environmental thinkers today," attributes the current surge of environmental concern to this evolutionary process of consciousness.[115]

Charles Tart defines transpersonal psychology as "the social manifestation" of trying to understand and develop the parts of our nature that are beyond (trans) our ordinary, limited, personal self.[116] Transpersonal psychology emerged in the 1960s in Western psychology and is often referred to as the fourth force.[117] The first force was the psychoanalytic approach that

---

[110] Ibid. , 9.
[111] Ibid. , 13.
[112] Ibid.
[113] William Raspberry, "Market Idolatry," *The Washington Post*, Friday/April 10 1998, A23.
[114] Boucouvalas, "An Analysis," 40. The researcher would like to acknowledge the contribution of this seminal work. In the late '70s, there was no conceptualization of the field. Dr. Boucouvalas spent a number of years reading and analyzing the extant literature, devising a five page conceptualization and sending it to a "Delphi" panel of the major authors and leaders in the emerging field for modification and verification. The resulting conceptualization was termed an "emerging outline" because of its incipient nature. This effort helped provide a substantive framework of concept characteristics in order to adequately analyze in a comparative manner the concept characteristics juxtaposed to the lifelong learning movement which was already fairly well conceptualized and established.
[115] Thomas Berry, *The Dream of the Earth* (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1988); John F. Haught, *The Promise of Nature* (New York: Paulist Press, 1993), 14, 84.
[116] Tart, "Introduction," ix.
[117] Boucouvalas, "Transpersonal Psychology: Scope and Challenges Revisited.;" Sutich, *Transpersonal Psychology*; Tart, "Introduction."

introduced the concept of the unconscious and its effect on behavior, focusing on the healthiness of releasing suppressed material into the unconscious.[118] The second force behaviorists, says Boucouvalas, reacted to what they claimed was nonverifiable and subjective and focused on observable behavior and ways to modify it.[119] Behaviorists stressed the importance of environment as a determinant of behavior.[120] Humanistic psychology, the third force, according to Boucouvalas, emerged unifying the first two by focusing on the whole person, not fragmented parts.[121] Humanistic psychology studied healthy, self-actualized people. Maslow developed his hierarchy of needs with self-actualization at the peak as the goal of personal growth.[122] Maslow, in his later years, however, Boucouvalas says, predicted the emergence of the fourth force, transpersonal psychology:

> I consider Humanistic, Third Force Psychology to be transitional, a preparation for a still 'higher' Fourth Force Psychology, transpersonal, transhuman, centered in the cosmos rather than in actual needs and interest going beyond humanness, identity, self-actualization, and the like.[123]

Charles Tart provides a clear explanation of the emergence of this transpersonal fourth force. Tart says in the 1950s and 1960s therapists began seeing clients who were successful by the standards of our culture but who complained of an emptiness in their lives. Humanistic psychology, which focused on creativity and "finding meaning beyond material gratification," evolved in response to this dis-ease.[124] Described by Tart as an exciting time—"a time of discovery that intelligence is not just a matter of intellectual, cognitive processes-- a realization grew of the intelligence of the heart and body."[125] According to Tart, it was an understanding of higher level of holistic functioning but still neglected the spirit. Spirit, Tart says, is "something real beyond the material manifestations of life, something we get fleeting glimpses of in 'mystical experiences,' the vital energy underlying religions before they all too often ossify into mechanisms of social control."[126] Attention to spirit enhances the human condition as eastern and mystical religions and transpersonal psychology attest.[127]

Transpersonal Psychology's Interface with Mysticism

In the late 1960s, according to Frances Vaughan, Abraham Maslow, Stansilov Grof, and Anthony Sutich, among others, integrated humanistic psychology with Eastern and mystical

---

[118] Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation," 7.
[119] Ibid.
[120] Boucouvalas, "Transpersonal Psychology: Scope and Challenges Revisited.;" Sutich, *Transpersonal psychology*; Tart, "Introduction."
[121] Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation," 7.
[122] A. H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1954).
[123] Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation," 7; Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being*, iii-iv.
[124] Tart, "Introduction."
[125] Ibid. , ix.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.

religions.[128] Stansilav Grof, writes that the spiritual philosophies of the ancient and Eastern cultures see "consciousness and creative intelligence as primary attributes of existence, both immanent and transcendent in regard to the phenomenal world," whereas Western psychology has seen human beings as "highly developed animals and thinking biological machines who have a fleeting and insignificant role in the overall scheme of things."[129] According to Vaughan, "immanent and transcendent consciousness" stem from a unifying transforming wisdom within that is spoken of in all major religions. For example, Vaughan notes that, "Christians believe 'the kingdom of God is within.' In Buddhism, wisdom is in the discovery of 'our own true nature'; in Hinduism, it is in 'Atman' realization' . . ..[130] Whatever the terminology used, all speak of a wisdom deep within ourselves.

