THE INDO-PACIFIC
JOURNAL OF
phenomenology

Peacebuilding from the Inside

by **Kevin C. Krycka**

Abstract

A deeper understanding of the role embodied intelligence can play in social change is vitally important if we are to be successful in creating and maintaining a more just and sustainable world. A key component of any change process, peacebuilding being one example of such a process, is developing inwardly focused bodily intelligence. A phenomenologically oriented understanding of social change, and by extension peacebuilding, is one in which bodily felt recognition must take a special place. Change that is bodily recognized has a different character and functions distinctly from the change that is experienced during a change of mind. A change of mind may stem solely from assimilating new information, (e.g. reading the latest book or professional journal), while bodily experienced change registers along broader lines than cognition alone. Although both processes are kinds of change, the embodied change, which is felt from the inside, is far more generative than change that involves merely altering or shuffling around existing schema or concepts. To assist in further exploration of peacebuilding as inherently both a personal and social event, I have developed an approach based in part on Gendlin's philosophical works, in particular his Process Model (Gendlin, 1997). I refer to this approach as a process model for peacebuilding because this articulates how intrapersonal, interpersonal, and social agency can be framed as one movement, a single ongoing process of human life. However, it must be admitted that this approach with its emphasis on developing embodied knowledge and practices is not as yet readily associated with such externally focused work as that which is found in peace-building as an academic field or social action activity. Embodied interior intelligence as a theoretically rich concept, although known in phenomenology and recognized in emerging theories of cognition, is not as yet sensible to many of those working in the peace-building arena.

Peacebuilding from the inside

As persons who live in a vast and interrelating world, addressing and perhaps solving any of our most 'wicked' problems requires fresh thinking. Thorny problems, which seem to be legion in any era, point to a complexity of specific issues that call for a different mode of thinking, one that can encompass the enormous potential we have within to shape and move forward the very situations that appear to resist simple solutions or easy answers.

Inspirations

I took as inspiration for this project my ongoing research on embodied personal change in transformative moments and conflict resolution in Israel, Turkey, Palestine, Central America and the United States. The personal impact the projects had on me lead me to take what I learned and attempt to apply my insights to the already robust arena of the peacebuilding movement. However, this manoeuver did not quite work as I thought it might. Merely

transferring my experience to an existing conceptual framework did not fit what I noticed.

Instead, it took listening deeply to my own and others' experiences and then reflecting on them in a systematic way for me to eventually come to redefine 'peacebuilding' in my own way. I recall a particularly important example of this that came from my work with understanding difficult conversations. Along with a team of teachers and therapists I worked for nearly two years to explore and create a deep understanding of how conflict is experienced from the inside out. From the level of our lived experience we worked to understand what it was like to be in a difficult conversation. We then modeled an experiential process wherein difficulties could shift and fresh steps of change could occur. We discovered that shifts toward resolution of difficulties came more easily if certain internal and external conditions were also present. It was a profound example of how a forward direction can emerge from what was once a reiterative, negative sequence. This experience fueled my desire to formulate a process model for peace that legitimizes our inner world while intimately regenerating connections to the so-called external environment in which we live.

It almost goes without saying that the world in which we find ourselves today is riddled with conflict. All around we see communities and individuals suffering from various forms of oppression that perpetuate structures of injustice. We witness violence and destruction in our interpersonal relationships, neighborhoods, society, nation and world. The majority populations of our world lack basic goods and this assaults their dignity and perpetuates a dehumanization that seems to have no end.

The desire for, and building of, a culture of peace is growing across many situations and contexts across the world. As our local environments, from the personal to the cultural, demonstrate interest in the new ideas and actions flowing from the rich inner territories found in shared person-to-person experiences, there has been a marked increase in interest in relationality as it intersects with demonstrable outcomes. Relationships resulting from encounters where persons genuinely meet and see each other form a power that has been referred to using terms such as social capital or transformational alliances.[1] I characterize these kinds of relationships as 'generative' insomuch as they allow for and encourage intrapersonal, interpersonal, and societal health and growth. However, to the extent to which environments demonstrate a lack of access to, and

willingness to, entertain fresh ideas and actions, all our good work in creating something new and original will likely fail.

The context and inspirations for this project are thus nested within an intellectual and experiential community of ideas and practices developed from the intersection of philosophical phenomenology, phenomenological psychology, and spirituality, in particular theologies of liberation. These three streams converge around the project of modeling a process for peacebuilding and are explored in detail within this article.

Stepping into the peace conversation

To step into any discussion as potentially broad and confusing as the discussion of peacebuilding, it is important to first lay out the territories of discovery employed. This is of course a slippery task. For instance, the understanding of the term peace has evolved and changed throughout history, as well as for me personally. With each definition its role and purpose has taken on different manifestations, both in society and in our educational system.

