Pragmatism and Socio-Political Movement Toward Solidarity

Julie M. Geredien

ESTABLISHING THE PRAGMATIST'S ACCOUNT OF RATIONALITY

American pragmatism assists in the processes of individual and collective maturation needed for a more evolved, spiritual and intellectual democracy, by mediating between the requirements of *liberalism* and those of *community*. The obligations of *liberalism* emerged through the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth, deepening and broadening earlier interest in confessional freedom; they respond to the "strenuous demand for liberty of mind- the freedom of thought and its expression in speech, writing, print and assemblage" (Dewey, *LW* 11: 290; James 1978). They are often associated with political and civic rights. The necessities of *community*, in contrast, locate one's constitutive sense of self in the collective; they provoke individuals to develop critical consciousness and to resist the advance of the modern state (Mustakova-Possardt 2003; Phelan 1996: 235). These necessities are in large part, considerably older than those of liberalism, dating back, to our small band hunter-gatherer ancestors who called strongly upon human caregiving and engagement systems

J. M. Geredien (✉)
Annapolis, MD, USA

to nurture the quality of relationships necessary for individual and collective survival (Narvaez 2014). Yet, they are as relevant now to the stability of everyday life as ever. Ignatieff views the requirements of community as "recurrent essentials of our common life", writing that: "We are moral beings because we have no choice—our survival and our success as social beings depends on [ordinary] virtue"; the obligations of community are "not an option, but a necessity" (2017: 222). Unlike the requirements of liberalism, community essentials are often related to social, economic and cultural rights.

The interrelating of the two political and social orientations within pragmatism is evidenced in a genealogical approach to community, in which provisionally fixed identities provide a middle ground: between the socio-historical specificity of the identitarian politics that characterize "*old-fashioned interest group liberalism*" and the expanded, unitary sense of being and common self, which is promoted in the voluntary association of "*strong community*" (Phelan 1994: 96; italics my own). In spiritual pragmatism, the movement between these two—liberalism and community—generates a creativity of "critical intelligence and social action" that, because of its integrity both to a particular self and a common self, resists the human tendency to solve problems through homogenizing or de-contextualizing ways of thinking. Instead, pragmatic creativity is "always embedded in a *situation*; i.e., on human being's 'situated freedom'" (Joas 1993: 4–5). Its commitments to mediation obligate it to remain committed to: anti-skepticism, fallibilism, holism and the primacy of practice (Festenstein 2002). Its fruits therefore are more diverse, practical and just, responding to an intuitive understanding of the moral and spiritual promises of democratic life.

Psychologically and intellectually, the benefits of pragmatism's mediating movement far outweigh the outcomes of a one-sided acceptance of the dominant paradigms of liberal political and economic democratic life; these rely upon narrow mindsets and epistemological stances that maintain norms of partisanship, competition and aggregation. As Touraine explains: "the social cost of these economic and political mechanisms for development is very high...They mobilize economies and armies which divide, challenge and conquer before they integrate and convince" (1995: 259). In twenty-first-century post-modern life, spiritual pragmatism protects public intelligence from the hegemonic forces operating within liberal democracy by re-connecting humans to more ancient sources of wisdom; these offer insight regarding the nature of

human security and paths to restorative justice. In this way, spiritual pragmatism safeguards the concept of the public as an entity distinct from State and market—a social structure with normative law-making powers and transformational potentials in its own right.

In *Discovery of the State,* John Dewey provided the following clarification as to what pragmatists in liberal society are actually in search of when they seek to understand the meaning of the public, and how it might commit responsibly to strategic political actions.

> There are many answers to the question: What is the public? Unfortunately many of them are only testaments of the question. ... a community as a *whole* involves not merely a variety of associative ties which hold persons together in diverse ways, but an organization of all elements by an integrated principle. And this is precisely what we are in search of. (*LW* 2 1988a: 259)

Dewey described the challenge involved in "discovering the means by which a scattered, mobile and manifold public may so recognize itself as to define and express its interests" as an "intellectual" challenge, as well as a psychological and social one (*LW* 2 1988a: 327). It entails: "the search for *conditions* under which the Great Society may become the Great Community" (327; italics my own). Once in place, these conditions are able to continue to "make their own forms" (ibid.: 327). Realization of a communal body then is *not* the final aim of the public once it has been found and identified itself. Instead, the conditions of community life are sustained by members, so that the ultimate goal of realizing ethical social creativity can be achieved. The constituents of the public ultimately become "a medium for generating public structures of space-time schema that permit work on common concerns, allowing decisions without closing debate" (Reid and Taylor 2010: 141).

Arising out of civil society, as a morally coherent social structure, publics manifest their creative political and legal potentials in *media res* (Fung 2012: 610). Guided by a pragmatic conception of democracy and emerging out of the complexity of actual conditions as they exist presently, in the real world, public intelligence can overcome habitual bias and expose the disjuncture between *norm* (the ideals of constitutional law) and *reality* (the unequal distribution of social power) (Habermas 1996: 304). Pragmatism, as a mode of developing the new public structures needed to work on common concerns, provides the rational

intellectual foundation for the virtue of human solidarity by promoting open-mindedness and a wholehearted commitment to inquiry:

> For pragmatists, the nerve of its account of rationality is a 'radical holism' which ... does not privilege or prejudice any domain of inquiry ... It does not pronounce that there are separate orders of fact and value or of the causal and the normative and then go on to glorify the factual/causal and denigrate the evaluative/normative. (Misak 2000: 86; Festenstein 2004: 292)

This genuinely egalitarian approach to inquiry requires an intellectuality that is grounded in emotional rationality. Ronald de Sousa writes in his investigation of this rationality: "the idea of an emotional integrity that would apprehend and celebrate the fullness of what it is to be human" can be viewed as "the equivalent of a mystical ideal in a secular context" (1987: 352). For de Sousa the emotional rationality that underlies the intellectual dimension of human solidarity includes the ability to approach even difficult emotions like revulsion, or horror, without prejudice; through such an acceptance of pluralism, it becomes possible to study value itself and to contribute to the creative formation of knowledge, ethics and new social forms (de Sousa 1987). This occurs as humans seek agreement, on a global scale, about ways of life, and kinds of human relationships—within and across the human and non-human world, living and non-living systems—that are in humankind's highest interests.

A key to this encompassing ontological-epistemic project is developing the appropriate quality of intentionality. When well-conceived and planned, institutional design can protect the social stability and consistency associated with "ordinary virtues" and through right role-modeling, it can even begin to facilitate within citizens the emergence of a greater pervasive attentional intelligence and quality of caring. Ignatieff comments on the importance of tending to institutional life today, that "...the ordinary virtues struggle wherever honest, non-collusive, responsive institutions are lacking. [They] cannot flourish in an environment of organized injustice toward immigrants, minorities, and the poor" (2017: 219). The championing of universal human rights as a theoretical ideal is not enough. One's way of being and feeling in everyday situations like schools and social service agencies, and in moments of interaction with governing authorities, like police, directly impacts one's way of understanding and becoming.