Pinkerton's relationship with Jesus reflects this inner wisdom of which mysticism and transpersonal psychology speak. "Allowing Jesus full possession over one is not the same as a Jesus and I mentality; it is a radical expansion of such spirituality," Pinkerton says, and she adds:

> One who allows God absolute dominion over one's life has radical internal freedom...Paul talked about the follower of Jesus being free from the Torah. Paul was saying that there was an act on the part of God which issues in a new creation for those who respond to the creative act of God. This act is continually working within the person who responds in faith. Something ontological takes place. The person can, through the power of Jesus, experience a new freedom, the freedom over sin and death, a freedom that is interior and radical, that is operative even in situations where exterior restraints limit the right to do what one chooses. One who gives Jesus full possession (of him/herself) knows that ultimate happiness rests in the willingness to be called forth as a unique person to fulfillment in Him, to become freely who one is in Him.[131]

The ontological knowledge of which Pinkerton speaks frees the ego. Ego is subsumed into a perspective of connectedness rather than separateness. Transpersonal psychology seeks to study people such as Pinkerton who realize we need each other, who live lives of service, who are reconcilers and peacekeepers, and who are able to see a sanctity and interconnectedness among all things and all world views. Spiritual psychologies such as Pinkerton's are a subject of interest in the field of transpersonal psychology for their power to transform.[132]

Tart urges using these spiritual psychologies as "sources of inspiration, neither embracing them uncritically, nor rejecting them unthinkingly."[133] Tart writes, "If there is a real spiritual dimension linking us, so that we are brothers and sisters in some profound and loving way, then we have a vital basis for creating peace in the world and genuinely caring for each other's welfare. Insofar as we discover the reality of the transpersonal, we will be rich in a much more important way than in the material dimension and these riches will transform our world for the

---

[128] Frances E. Vaughan, "The Transpersonal Perspective: A Personal Overview," *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* 14, no. 1 (1982): 40.
[129] Stanislav Grof, "East and West: Ancient Wisdom and Modern Science," *The Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* 15, no. 1 (1983): 14.
[130] Vaughan, "The Transpersonal Perspective," 37.
[131] Pinkerton, "NAWR: A Vision for the Future," 3.
[132] Tart, "Introduction."
[133] Ibid. , 4-5.

better."[134] According to Tart, many of the world's problems result from a neglect of the spirit, causing a spiritual vacuum which has been enormously costly. To find our spiritual side and to find good solutions to world problems, Tart advocates looking at psychologies that have dwelt with the spirit and cites a need to link current research with the work of researchers such as William James and Carl Jung and with "the 'esoteric' psychologies of other cultures, such as Sufism, Yoga, and Buddhism."[135] These psychologies all speak of an inner wisdom. Vaughan, too, writes that access to this source of inner wisdom is needed in order "to use science for the benefit of humanity, rather than for self-destruction."[136]

Other researchers, too, believe this inner wisdom has such potential for benefiting humanity. Stanislav and Christina Grof report that people who are involved in the process of spiritual emergence tend to develop a new appreciation for all forms of life and a new understanding of the unity of all things:

> Consideration of all humanity, compassion for all of life, and thinking terms of the entire planet take priority over the narrow interests of individuals, families, political parties, classes, nations, and creeds. That which connects us all and that which we have in common become more important than our differences, which are seen as enhancing rather than threatening.[137]

Peter Russell says the nucleus of our being holds enormous untapped potential. Russell doesn't advocate a return to religions of the past, "but to discover the sacred within us in the language and technologies of the twentieth century."[138] According to Russell, the root of our environmental crisis is an "inner spiritual aridity," and overcoming the crisis requires research in not only the physical and biological sciences, but also psychological and sacred sciences.[139]

Ken Wilber, however, disagrees with anyone who says that the only way the world's problems can be solved is by a transpersonal transformation and calls for revisiting existing historical research:

> ...A cogent theory of how marginal knowledge (such as that of the transpersonal) becomes normalized or conventionally accepted needs to be worked out and thoroughly checked by then rereading history using that model. Work in this area is virtually nonexistent, yet without it any claim to 'world transformation,' is simply more ideology.[140]

---

[134] Tart, "Introduction," 5.
[135] Ibid. , 4-5.
[136] Vaughan, "The Transpersonal Perspective," 37.
[137] Stanislav Grof and Christina Grof, "Transpersonal Experiences and the Global Crisis," in *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, ed. Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan (Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Perigee Books, 1993), 252.
[138] Peter Russell, "An Inner Manhattan Project," in *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, ed. Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan (Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Perigee Books, 1993), 253.
[139] Russell, "An Inner Manhattan Project," 253.
[140] Ken Wilber, "Paths Beyond Ego in the Coming Decades," in *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, ed. Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan (Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Perigee Books, 1993), 262-63.

Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan state that both our global ecological crisis and the transpersonal vision call us "to grow up and wake up."[141] According to Walsh and Vaughan, we've learned that our view of normal development has had a culturally determined limit, and for the first time in history we have a transpersonal vision of our possibilities. Whether or not one believes that a transpersonal perspective is needed for world transformation, Walsh and Vaughan say, this "adventure of consciousness" has awakened us to often untapped potential.[142] Boucouvalas believes this untapped potential is of great importance to adult education.[143]

Transpersonal Psychology's Interface with Adult Education

From research in the field of transpersonal psychology, awareness of a mostly untapped human potential-- an ego-transcendence that stems from a deep inner wisdom, and that sees an interconnectedness and interdependence of all things-- has great importance for adult education. According to Boucouvalas, this untapped potential necessitates for educators an expanded view of human capabilities and an ability to prepare scholars and practitioners with academic knowledge and integrated healthy transpersonal experience.[144] Healthy transpersonal experience vs. unhealthy is discussed in detail later on. For now, the reader should know that healthy transpersonal experience adheres to the Deweyan view that all learning is continuous, building on previous learning.

The root of the word educate, *educare*, means *to bring out*, to call forth the potential from an individual.[145] Boucouvalas notes that if we have been living in a very restricted circle of our potential being, then educators will need to learn ways of calling forth this larger potential for learning. "A transpersonal image of humankind extends the parameters of what is possible," explains Boucouvalas, "and furnishes new pinnacles for human growth and learning, a new outer limit for lifelong learning endeavors."[146] She believes the transpersonal movement has the potential to foster social transformation, as does the lifelong learning movement, and sees the two movements as intertwined.[147]

Some adult educators do not see the lifelong learning movement as actually fostering social transformation in practice. Mechthild Hart says adult education today generally has a "one-dimensional identification with the needs of business and industry" that in many ways contributes to social and economic injustice. Productive education, according to Hart, should be one that is "based above all on an affirmation of life rather than an affirmation of 'the bottom line'."[148] Michael Welton says for over a decade and a half "voices from the margins" have accused the modern practice of adult education of abandoning its role in fostering democratic

---

[141] Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan, "The Adventure of Consciousness," in *Paths Beyond Ego: The Transpersonal Vision*, ed. Roger Walsh and Frances Vaughan (Los Angeles, CA: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Perigee Books, 1993), 267.
[142] Walsh and Vaughan, "The Adventure of Consciousness," 266.
[143] Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation."
[144] Boucouvalas, "An Analysis," 2.
[145] Skeat, *An Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, 188.
[146] Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation," 9.
[147] Boucouvalas, "An Analysis.;" Boucouvalas, "Social Transformation," 6.
[148] Mechthild U. Hart, *Working and Educating for Life: Feminist and International Perspectives on Adult Education* (London: Routledge, 1992), 2, 6, 198.

social action and ignoring the poor, oppressed, and disenfranchised in North American society.[149] Welton argues that adult education needs to change course from its current direction of "teaching our future practitioners quickly digested and easily formulated principles of program planning" and instead, "have as its normative mandate the preservation of the critically reflective lifeworld…and the extension of communicative action into systemic domains."[150] An interface with transpersonal psychology would help education "foster the good life and the good society" as well as "produce the good human being."[151]

Students interested in transpersonal psychology can now obtain masters and doctoral degrees in the field, but some professionals in academia and other professions have a cultural bias against the transpersonal and a "prejudice against the intuitive mode in scientific and academic circles," Boucouvalas says.[152] According to the works of Felix Morrow and Ken Wilber, years of hegemonic empiric-analytic inquiry have resulted in suppression of non-sensory verifiable research.[153] The philosopher, William James (1842-1910), however, proposed a different view of empiricism which will be discussed below.