Today we accept that peace is more than simply the absence of war, but rather, "the presence of the conditions for a just and sustainable peace." (Kroc Institute, n.d., no page). In my opinion the conditions for peace are just as much found at the inward level as at the more external level. I refer to the right conditions for peace, inside and out, as the environments for peace. However, before we explore this area further it is important to establish the accepted territories for the study of peace.

The end of World War I (1914-1918) saw a deepening appreciation for international cooperation and understanding. Following World War II studies of peacemaking emerged. These studies immediately shifted to studying ways to prevent further worldwide conflict. However, any consensus achieved in spirit among nations was challenged by the needs of individual nation building. This situation continues to exist to this day.

Over the next several decades a multi-layered system for the analysis of peace processes developed that at first focused on responding to immediate crisis, which included managing immense military resources. Built largely upon a positivist, natural scientific model, government funded and non-governmental agencies began looking at peace, and what thwarts it, as a set of independent factors that converge to produce conflict and war. The positivist view aimed to find ways to influence the parties in conflict to move towards peace, including monetary incentives, procedures to facilitate the processes, methods, and

---

[1]See the various works of Martin Buber for an introduction to the concepts of relationality and dialogue (Buber, 1958, 1965)

techniques that they hoped would eventually bring about cessation of hostilities and the implementation of ceasefire provisions (Peacemaking, 2010). The focus of peace building during the period after World War II quickly became 'peacemaking', a largely externalized view that emphasized bringing together parties already engaged in hostilities in order to seek agreement for peaceful resolution of their conflict.

'Peacebuilding' is a relatively new term in academia, but the ideas and practices behind this term have surfaced across cultures during the decades after World War II. In its most basic form peacebuilding can be defined as activity aimed at improving the quality of life. It therefore seeks to either prevent or reduce violence in all forms, be this physically, psychologically, socially, spiritually, and to help communities recover from such kinds of violence. Peacebuilding emerges out of a set of values, relational skills, analytical frameworks, and social processes that were emerging during perhaps one of the most recent creative periods in human consciousness; the 1960s and 1970s.

'Peace Studies' is an interdisciplinary, academic field that draws from political science, psychology, history, theology, philosophy and other fields. Since the early 1900s, peace studies have focused on the study of war, its causes, and human security (University of Notre Dame, 2012). The late 1950s onward saw the birth and formation of both private and government funded independent institutions dedicated to peace research (University of Notre Dame, 2010). These institutions are found in Canada, Europe, Latin America, Australia, Japan, and the United States.[2] In the United States, peace research is conducted primarily at universities. Elise and Kent Boulding created *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* as part of the University of Michigan Conflict and Peace Program in 1956 (University of Notre Dame, 2010). Peace research has ranged from the prevention of war to the reduction and elimination of war, to conflict resolution and nonviolence training.

Other researchers have developed a broader view of peacebuilding that is not only "primarily concerned with conflict behaviour, but addresses the underlying context and attitudes that give rise to violence, such as unequal access to employment, discrimination, unacknowledged responsibility for past crimes, prejudice, mistrust, fear, hostility between groups,"

_____

[2] Peace Research Institute (Dundas); International Development Association (IDA); Human Security Research Group (Vancouver, BC); University of Bradford, UK; Free University, Berlin; Latin America: FLACSO and CLAIP; Australian National University; Asian-Pacific Peace Research Association (APPRA).

(Fisher, 2000, p. 14). A serious challenge to conceiving peacebuilding in this manner relates to its capacity for deeper understanding, not only of the external sources of the conflict that led to the violence in a particular community, but also the deeper understanding of the self-in-relation-to-oneself and the broader environments in which this is lived out. It is here where a process model makes a contribution.

I distinguish the term peacebuilding from its more conventional use and from peace building for one important reason: To indicate a process rather than the joining of two separate entities in intellectual convergence. Fundamentally, peacebuilding, as a process, is an inward space achieved in a situational space that moves life forward. By its very nature, peacebuilding is known through living the lived connections we encounter within and around us.

Peacebuilding as a 'Doing of the Lived Body'

For the moment, it may be helpful to address the process called peacebuilding as if it consisted of two main movements or hermeneutic doublings: 1) Referencing the lived body; and 2) leaning forward into sociality. However, clarifying distinctions within an entire process is not the same as bringing together two separate elements – peace with building or lived body with sociality. It is important to understand that the movements or doublings are a way of describing the doing of the lived body in peacebuilding.

The notion of a doing lived body is similar to Gadamer's (1975) phenomenological hermeneutics (Risser, 1997) and the 'double hermeneutic' of Giddens (1987). Taking the lead from these authors the concept of a doing lived body emphasizes the role of the lived body not merely as an instrument or lens, but as an instance of the 'in-dwelling' and 'becoming' processes involved in thinking and behaving. Thus, the doing lived body is as inherent in the entire process of peacebuilding as breathing is to existence. It is not something to use, but something you are. Through the phenomenological concept of a doing lived body, peacebuilding (or living in general for that matter) can be better described as a whole process with many effects.