> Acknowledging that such [desperate and defenseless] people have rights based on international law is a necessary condition for decency, but it is not sufficient to sustain a public culture of welcome. Such a public culture must replicate the virtues of the private realm, the virtues of compassion and generosity, so that citizens see, in the actions of their government, a version of their better natures. (216)

Ignatieff warns that without the ability to "count on equal protection of the laws" in daily life, the "private virtues" of those from "poor and disadvantaged families" will "languish" (2017: 219). The reality is that, without foresight and critical regard for intentionality, human attention is easily manipulated and diverted, and this impacts paths of moral and intellectual development. An example of this problem, which reflects the overly dominant emphasis today on liberalism, is found in the rise of the Internet. The Internet came into being as a publically funded infrastructure. It hosts a vast number of emergent communicative community spaces. But these "portals" lack what Habermas has referred to, as "an inclusive bind, the inclusive force of a public sphere highlighting what things are actually important"; the "concentration" that is required for this highlight of morally and intellectually significant content can only be achieved when citizens "know how to choose – know and comment on – relevant contributions, information and issues" (Schwering 2014). The way information proliferates on the Internet often heightens human interest in a topic, but it also disperses and sometimes misdirects it, through misinformation, lack of accessibility or sensationalism. This is just one example of how innovations and infrastructures influenced by the liberalism of the political economy threaten public intelligence and institutional life, even while often creating the illusion of bolstering it, by making new platforms of opportunity for social participation. On this theme, Ignatieff writes:

> Just as ordinary virtue, as Montaigne said, is in constant struggle with the ordinary vices, so liberal institutions are constantly at risk from corruption, predation, and abuse. (2017: 219)

But the promising fact remains, that with the right kind of intentionality within institutional life, people's experience of "living attention" in intra- and inter-personal relations can nurture their inner comprehension, critical thought and capacity for problem-solving, even across cultural and

historical differences (Bion 1959; Jardine 2007). There is no reason to rule out the possibility that, as structural violence is eradicated, and the virtue of intellectual solidarity tended to within institutions, innovations like the Internet can both: make accessible the energies and information that constitute a radically holistic approach to inquiry; and function optimally as a vehicle for political freedom through their inclusion in epistemic endeavor that is grounded in a coherent moral ontology.

In his writing on virtue and democracy, David Hollenbach reminds that solidarity as that most essential conscious bond of mutual responsibility is not counted as one of the Greek and Roman cardinal virtues (prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude), nor is it a Christian theological virtue (faith, hope and love); nevertheless, Pope John Paul II proposed to *add* solidarity as a chief virtue "needed to address the problems of our world" (ibid.: 150). The emotional integrity required to apprehend and celebrate the fullness of what it is to be human, not privileging or prejudicing against any domain of inquiry, requires a kind of determination that is only achievable when one has dedicated oneself to the common good of humanity (ibid.: 150; John Paul II 1987). It is this integrity, and the persevering quality that results from this degree of commitment, that brings forth the gifts of an intellectual solidarity and guides the mediating movement of spiritual pragmatism.

Alain LeRoy Locke listed three moral imperatives of a new world order organized by solidarity that support the Pope's claim that this virtue is crucial for addressing the problems of today's world. They are: "an internationally limited idea of national sovereignty, a non-monopolistic and culturally tolerant concept of race and religious loyalties freed of sectarian bigotry" (1989: 152). On this last point, he provided the following example of how important intellectual agreements rooted in emotional rationality require a willingness to perceive functional equivalences; these correspondences most likely cannot be truly recognized and internalized until one has dedicated oneself to the common good of humanity:

> If the Confucian expression of a Commandment means the same as the Christian expression, then it is the truth also and should so be recognized. It is in this way alone that Christianity or any other enlightened religion can vindicate its claims to Universality; and so bring about moral and spiritual brotherhood. (ibid.: 152)

Furthermóre, as value types are appreciated as expressions of different embodied and context-specific modes of feeling, as Locke understood them to be, spiritual pragmatism can work on two levels. It can mediate differences between opposing political and social orientations, clarifying citizens' political power; it can align law and institutional design with scientific understandings, like the role of dynamic systems and variability in human development, for example, thereby illuminating citizens' legal power (Fischer and Biddel 2006). The recognition of virtue "across the differences of race, religion, language, and culture" may indicate recognition of "a universal Good, a common core of moral practice, grounded in our natures and shared by all human beings" (Ignatieff 2017: 206). But Ignatieff adopts a pragmatist's account of rationality when he asserts that "it seems equally plausible to think" that, in everyday life, what is ultimately being recognized in the functional equivalence of the Confucian and Christian expression cited by Locke, for instance, is "not the Good, in its universal, unchanging form, but goodness, in all its astonishingly contextual singularity" (2017: 206).

The challenge today is that the partnering of capitalism and liberalism has normalized how classical liberalism protects social stability by connecting individuals to one another, not through an inwardly shared yet particularized sense of obligation, deep understanding and conscience, but rather, primarily through the cohesive power of overarching, rationalizing structures (Reid and Taylor 2010: 31). Agreements structured by contract law, the logic of the market, and technocratic standards of security and excellence may appear superficially to be reasonable; however, they are *not* (ibid.: 31). These methods of rationalizing human relations reflect the spatiotemporal distortions and limitations of global capitalism. They also often require literally outlandish amounts of time, money and labor to maintain (ibid.). In contrast, the quality of reasonableness that arises through public intelligence, and a guiding pragmatic conception of democracy, is based on social organization achieved through functional, moral or ethical integration within the community sector. Rather than reliance upon fixed social contract agreements, integration is made possible as citizens engage flexibly in the kind of perception of functional equivalences extolled by Locke, and elaborated upon in the statement by Ignatieff. It is facilitated as they insist upon reconciling the dissonance between, on the one side, privileged and often times prejudiced, validity suppositions within constitutional democracy, and, on the other side, how

things actually wind up happening in the political process (Habermas 1996: 320).

The striving toward this higher degree of reasonableness and more culturally sensitive and pluralist moral agreeability is supported in those domains of civil society that are "the primary bearers of cultural meaning and value" like education (citizenship schools of the civil rights movement in the US), religion (interfaith organizations like Parliament of World Religions), arts (the "velvet revolution" initiated in Prague's Magic Lantern Theater) and journalism (Bill Moyers Journal in the USA) for example; generally speaking, a much more creditable quality of reasonableness arises in those places where more intensive and sincere learning and inquiry regarding "the meaning of the good life" occurs and a sense of mutual responsibility is taken up (Hollenbach 1995: 151).

The pragmatist's account of rationality upholds this more penetrating perception of goodness and higher standard of reasonableness. In the striving toward greater functional, moral or ethical integration within the community sector, the spiritual pragmatist disrupts customary and chronic attempts to conflate citizens' political and legal power. The awakening of universal compassion, and the internalization of a pragmatic conception of democracy, serves as a more discerning moral compass: it challenges citizens' reliance on rationalizing structures and social contractual agreements and it questions their identification with social power fueled by the media. Spiritual pragmatism points to the human capacity to engage in algebraic and scientific, inductive reasoning that is nevertheless, personalized and humanizing. Respect for this capacity empowers citizens politically and intellectually, supporting processes of social and systemic integration (Hayward 2011). It encourages their direct critical engagement in social problem-solving and in law-making processes.