Transpersonal Psychology's Interface with Empirical Research

"James advocated 'radical empiricism' in which no meaningful source of evidence was to be ignored or discounted, and he viewed 'reality' as 'anything which we find ourselves obliged to take into account in any way'."[154] Morrow notes that James had written much on psychical research and had concluded there is "a continuum of cosmic consciousness against which our individuality builds but accidental fences and into which our several minds plunge, as into a mother-sea or reservoir."[155] According to Morrow, James's research in this field was subsequently suppressed by Ralph Barton Perry, the editor of a posthumous collection of James's writings. Also uncovering works on consciousness by John Dewey that had been suppressed, Morrow reflects that these actions are symptomatic of the disdain in the empiricist academic world for psychical research.[156]

Wilber believes empiricism's understanding of 'experience' has been too limited and explains, "Empiricism . . . rightly claims that all valid knowledge must be grounded in experience, but it then reduces the meaning of experience to *sensibilia*."[157] Experience, according to Wilber, also encompasses *intelligibia* in which we experience our own thoughts, ideals, and 'imaginative displays' with the mind's eye, and *transcendelia* in which we experience

---

[149] Welton, "The Critical Turn," 4.
[150] Ibid. , 4-6.
[151] Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, "The William James Research Center," <http://www.tmn.com/itp/details.html#Research>, 12/26 1997.
[152] Boucouvalas, "An Analysis," 45.
[153] Felix Morrow, "William James and John Dewey on Consciousness: Suppressed Writings," *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 24, no. 1 (Winter 1984): 69-79; Ken Wilber, *Eye to Eye: The Quest for the New Paradigm* (Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1990).
[154] Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, "The William James Research Center," 3.
[155] William James, *Memories and Studies* (NY: Longmans, 1912), 204: Morrow 1984: 70; James, *Memories and studies*, 204.
[156] Morrow, "William James and John Dewey," 73.
[157] Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, 42.

spirit with the eye of contemplation.[158] The three modes of knowing have different methods of data collection and verification, Wilber says, but "the a*bstract principles* of data accumulation and verification are essentially *identical* in each."[159] Three strands of valid data accumulation exist, and each has a "potential disproof mechanism," continues Wilber.[160] The three strands of data collection are:

> 1. *Instrumental injunction*. This [strand] is always of the form, 'If you want to know this, *do* this.'
> 2. *Intuitive apprehension*. This [strand] is a cognitive grasp, prehension, or immediate *experience* of the object domain (or aspect of the object domain) addressed by the injunction; that is, the immediate *data* apprehension.
> 3. *Communal confirmation*. This [strand] is a checking of results (apprehensions or data) with others who have adequately completed the injunctive and apprehensive strands.[161]

Wilber further explains a hierarchy in which each of the three modes of knowing--sensory, mental, and spiritual--can access data within their own mode. The mental mode, however, with its words, symbols and concepts, can be used to "*point* to, or *represent*, *other* data from any other realm," adds Wilber.[162] He notes that this "mediate" or intermediate process explains or maps other data results in "*theoretical knowledge*." In Wilber's view, the problem is that spiritual data are "transconceptual, and thus they resist, even defy, conceptual, rational, theoretical mapping and codification."

> The mind can adequately look at and map sensibilia because it transcends sensibilia; it can adequately look at and map intelligibilia because that is its own backyard; but it cannot adequately look at or map spirit because spirit transcends it. And when spirit is described in mental terms, it is not in the nice, common-sensical, down-to-earth categories of empiric-analytic thought or even in the subtler symbolic logic; it is the slippery, paradoxical, poetic terms of mandalic [163]reason. Understand that spiritual knowledge itself...is the most direct, clear-cut, impactful knowledge imaginable–it simply transcends conceptualization and therefore resists neat hypothetical categorizations and mental mappings.[164]

Elusiveness of conceptualization should not result in the discounting of transcendelia, however, for, as Melvin Miller and Susanne Cook-Greuter aptly put it, " . . . how we conceptualize what is possible enhances and limits our individual and cultural development."[165]

---

[158] Ibid.
[159] Ibid. , 44.
[160] Ibid.
[161] Ibid. , 44-45.
[162] Ibid. , 67.
[163] Mandalic refers to a mandala: a symbolic representation of the cosmos with the attributes of a deity. In Jungian psychology, a mandala is a symbol representing the effort to reunify the self. *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language*, Second Edition (New York: Random House, 1987), 1167.
[164] Wilber, *Eye to Eye*, 70.
[165] Melvin E. Miller and Susanne R. Cook-Greuter, "Introduction," in *Transcendence and Mature Thought in Adulthood*, ed. Melvin E. Miller and Susanne R. Cook-Greuter (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1994), xvi.