An Overview of What's Ahead

In this essay, I will review how two organizations within civic society— LiKEN in Appalachia and FUNDAEC in rural Colombia—are developing intellectual solidarity and an improved higher quality of reasonableness, by engaging in spiritual pragmatism and actively countering the space-time frames of global capitalism. Both organizations cultivate *fluency* in their work addressing human needs and the real-world consequences of human actions. Defined by Betsy Taylor and Herbert Reid, fluency involves the ability to flow with lucidity from one perspective to another, and to shift

spatial and temporal frameworks. When developed thoroughly, the first ability works to "ensure that a question is deliberated upon in an open-ended and egalitarian way"; and the second helps both to "consider past and future impacts and consequences across multiple sites (not just the powerful and privileged sites that have made themselves central)" and to "re-center... within the particular situations what is at stake in particular debates" (Reid and Taylor 2010: 13).

Following this review of the two organizations is a sociological analysis of the creative tension that exists between structure and agency. A beginning theoretical account is provided, of how social entities, like LiKEN and FUNDAEC, generate the coherence and the capacity for trans-formation needed to address problematic power complexes and global contradictions. The organization of the relations between parts into a complex whole, in both biological and social entities, creates an experience of emergence (Elder-Vass 2010). In both of the cited groups, the interaction between the causal powers of agency and social structure enlivens capacity for self-organization; this indicates the possibility for the relational emergence of a greater collective wisdom and "conscious bond of mutual responsibility" within and across such social entities. Unlike the "ordinary virtues" and assertions of "equality of voice" supported by liberal democracy (Ignatieff 2017) and by unconscious reliance upon social contractarianism (Baka 2016), the bond of mutual responsibility that arises represents a uniquely integral realization of self-determination: one that is at once individual, particular to local place, group and circum-stance; *and* collective, universal to the most passionate human experiences of embodied morality, and generative of insights and dispositional stances akin to those found in other groups responding to the same reality of "structural and global contradictions" (Reid and Taylor 2010: 75). As intellectual solidarity is better understood and nurtured, one perceives how this relational emergence can bring forth morally coherent national and trans-national publics.

Finally, I discuss how this emergence is central to the birth of a "public audience" (Strydom 1999). The logic of social thought and action in groups like LiKEN and FUNDAEC is common to social and political movements around the world, though not necessarily well represented in mainstream learning forums. It represents a mode of development through which the public audience may recognize itself as a social struc-ture in its own right. Citizens and their institutions must become able to recognize and name objective deprivations and losses that various

peoples struggle to endure and must be encouraged and better prepared to respond in a fully empathic, compassionate and corrective way to these (Baka 2016). As inter-dependent peoples and groups in different locations forge a far more unifying sense of co-responsibility and begin to manifest the virtue of intellectual solidarity, they can become a collective voice for restorative justice challenging the conceptual foundations of both the local and global societies (Hollenbach 1995). This concluding section affirms that intellectual solidarity as a democratic virtue achieved through pragmatism is uniquely able to transform the cognitive order within both municipal and international domains. It overcomes the intellectual limitations and moral divides associated with legal positivism, that generate a schism between these two domains (Baka 2016); and it facilitates the transformation of citizens' social power into political power, signaling the rightful reclamation of their legal power.

LiKEN

The Appalachian group LiKEN, which stands for Livelihoods Knowledge Exchange Network, calls itself a "link-tank" rather than a "think-tank". Rather than generating ideas in self-enclosure, it seeks actively to serve and support necessary learning and transformation within lives in community. It accomplishes this by working across generations and other common divides to engage a multitude of diverse values and perspectives, nurturing social integration by engaging in projects that "connect local knowledge with specialized expertise" for instance. LiKEN works in an active and responsive way to: educate for community-based; asset-based development; evaluate development scenarios and outcomes; monitor government and scholarly systems for assessing quality of life; and translate between communities, experts and policy-makers, and between local and trans-local. Members believe that "people understand their own places, environments, and communities in ways that are essential to good public policy and good science" (www.likenknowledge). Here, citizens' local knowledge is not perceived as anti-scientific. Instead, it is recognized to be often more scientific than expert knowledge, in that it can lead to empirical questions about what is happening in an actual location of concern. Official management systems, that follow their own bureaucratic protocols, rather than responding to real-life needs in context, are removed from this level of factual insight (Reid and Taylor 2010: 161).

LiKEN focuses on *deliberative dialogue* and *alignment* so that individuals and institutions can mutually influence one another. Agendas within institutions influence citizens' action plans; likewise, reference to the deliberative and contestatory work of citizens needs to guide the vision and efforts of institutions. Nussbaum describes this same logic of reciprocity in her writing on compassion and public life, writing that:

> The relationship between compassion and social institutions is and should be a two-way street: compassionate individuals construct institutions that embody what they imagine; and institutions, in turn, influence the development of compassion in individuals. (2001: 405)

A founding member of the LiKEN group, Betsy Taylor further explains:

> By introducing deliberative dialogue and alignment, communities can engage the organizations or institutions in their interrelated networks to create new solutions to their problems and strengthen public life. (www. likenknowledge)

Here, how deliberative dialogue and alignment work to "strengthen public life" can be translated as, how they serve to create intentional *regularities* through new biological and social structures within the individual and community life. These are created as participants manage conflict and difference through deliberative politics that support collective moral endeavor. They include life-affirming biological regularities, within the brain-body circuitries related to optimal vagal tone, for instance, which supports relational attunement, neural integration and regulation of emotion and thought (Hass-Cohen and Findlay 2015; Siegel 2012); these regularities support the maturation level needed to engage in "imagination ethics" that expand the field of possibilities through a metacognitive awareness of moral consciousness (Narvaez 2014: 193), and they function to help integrate, rather than habitually avoid or suppress, communication that is unruly in that it contests dominant norms. The emergent regularities also support social conditions that stabilize cognitive endowment through shared reflection, increasing human understanding across borders and established boundaries. A dynamic stabilization process that is conducive to healthy ongoing social growth is therefore set in motion. Biological and social regularities, in turn, serve to strengthen,

refine and sustain these inner and outer world structures so that open-mindedness and the ability to negotiate more fluently across different perspectives can improve overall social health and ethical creativity.

An example of this is the partnership LiKEN has developed with the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research/National Center for Atmospheric Research (UCAR/NCAR) and Haskell Indian Nation University to support the organization of a new group, *Rising Voices*, which has a cross-cultural approach to environmental and climate issues, and a pragmatic, genealogical approach to community-making. *Rising Voices* includes Indigenous communities, Tribal nations, earth and climate scientists, practitioners, academics and researchers from around the world. Relationships between diverse students and federal and state government representatives are described as being founded on a "platform of respect" that protects participants as they voice concerns, thereby allowing an ongoing belief-evaluation relational shift to occur within and across participants from different backgrounds. In their sixth gathering in 2018, Dan Wildcat of Tribal Haskell Indian Nation University urged for a shift in political discourse, toward the inalienable responsibilities that humans have as "members of larger systems and communities" in which the importance of relationships, respect and responsibility become key to cultivating resilience (risingvoices.ucar.edu; 5). Institutions should outgrow "anthropogenic notions of progress" and become more Indigenized in this sense, he averred, with Indigenous people leading the way toward a human solidarity in which it is understood that: "We are all part of the larger global community, and there is work for everyone" (6):

> Relationships matter *(pau nā mea pili pili)*
> The power of one *(ka mana o kekahi')*
> The power of partnerships *(ka mana o na hui)*

Participants have noted that, at these intensive three-day annual meetings, "nothing is swept under the rug for cooperation"; and they have described the trust and nurturing social-emotional ecology they feel present at *Rising Voices*, in which both the specificity of needs within identitarian politics and the universality of needs for belonging within a voluntary association with global vision are recognized and mediated between:

It is a place for Indigenous community members to speak of their struggles, their fights, their need for Western science to acknowledge them and their knowledge....I found the representation and empowerment from people of color who could be my mentors – people I do not often see in an educational system that is predominantly white. (Flores Castillo)

In LiKEN's "linking" communicative projects, needs for goods of *respect*, *love* and *activity*, which are often viewed asymmetrically in relation to one another, or as separate and distinct needs, are approached instead through the paradigms of reciprocity and social and systemic integration (Harris 1999). These goods, which directly support participation in the radical holism of pragmatic inquiry, include needs for: confidence, self-respect and understanding; mutual affection and particular appreciation of unique identity; and engagement as well as aesthetic pleasure (1999). The spiritual pragmatism modeled in *Rising Voices* has resulted in the emergence of the Indigenous Phenology Network (IPN); input to the US National Climate Assessment; disaster preparedness training for participating communities and representatives; recommendations to the President's State, Local, and Tribal Leaders Task Force on Climate Preparedness and Resilience; and in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) accommodating fellowship opportunities for the needs, and increased inclusion, of tribal college students (risingvoices.ucar.edu). Diverse and plural human goods, and the value imperatives they generate, can be perceived in dialogue with one another, regulating and structuring each other mutually and symmetrically to bring about meaningful outcomes and change (Harris 1999). Coherence is created within individual moral personality, local community and the broader movement toward global moral consciousness, countering the fragmenting effects of the rationalizing structures of liberal democracy and contributing significantly to both individual and collective maturation processes.

FUNDAEC

Another example of this kind of movement toward coherence, knowledge-sharing and communication across domains of real-life concern is the organization FUNDAEC. FUNDAEC (Fundación Para la Aplicación y Enseñanza de las Ciencias) was founded as a non-governmental organization (NGO) in 1974 by an interdisciplinary group

of scholars from the Universidad del Valle who were concerned that development projects in rural Columbia were being conceived of only as a product. The development paradigm of modernization and industrialization left people in these areas used and dependent rather than empowered and with dignity. The Foundation created a university for integral development, called UDI (*Universidad Para el Desarrollo Integral*), which was defined as "a social space in which the inhabitants of a given region learn to choose and walk the paths of their own communities' development"; these social spaces are now present and active not only in Columbia, but also in many other Latin American countries (www.fundaec.org).

Today, FUNDAEC's "Sistema de Aprendizaje Tutorial", SAT, focuses on capacity development. One of its guiding beliefs is that catalysts for change are located within rural populations themselves and are able to instigate meaningful transformation as knowledge already within the community is developed and shared. The program is organized in functional phases so that practical results are achieved whether students complete or not. Many students can complete all three correlated phases though. This is because the model counters the dominant global space-time framework for development, by remaining flexibly adapted to rural student time frame needs, which include the need to leave school during harvest seasons, or to attend to home duties. Rather than running on a fixed schedule planned by administrators, students and their tutor arrange scheduling together. The tutor is a guide rather than an authority, and a community resident, rather than an outsider. The result is a much more participative and cooperative educational experience.

FUNDAEC's fundamental programs are listed as (1) Sustainable Production Systems in Small Farms; (2) Small-scale production processes for Families and Groups that have poor access to land; and (3) Opening and strengthening Support (www.fundaec.org). These programs overcome the dominant paradigm of development as product; development as co-participatory process is able to prevail, creating a foundation for organic growth that is based on an expanding network of relationships across different organizations, and ongoing inclusion and outreach, especially to youth. Rather than relying upon technocratic legal pacts to gain security, FUNDAEC and regional or local institutions sign SAT Covenants to realize a dynamic stability in their growth together. These represent not only a contractual agreement but *an alliance* between organizations and persons that share the same vision of development (www. fundaec.org).

A founder of FUNDAEC, Farzam Arbab, who was a professor of physics at Universidad del Valle when the initiative began, makes a critical point about the need to continuously articulate and improve the shared vision of development, so that more comprehensive value integration can occur. The intense challenge of meeting real-world needs for development demands inner processes of ongoing self-improvement. For FUNDAEC, that improvement is deeply rooted in structured scientific learning. Furthermore, it requires being open to guiding "moral and spiritual principles emanating from religion" while also scrutinizing proposals from this domain:

> The process [of self-improvement] is not advanced by the mere application of technology, even when it is supported by political will, and must be intimately connected to structured scientific learning. But *while science can offer the methods and tools of inquiry and learning, it alone cannot set the direction*; the goal of development cannot come from within the process itself. The path of development must be illumined by the light of moral and spiritual principles emanating from religion, *but religion willing to submit its proposals to the scrutiny of science.* (Arbab 2000: 136; italics my own)

This statement has a serious implication for the scope, or horizon, of that development which counters the closed logic of global capitalist space-time frames. At a certain point, a commitment to development that is driven by the sincere desire to "exercise the powers that characterize the parties as moral persons" (Galston 1991: 496) leads to the need to initiate another, more expansive sociocultural moral project: to work out more specifically and systematically, how people in both local and global communities can advance an operational understanding of social health that calls upon

> Our capacity to function in an inter-participatory way within our own person, interpersonally with others, and institutionally in systems of others. (Mustakova-Possardt et al. 2014: 106)

Arbab concludes that this expansive project requires the integration of values and guidance from both science and religion. Improved fluency in this instance allows participants to "*re-center*... within the particular situations *what is at stake* in particular debates" (Reid and Taylor 2010: 13; italics my own), which is critical, because as Arbab has noted, "the goal of development cannot come from within the process" itself. This

recognition of an emotional and intellectual re-centering process, and of the importance of a group's relationship to otherness, is in contrast to the more adversarial or defensive relationship to the Other that have been observed around the globe in the twenty-first century; for example, in places where one hears the liberal democratic assertion of "equality of voice" a positivist belief in human rights is represented, that is not at all necessarily inclusive of the other, and that is indeed separated from any universal claim (Ignatieff 2017). By participating in the search for moral and spiritual principles and engaging in scientific scrutiny of them, FUNDAEC members become active and creative agents of organic wide-scale, structural change: that is, not just "think-tank" members, locked into one discipline or way of thinking, but "link-tank" members, people who are not afraid to extend communication across boundaries like this, and to expand contemplation, in order to counter the space-time frames of global capitalism and to address real-world consequences that generate in one domain and spread, uncontrollably and unintentionally, to so many others.