Healthy Transcendence Derived from Continuous Learning

Transcendence needs to be built upon a healthy, fully developed, stable ego. Psychotherapist, John Welwood, who is interested in the relationship between psychological work and spiritual work, recounts three traps into which one may fall, obstacles to growth and development.[166] The first he calls spiritual by-passing--using spiritual practice to avoid dealing with unresolved personal and emotional issues--"all the sticky, messy things that keep us rooted right here."[167] The second is narcissism, "getting so fascinated with our own personal process that we become trapped in the labyrinth of our own rich material."[168] The third trap, Welwood notes, is desensitizing ourselves to personal process and spiritual development because we'd rather not feel things too strongly, just get through life with as little effort as possible.[169] Welwood believes this desensitizing is probably the most common of all in our society.[170]

Perhaps this desensitizing, in our culture, results from being overwhelmed with the pressures of modern life and upward progress. We aim for higher salaries and higher achievements, but the journey of transcendence in which the common good becomes a natural outgrowth of an awareness of the interconnectedness of all things, according to Melvin Miller and Suzanne Cook-Greuter, is a "journey inward to deeper and more subtle levels of perception."[171]

Pinkerton spoke of this interconnectedness to a group of Maryknoll women religious:

> . . . down deep, we religious are fully aware that we cannot look upon the world and its confusion and complexity as an entity apart from any of us. It is part of our psyche. Our inner lives and energies, even our brokenness and fragility flow into the world and at the same time, the energies of the world, both positive and negative, flow into our psyches.
>
> We need to embrace that conflicted world reality as part of our own redemption before we can move to becoming instruments of its resurrection, so fiercely that we shall be enlivened, knowing that the Cosmic Christ will be with us all days even to the end of time.
>
> Our faith in Christ's promise of resurrection cannot falter at this time in history. What we must avoid is giving in to any sense of powerlessness or ennui because of the overwhelming nature of the reality in which we are called to be the Word.[172]

While Pinkerton was speaking to women religious, the message of interconnectedness she would address to all people.

---

[166] John Welwood, "Principles of Inner Work: Psychological and Spiritual," *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology* 16, no. 1 (1984): 64.
[167] Welwood, "Principles of Inner Work: Psychological and Spiritual," 64.
[168] Ibid.
[169] Ibid. , 65.
[170] Ibid.
[171] Miller and Cook-Greuter, "Introduction," xxii.
[172] Pinkerton, "Global Spirituality," 13.

Grof describes this interconnectedness as an expansion of identity. "In transpersonal experiences," Grof says, "the sense of one's identity can expand beyond the body image and encompass other people, groups of people, or all of humanity. It can transcend human boundaries and include animals, plants, or even inanimate objects and processes."[173] Inspired by the work of transpersonal psychology, Grof, who contributed much to the field, maintains, "We are approaching a phenomenal synthesis of the ancient and the modern and a far-reaching integration of the great achievements of the East and West that might have profound consequences for the life on this planet."[174]

Interface of the Common Good, Transpersonal Psychology, and Catherine Pinkerton

Chapter Two has traced the evolution of thought regarding the common good and recalled from Chapter One contemporary literature's call for the recurring components of dialogue and action/participation in operationalizations of the common good. An historical study of Pinkerton's championship of the common good also reveals the same components throughout her life. This dialogue and action will be illuminated in Chapter Three. Transpersonal psychology's scholarly literature spoke of increased human potential – an ability to access an inner wisdom that broadens one's understanding of an ego-centered self to an intersubjective self. An intersubjective self is subject of self but able to see her role in relation to others, to creation, and to a higher force. One who understands self as intersubjective has a homonomous, ego-transcendent understanding of interconnectedness. Pinkerton's speeches reveal a spirituality in touch with the inner wisdom that allows ego to be subsumed into a perspective of connectedness rather than separateness. This sense of connectedness allowed an extraordinary commitment to the common good to develop in Pinkerton.

This chapter has traced in philosophic literature historical incarnations of the common good and looked for its dynamic qualities, three of which are dialogue, action or participation, and inclusivity. With more and more public calls for the common good and with Pinkerton's extraordinary commitment in mind, the researcher combed the literature of transpersonal psychology and learned that a deep, inner divine wisdom often reveals an interconnectedness and interdependence of all life that fuels such commitment. Awareness of this mostly untapped—in the field of adult education--source of wisdom, coupled with society's current need for a civil society based on an ethical concern for each other, offers a threshold of opportunity for adult education. Adult education has the potential to aid in the fullest development of humankind's potential and help a world in need of attention to the common good.

[173] Grof, "East and West," 30.
[174] Ibid. , 33.