Emergence, Structure and Agency

Groups like LiKEN and FUNDAEC bring to the forefront the creative tension existing between structure and agency, by: exposing issues involved in both local-municipal and global-international aspects of the right to self-determination; and, actively, addressing the problem of over-reliance upon conventional social contract. This second area of concern is implicated in how positivist constructions of law continually generate and maintain the gap between the two aspects of the right to self-determination. A better understanding of the significance of the creative tension between structure and agency must begin with definitions of the terms. *Structure* includes established frameworks of meaning, social roles and agreements about organizational development and communication. *Agency* is an expression of the emotional integrity and persevering determination needed to follow through on social actions; ultimately, in an integrated human experience of agency, these actions are inwardly organized by one's dedication to the larger interests of humankind, or the 'common good'. As actions, they are therefore able to transform "the de facto interdependence of persons and groups into a conscious bond of mutual responsibility" (Hollenbach 1995: 150). The difference between structure and agency and how they interact with one another, represents a

central dilemma in understanding how causal power works in the realization of self-determination and formation of human solidarity. It also can reveal something about the difference between political and legal power, and their necessary intertwinement in authentic law-making processes (Baka 2016).

The problem can be pondered like this: Is there something social—like members of civil society, who become constituents of emerging publics that address real-world issues and needs—that could be *causally effective in its own right*? If so, how exactly is this causal power generated so that the influence that group members exert upon the world and within people's hearts and minds is not deemed merely 'a side-effect' of the behavior of different individual agents in that assembly? Instead, it is a direct result of *the generative mechanisms inherent within processes of interaction* among members, indicating that the social structures developing organically out of the self-organizing potentials within the community sector are a major source of that causal power (Elder-Vass 2010: 23). But how is that self-organizing potential activated and how is it sustained within processes of interaction? Clearly, the causal power of agency must play a major role. Which then is the more relevant, or dominant, factor in the evolution of social change guided by the larger core virtue of intellectual solidarity: agency or social structure? Which is more primary or fundamental to the public's acknowledgment of mutual responsibility? Which is more important for its recognition of itself as a living whole capable of authoring new forms, and of altering the cognitive order that organizes social life?

Generally speaking, there are two basic camps of belief in this creative tension. One holds that the causal power of agency overrides the influences of social structure; the other asserts the converse that the causal effectiveness of social structure dominates over human capacities for agency (Elder-Vass 2010). Methodological individualists are like "voluntarist thinkers" who dismiss social factors arising out of social structures and elevate the role of agency and conscious decision-making in human social behavior. "Determinists", on the other hand, view behaviors and decisions as arising unthinkingly out of social conditioning that occurs within social contexts and therefore regard social structure as the influential force shaping these (ibid.). If this second view were entirely true, then social institutions like schools and legal courts could so condition individuals as to make impossible recognition that members of civil society have the capacity to self-organize social structure with causal power in its own

right. Indeed, the negative feedback loops maintained by these types of deterministic relations to dominant social entities are why Dewey (1927) proclaimed the public to be in eclipse, and bereft of its intelligence. Elder-Vass summarizes these two schools of thought like this:

> Individualists about structure, it would seem, must be voluntarists about agency, while it is often believed that those who attribute causal significance to social structure must be determinists about agency. (ibid.: 2)

The disagreements between the two seem to offer only a binary framework through which to consider the ways in which causal power operates. For this reason, these kinds of disputes and the paradoxes they raise are said to be central in "a battle for the heart and soul of sociology" (ibid.: 3). A person is left uncertain as to whether it would ever be possible for the public to recognize itself as a social structure, or for its individual constituents to realize the causal power of their agency to the extent that their normative law-making power is recognized and authentic public action made feasible.

This uncertainty is why Habermas inquired into how systemic error, which accumulates in social subsystems like hospitals, prisons and schools, for instance, can be remedied through a better alignment of morality and law that makes possible the coordination of right action (Habermas 1996). The problem of social inertia, referred to by him and Teresa Brennan as well, is enmeshed in the problem of "unavoidable inertial features" which are accounted for in the formal structure of the constitutional state. Nevertheless, they become "a point where illegitimate power complexes that are independent of the democratic process can crystallize" and can be abetted by the systemic infrastructure that circulates normatively regulated power (Habermas 1996: 328; Brennan 2000). The interrelation of law and deliberative politics needs to be aligned first and foremost, then, not with an unspecified ideal of communication, but with *a pre-determined practical means* of discerning how and when illegitimate power complexes crystallize and are unofficially circulated. Habermas affirms this when he writes:

> For nothing appears less probable to the enlightened sociologist than the claim that the integrative achievements of modern law are nourished solely, or even in the first instance, by a normative consensus whether already

existing or achieved, and hence *by the communicative sources of solidarity.* (Habermas 1996: 34; italics my own)

A genealogical approach to community that encourages contestation and uses the mediating movement of pragmatism to address real-world power differentials while problem-solving provides insight into the kind of *pre-determined practical means* needed to discern the unofficially circulated, illegitimate power, referred to by Habermas. LiKEN's stance, that locals be included in the "official" management of land and resources in Appalachia, because of their more specific and vital factual insight regarding where and how social inertia is creating stress and harm, is an example of how an intentionally pragmatic interrelation of law and deliberative politics can unleash new sources of causal power capable of transforming inter-agentive and systemic forms of domination (Hayward 2011). Because of its commitment to emotional integrity and willingness to hold a vision of the greater common good, the pragmatic, genealogical approach to human interaction nurtures intellectual solidarity. Participants develop the courage to adopt fully the rationality of a radical holism, so that one's approach to inquiry is not constrained by the categorization of "separate orders of fact and value or of the causal and the normative"; the factual/causal is not elevated nor is the evaluative/normative degraded (Festenstein 2004: 292).

Another way to say this is that, the descriptive science of values associated with politics, and the normative science of virtues associated with ancient philosophical approaches to law, are able to sustain dynamic interactions with one another (Baka 2016: 12; Kelsen 1971: 358). The science of ethics or virtue depends today upon the high degree of reasonableness that distinguishes the pragmatist's account of rationality. It is the pragmatist's insistence upon reconciling the dissonance between norm and reality that makes for a necessary creative dialogical intertwining of morality and legality. Elder-Vass himself observes that neither position in the agency-structure divide can dispense with that side of the dualism that it would depreciate, thereby reflecting something of that same underlying unbiased and egalitarian logic of holism.

The schism between structure and agency is reconciled through a "relational emergentist" account of how new realities come into being. When structure and agency are in dynamic relation with one another, the new reality that emerges can unify morality with human law-making power (Elder-Vass 2010: 66). Emergent properties are those properties

and powers of the whole that cannot be found in the parts alone (ibid.: 16). Elder-Vass views wholes and parts as descriptor terms for the roles that particular entities play in a given circumstance. An entity is basically an object or thing like a cell, flower, person or institution that consists within itself of multiple organizational levels of entities. For instance, a cell is made of molecules made of atoms, or as a school is usually made of administrative leaders, teachers, support staff and students (ibid.). *Relational emergence* refers to particular organizational patterns within the multiple levels of entities that comprise a larger entity, like a cell or school; as new structural organization is realized, new properties emerge that are distinct to the entity as a whole (ibid.: 19). As individuals activate their agency to form participatory citizen groups and as these groups operate as social structures to connect creatively with other diverse groups, both locally and globally, for problem-solving, as FUNDAEC, LiKEN and *Rising Voices* are doing for example, an organic movement of multi-dimensional organization begins. This socio-political movement relies not only upon the inner experience of solidarity. It also affirms the complexity of difference within the interaction of the causal powers that exist in both agency and social structure. These synergistically exert themselves against "unavoidable inertial features" in the society, so that an organizational intelligence and resilience emerges out of both individual and collective experiences of oppression, need and resistance.

Relational emergence accounts for change in both biological and social entities creating an overlap in the "philosophical ontology" between the two that is worth reflecting upon in order to better understand the nature of the self-organizing forces at work in these groups (Elder-Vass 2010: 198). First however, it is helpful to discern the differences in the accounts of change these two provide. A biological organism like a cell retains its basic compositional consistency while it is alive so that as long as it is surviving, it maintains its status as an entity; over time it morphs beyond the formal bounds of its original composition or loses that composition entirely as it either evolves dies or is killed. Another attribute unique to biological entities, studied in natural science, is that they rely structurally upon their parts having relatively fixed spatial relationships to one another; and internal parts are differentiated from the external environment usually by clear spatial boundaries.

A social entity, like a college, on the other hand, shares many natural features with the biological entity, but to achieve status as an entity requires that there be some organization of the individual human parts

that is generated and maintained internally and psychologically through, for instance, shared language and cultural agreement. The members of any kind of school must in some way share the common project of learning and maintaining the learning environment and activities. This permits interaction organized around a shared goal to occur across diverse members and makes possible not only the organization of the constituents into a whole that is greater than the parts, but also the dynamic reorganization of relationships over time so that new properties pertaining to the whole can emerge continually and structural evolution occur. Social entities rely upon the beliefs and dispositions of constituents to produce the mechanisms needed for the emergence of new properties that secure the survival and evolution of a social structure.

In addition, unlike biological organisms, social entities, studied in social science, do *not* depend on the kind of spatial stability found in the former in order to maintain their structure as an entity. Elder-Vass observes how a school building may spatially constrain the constituents of the school, yet, school activities persist outside of the building, during field trips, for example. This allows social roles to grow and transform and permits the entity itself to defy the spatial boundary of the building. Businesses with global reach seem to have an unlimited capacity for this kind of extension, although in other ways, they rely on the stability of compositional consistency that limits the quality of reasonableness that characterizes their inwardly generated binding agreements to the logic of rationalizing structures. Still, their capacity to extend and transform their boundaries gives hope that with an improved understanding of the intellectual solidarity and spiritual functioning, publics can also be extended trans-nationally and dedicated to a larger common good (ibid.: 200). Intellectual solidarity continuously expands, integrates and refines how the common project unifying a social entity is envisioned and shared. The social entity's capacity for extension indicates the possibility for transforming different forms of systemic and inter-agentive domination (Hayward 2011), which are related to different particular spatial and temporal arrangements. It is those particular socially encoded arrangements that hinder realization of political freedom worldwide.

Having outlined the differences between the biological and social, it is time to return to the subject of their overlap. Elder-Vass perceives a problematic ambiguity in the combination of naturalistic and anti-naturalistic elements in social entities. In terms of the philosophical ontology related to emergence, he perceives that a form of naturalism can be advocated

for. And although differences exist in the methodologies needed to study emergence in the social and natural sciences, the need for interpretive elements in the study of social entities cannot alone be made the grounds for anti-naturalism; this is because variations in methodologies exist also across the varieties of natural sciences. That said, one must admit that, though it does not "license anthropocentric denials of the causal powers of social structures", the fact that humans, who constitute the parts of social entities, have *beliefs and dispositions* (i.e., a political nature that can positively assert the separation of legality from morality), introduces a distinction from natural biological entities that is so complex and vast as to approach the anti-natural (Elder-Vass 2010: 199).

The main point for now though is that an entity, whether biological or social, is more than a set of internally coherent parts. As an entity, it is structured in such a way that relations between the constituting parts are "more than merely aggregative" (ibid.: 16). Collections of parts might more accurately be termed "arbitrary constructs" like "all the rice in China" (Collier 1989: 193; Elder-Vass 2010: 16). Diverse parts that share a few basic similarities may accumulate to make a quantity that can be impressive, but they do not form entities: a collection of people who all reside in a particular nation-state or who all share the same planet does not have the moral coherence or intelligence of a truly democratic public guided by a far more profound emergent collective wisdom.

It is the organization of the relations between parts into a complex whole that creates emergence (Elder-Vass 2010: 45). But emergence is by no means limited to that single temporal event when an entity first arises as a coherent whole. New properties of the whole, that the parts alone do not possess, can arise continually out of multiple levels of organization that shift and change within the entity; emergence here is understood to stem from *the generative mechanisms of nature* and the *causal powers of things* (Elder-Vass 2010). And it is the interaction between the causal powers of agency and social structure, rather than the dominance of one over the other, that enlivens this organization. This relational emergentist account of change in individuals and society is able to describe with considerable complexity ongoing processes of creative evolution, as well as the underlying power dynamics implicated in social ills; and it provides an explanation as to how the public, as individuals in a vast social group, might arise in its most self-determining and morally coherent sense and survive over time.

Elder-Vass explains the nature of this change in terms of morphogenetic and morphostatic factors that make up the causal history of entities. While morphogenetic factors are involved in how an entity arises, morphostatic ones help to sustain its existence over time, maintaining its characteristic set of "compositional consistency requirements" thereby keeping a higher level entity "in continuous existence from moment to moment" (Buckley 1967: 58; Elder-Vass 2010: 32; 35). The latter is witnessed in the "ordinary virtues" described by Ignatieff, like "trust, tolerance, forgiveness, reconciliation and resilience"; he observed that these are constitutive of the unconscious "moral operating systems" that allow groups of people to survive together (2017: 26). In his far-ranging empirical research into how people in different locations around the globe actually make sense of change and respond to the physical and moral events that unfold in their own local context, it was the morphostatic consistencies generated by unconscious reliance on "ordinary virtues" that proved most important (2017). Crisis itself can be a contributor to morphogenetic factors. In the community-making process described by Scott M. Peck and taught and practiced by the Foundation for Community Encouragement, the emergence of "genuine community" is an example of this: it is, in actuality, a response to the crisis generated in earlier stages of the process, that are related to group experiences of "chaos" and "emptiness" (Geredien 2018). Morphogenetic factors are able to alter the form of an entity but its existence is contingent upon not being overcome by causal factors, like the crises of environmental degradation or terrorism, that can end it outright (Elder-Vass 2010: 67).

This means that in order to survive, the public, once it is freed from the forces of its obscuration, will need not only to sustain itself through the support of multiple morphostatic causes, (i.e., substantive changes in institutional and community life that stably support the moral ontology of genuine citizenship) but also to recognize itself as "the outcome of an ongoing interplay between morphostatic causes, morphogenetic causes and structural possibilities" (36). Ignatieff has concluded that aligning the assertion of equality of voice with a universal claim that extends the horizon of caring involved, ultimately to include concern for all sentient beings and for the planet as a whole, *cannot be achieved* by the mere counter-assertion of the universal validity of human rights, as this concept is constructed in elite discourses (2017). Instead, the realization of universality he refers to must be attained through the moral transformation of

institutional life and the practical embodied striving of individual citizens and groups like LiKEN and FUNDAEC, for a higher degree of reasonableness.

The emotional rationality that makes possible the radical holism of pragmatic inquiry supports a world-embracing humanism that reconnects morality and legality. In this, citizens' capacity to care for the well-being of all fellow humans and to protect the integrity and welfare of all life is awakened as they transform the dissonance between norm and reality. It is further affirmed as new social ethical paths to knowledge formation are realized and as citizens intentionally strive to end the suffering that arises out of human ignorance. Therefore, in managing the interplay of causes and possibilities outlined by Elder-Vass, one can appreciate the wisdom in Farzam Arbab's statement that science alone cannot set the direction for development. Its goal "must be illumined by the light of moral and spiritual principles emanating from religion, *but religion willing to submit its proposals to the scrutiny of science*" (Arbab 2000: 136; italics my own).

Movement Toward Intellectual Solidarity

Ultimately, in projects like LiKEN and FUNDAEC, what makes the moral good as an endeavor distinct, on the one hand, from a philosophical academic exercise, and on the other, from journalistic reporting on the outcome of real-world events, is the fact that one's "philosophical" contemplation is attuned and organized around "real-world" consequences—and one does not back down, or turn around, when exposed empirical facts or inner psychological and moral truths come to light. Betsy Taylor refers to the pragmatist's pursuit of the moral good as "THE WORK!". She describes the sense of unity of conscience across peoples, as an evolutionary convergence brought about by shared commitment to respond to "similar structural and global contradictions" (2010: 75); these contradictions consist of ubiquitous problematic power complexes and illegitimate constitutionally regulated sources of power. Referred to by Habermas, these complexes are at the root of various forms of human domination and social inertia.

> One can discover people who do "THE WORK!" in various work roles – activists, academic, government, media—working on various issues—health, environment, empowerment, income generation, human rights, culture,—but somehow one senses that one is on the same path. There

are uncanny resemblances between grassroots efforts in quite different places—*as if this is convergent evolution*, different communities responding to similar structural and global contradictions. (Reid and Taylor 2010: 75; italics my own)

All over the world, in different circumstances, coherence in public consciousness arises as moral impulse is vitalized and willingness to engage in social change comes to a head because there is "a conflict of social customs of such a nature" that the only way to proceed is by working out "the proper mode of action" (Koch 1991: xxxviii; quote by Dewey on 101). The challenge of determining what that action should be and then engaging in it, presents an opportunity for the most vital human development to occur. This is because the tension within the interactions of structure and agency provokes the rise of new properties within the whole, through relational emergence. In the possible resulting discovery of solidarity across borders one recognizes also the integrative and unifying power of human conscience. But it is important to remember that it is the "conflict of social customs" and the need to work out "the proper mode of action" that invigorates this power and that can mobilize morally coherent social and systemic integration. As Ignatieff writes:

Moral globalization is best understood not as a tide of convergence in which we are swept together into a single modernity, but instead *as a site of struggle* over whether, and to what extent, the cash nexus can be made to serve moral imperatives of equity and justice and which civilizational model... will define the political and moral order of the twenty-first century. (2017: 16; italics my own)

The experience of the conscience is the most internal source of human beliefs about right or wrong and of moral disposition. As Elder-Vass informs, the role of beliefs and dispositions in human development distinguishes the organizing power of social entities from that of biological organisms; nonetheless, when conscience itself is made their common source, the anti-naturalism associated with their complexity and vast nature is to some degree, restored to a natural phenomenon. Hence, Taylor's seemingly anti-natural observation of "convergent evolution" signals a much deeper natural convergence in how moral disposition is being developed internally. Objective validity and empirical stances regarding social health or illness are being aligned with the "fruit of

authentic subjectivity" (Helminiak 1998: 17; quote by Lonergan 1972: 292; Macy 1991).

Strydom refers to the problem-solving, world-creating domain of the public sphere that arises through critical need and the power of conscience as the "public audience". The constituents of the public audience can be thought of as public eyewitnesses who respond scientifically and creatively to real-world consequences. As friends bound together by their inner commitment to fulfill human moral heritage, they seek to supervise and regulate these consequences. It is the task of the public audience to recognize the distinct resonance structures used for communication in any one domain of the public sphere and to overcome the limitations inherent to it, thereby increasing the human capacity for fluency (Strydom 1999, 2001). Dewey perceived that the "supervision and regulation" of consequences "cannot be effected by the primary grouping themselves" (Dewey *LW 2* 1988a: 252). The natural or biological conditions through which, for example, religious, scientific, sporting or artistic group associations and actions have arisen from local contiguity, produces "distinctive consequences- that is, consequences which differ in kind from those of isolated behavior" (252). The public as public audience is called into being by the "essence of the consequences", by the fact that these consequences, by their very nature, "expand beyond those directly engaged in producing them" (253). It is the interrelated, extensive nature of the consequences produced by seemingly discrete social entities that practically speaking has the creative moral power to beget a public consciousness. Public intelligence is found in the felt awareness of unity that underlies the human relationship to life matrix.

This idea, of people coming to accept the interrelational nature of the consequences of human action, and of initiating new paths of development and problem-solving that respond to an understanding of mutual responsibility, resonates with the Islamic concept of *din*. *Din* has three main aspects pertaining to: indebtedness; the nature of the cosmopolis; and the action of refining, building or civilizing. *Din* is the "foundation and motivation" for the Islamic approach to science and development (Baharuddin 2000: 113). When respected in all its aspects, it provides the vital insight and reminder that social responsibility does not arise only out of social thought, but also out of one's *responsibility*, as a created and dependent being, to fulfill one's intellectual and spiritual capacities. In the Islamic understanding, if one is in debt (*a da'in*), then one is obligated (*dayn*) to tend to those regulations and laws that would govern

that debt (ibid.: 115). This process involves cultivation of the wisdom ethic (*daynuya*), so that considered judgment and justice can be realized by each person.

By focusing on what Dewey called the "essence of the consequences", members of the public audience are working with the concept of debt and development both internally and externally, negotiating the creative tension within the interactions of agency and social structure. By engaging with empirical data, and by examining the disjuncture between legal norms and the way things actually are on the ground, the objective deprivations and losses that various peoples experience are felt and known at a deeper level of being (Baka 2016). Old cognitive order assumptions that have been projected onto society can finally be identified and uprooted. In brief, by focusing this way on the "essence of the consequences", members of the public audience are helping to secure social conditions in which human dignity within genealogical community can truly be realized. Hollenbach defines this emergent intellectual solidarity as

> a spirit of willingness to take other persons and groups seriously enough to engage them in conversation and debate about how the interdependent world we share should be shaped and structured...[it] calls for engagement with the other through both listening and speaking, in the hope that understanding might replace incomprehension and that perhaps even agreement could result. (1995: 150)

Pragmatism as action-oriented philosophy and mediating movement empowers this progress toward engagement, better understanding and renewal. For those who are willing to engage dynamically with the intellectual challenges inherent to new processes of knowledge formation and who accept the border-crossing nature of "THE WORK!" pragmatism establishes relationship to an integrative principle. Manifesting through the particular new properties that arise out of relational emergence, this living principle advances movement toward an "organization of all elements" (Dewey *LW* 2 1988a: 259). It is found in the "site of struggle" referenced by Ignatieff and evidenced in the emergent "convergent evolution" referred to by Taylor, in which different communities respond to similar structural and global contradictions. Through their civilizing actions, members of those communities may better discern and appreciate the nuances and complexities that characterize one's inner relationship to conscience. They may collectively realize the deeper structural

legal significances that link debt to morally coherent social development
and to a global movement for restorative justice. These significances are
associated with the concept of *din* and with the mutual sense of political
responsibility and obligation that characterizes the virtue of intellectual
solidarity.

REFERENCES

Arbab, Farzam. 2000. "Promoting a Discourse on Science, Religion, and
    Development." In *The Lab, The Temple, and The Market: Reflections at
    the Intersection of Science, Religion, and Development*, ed. Sharon Harper.
    Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Bahruddin, Azizan. 2000. "Rediscovering the Resources of Religion." In *The
    Lab, The Temple, and The Market: Reflections at the Intersection of Science,
    Religion, and Development*, ed. Sharon Harper. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian
    Press.

Baka, A.E. 2016. *The Dialectic of the Cave: Self-Determination, Constitution and
    the Phenomenology of Deprivation*, thesis. University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam,
    Hong Kong SAR. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5353/th_b5731083.

Bion, W.R. 1959. *Experiences in Groups and Other Papers*. New York: Basic
    Books, Inc.

Brennan, Teresa. 2000. *Exhausting Modernity: Grounds for a New Economy*.
    London: Routledge.

Buckley, Walter. 1967. *Sociology and Modern Systems Theory*. Englewood Cliffs,
    NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Collier, Andrew. 1989. *Scientific Realism and Socialist Thought*. Hemel Hemp-
    stead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

De Sousa, Ronald. 1987. *The Rationality of Emotion* Cambridge, MA: MIT
    Press.

Dewey, John. 1988a. *The Later Works, 1925–1953 Volume 2: 1925–1927*. Ed.
    Jo Ann Boydston, textual ed. Bridget A. Walsh. Carbondale, IL: Southern
    Illinois University Press.

Dewey, John. 1988b.*The Later Works of John Dewey, Volume 11, 1925–1953:
    Essays, Reviews, Trotsky Inquiry, Miscellany, and Liberalism and Social Action
    (Collected Works of John Dewey)*. Ed. Jo Ann Boydston, textual ed. Bridget A.
    Walsh. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Dewey, John. 1927. *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Holt.

Elder-Vass, Dave. 2010. *The Causal Power of Social Structures: Emergence,
    Structure and Agency*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Festenstein, M. 2002. "Pragmatism's Boundaries." *Millennium—Journal of
    International Studies* 31 (3): 549–571.

————. 2004. "Pragmatism and Two Models of Democracy." *European Journal of Social Theory* 7 (3): 291–306.

Findlay, J.C., and N. Hass-Cohen. 2015. *Art Therapy and the Neuroscience of Relationships, Creativity, and Resiliency: Skills and Practices*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fischer, K., and T. Biddel. 2006. Dynamic Development of Action, Thought and Emotion. In *Theoretical Models of Human Development. Handbook of Child Psychology*, 6th ed., Vol. 1, ed. W. Damon and R.M. Lerner, 313–399. New York: Wiley.

Fung, Archon. 2012. "Continuous Institutional Innovation and the Pragmatic Conception of Democracy." *Polity* 4 (44) (October): 609–624.

Galston, William A. 1991. *Liberal Purposes: Goods, Virtues and Diversity in the Liberal State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Geredien, Julie. 2018. "Transformative Harmony and the Community-Making Process." In *Transformative Harmony*, ed. Ananta Giri. New Delhi: Studera Press.

Habermass, J. 1996. *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harris, George. 1999. *Agent-Centered Morality: An Aristotelian Alternative to Kantian Internalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hayward, Clarissa Rile. 2011. "What Can Political Freedom Mean in a Multicultural Democracy?: On Deliberation, Difference, and Democratic Governance." *Political Theory* 39 (4): 468–497.

Hollenbach, David. 1995. "Virtues and Democracy." In *New Communitarian Thinking: Persons, Virtues, Institutions and Communities*, ed. Amitai Etzioni. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia.

Ignatieff, Michael. 2017. *The Ordinary Virtues: Moral Order in a Divided World*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

James, William. 1978. *Pragmatism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jardine, Alice. 2007. *A Surplus of Living Attention: Celebrating the Life and Ideas of Teresa Brennan*, Ed. Alice Jardine, Shannon Lundeen, and Kelly Oliver. New York: State University of New York Press.

Joas, Hans. 1993. *Pragmatism and Social Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

John, Paul II. 1987. *"Solicitudo Rei Socialis: To the Bishops, Priests Religious Families, sons and daughters of the Church and all people of good will for the twentieth anniversary of Populorum Progressio"* found at www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis.html.

Kelsen, Hans. 1971. *What Is Justice: Justice, Law and Politics in the Mirror of Science: Collected Essay by Hans Kelsen*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Keil, Charles. 1979. *Tiv Song: The Sociology of Art in a Classless Society*. Chicago: Chicago University of Chicago Press.

Koch, Donald. 1991. "Introduction." In *Lectures on Ethics, 1900–1901: John Dewey*. Ed. Donald F Koch. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Locke, Alain LeRoy. 1989. *The Philosophy of Alain Locke: Harlem Renaissance and Beyond*. Ed. Leonard Harris. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lonergan, Bernard J. F. 1972. "Insight: A Study of Human Understanding." *Method in Theology*, 3–25. New York: Seabury.

Macy, Joanna. 1991. *Mutual Causality in Buddhism and General Systems Theory: The Dharma of Natural Systems*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Misak, Cheryl. 2000. *Truth, Morality and Politics: Pragmatism and Deliberation*. London: Routledge.

Mustakova-Possardt, E. 2003. *Critical Consciousness: A Study of Morality in Global, Historical Context*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Mustakova-Possardt, et al. 2014. *Toward a Socially Responsible Psychology for a Global Era*. New York: Springer.

Narvaez, Darcia. 2014. *Neurobiology and the Development of Human Morality: Evolution, Culture and Wisdom*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Nussbaum, Martha. 2001. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Phelan, S. 1994. *Getting Specific: Postmodern Lesbian Politics*. Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.

———. 1996. *Revisioning the Political: Feminist Reconstructions of Traditional Concepts in Western Political Theory*. Ed. Nancy J. Hirschmann and Christine DiStefano. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Reid, Herbert, and Betsy Taylor. 2010. *Recovering the Commons: Democracy, Place, and Global Justice*. Springfield: University of Illinois Press.

Schwering, Markus. 2014, 24 July. "Internet and Public Sphere: What the Web Can't Do" Reset Dialogues on Civilizations found at www.resetdoc.org/story/internet-and-public-sphere-what-the-web-cant-do/.

Siegel, Daniel. 2012. *The Developing Mind: How Relationships and the Brain Interact to Shape Who We Are, Second Edition*. London: Guilford Press.

Strydom, Piet. 1999. "Triple Contingency: The Theoretical Problem of the Public in Communication Societies." *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 25 (2): 1–25.

———. 2001. *Contemporary Critical Theory and Methodology*. Oxon: Routledge.

Taylor, Betsy. 2010. "Pollution, Subsistence, Sustainability in USA Nationalism: The Symbolic Construction of 'Appalachia' as America's 'trash' People." In *Interrogating Development: Insights from Margins*, 62–82. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Touraine, Alain. 1995. *Critique of Modernity*. Cambridge: Blackwell, Ltd.