With this stipulation in mind it is now possible to say more clearly what peacebuilding is not. Based on the understanding of a doing lived body, peacebuilding is not a 'tool' to fight things such as poverty, oppression, or marginalization. In a similar fashion, peacebuilding is not a 'conceptualization' from which it would be possible to argue for intellectual structures such as 'position', 'context', or 'ideal'. Peacebuilding as a process of a doing lived body is not structure-bound as instrument or perspective. We obviously want to retain practices that generate fresh

thinking and doing, and these practices might include employing the various instruments and perspectives that are currently known. However, these will come from within process and will thus be 'beyond the patterns' that today define peace.

Giddens (1987) and other proponents of postmodern discourse emphasize the sociality of meaning making, thus leaving the lived body as merely a concept if it is mentioned directly at all. My use of the lived body makes it clear that one's bodily doing is meaning making that is always ripe for shaping our thinking, behaviours and practices, although not in isolation. Meaning making begins with sensing the lived body from within and then doubles or opens to further revisions as we re-reference (double back onto) our lived bodily awareness of the changes or direction in which our emergent in-dwelling thinking and behaving takes us.

Thankfully, we already have many good traditions for understanding the 'doing of the lived body' in peacebuilding. The disciplines of phenomenology, the humanities, psychology, and spirituality each in their own way study and address human living. Each tradition offers something independently of the others that relates to the project of articulating the phenomenon of peacebuilding as a lived bodily doing that emerges in and because of one's sociality. In brief, it is possible to say that phenomenology attends to how we experience life, psychology attends to the ways we live life, while the humanities help voice life, and spirituality studies the ineffable of life. All are necessary for a full and rich understanding of peace building and peacebuilding. This understanding includes the meanings we generate about it and the stumbling blocks we encounter in trying to achieve it.

The problematics of peacebuilding

The current emphasis on conceptual, methodological, and strategic plurality is a significant problematic regarding fresh thinking and doing in peacebuilding; while the dis-attribution of listening from the central character of peacebuilding is another. The former problematic results in a morass of theoretically confused solutions rather than in a way forward for promoting and establishing peace inside and out. The latter leaves the situations and persons our peacebuilding is intended to assist infused with strategies dis-connected from them.

However, we are not in a hopeless situation. The phenomenological tradition can assist in tackling societal and personal problems as we continue to develop new ways of responding to the demands of the current era. Whether the phenomenological approach is used as a philosophy, psychology, epistemology, or axiology, it still seeks to explore the territories of human experience in order to develop clarity about this experience, its situatedness, aesthetics, and performativity, as well as generativity. Phenomenological thinking brings an openness to 'experience as it is' that does not survive easily in the highly hierarchical structures (conceptual, epistemological, and pedagogical) that have been erected to solve our wicked problems.

However powerful the phenomenological insights into the nature of experience and its interpretive sociological import, the current era does not seem satisfied with the depth of understanding we produce, although there are indications of local support. Perhaps this dissatisfaction is not necessarily with phenomenology but with any univocal response to the multiple sources of the problems we face today. In this sense, phenomenology 'only' speaks for the depth, the intangible, the human, of human experience. In a similar manner, natural sciences 'only' speak for the objective, the verifiable, and the replicable. Peacebuilding, peace making, and peace theorizing challenge phenomenology to speak more directly to that aspect of lived experience that is inwardly originative, intentionally societally directed, and unable to be contained by bifurcation in our thinking and responding. This definition of peacebuilding positions it as providing an opportunity for phenomenology to speak out and loud.

Within this general condition another specific problematic facing peacebuilding arises. This problematic can be characterized as arising from thinking from distinctions first. Traditionally, when tackling a big problem as big as peace (and all its attendant aspects) one would first approach it from each distinct discipline or approach and compare or contrast the best thinking found within these traditions and then apply the results to the problem. It is my assertion that we can no longer afford the luxury of thinking from distinctions first. That is, we can no longer afford the kind of thinking that begins with fragmented parts, subject/object dichotomies, or binaries embedded in structure-bound thinking. We can no longer afford the kind of thinking that is exemplified by such constructs as 'position' and 'identity'.

However, so-called 'holistic thinking' may not be the solution either because it is often an elaboration of the positivism embedded in the structure-bound thinking from distinctions. Instead of creating truly new, fresh thinking, holism gives us 'more of the same only deeper' by reconfiguring and expanding the parts. This is an interesting, but intellectually faulty, slight-of-hand. We need to think from the doubling and find new ways of doing that freshly inform and shape our thinking and impact our acting.

What is called for now: A process approach

Today we need a conceptual framework that describes and demonstrates thinking and doing that is 1) recognized by us as authentic, 2) responsive, and 3) ethical. This involves us developing links between what we know by virtue of embodied knowledge (from internally generative spaces of authenticity and responsiveness) and existing schema based on rational discourses (third person spaces that include reflexive ethical guideposts). In this way, we will build 'intermediate spaces' between the first person authentic and responsive and the third person reflexively ethical. These intermediate spaces will allow us to conceive of, and 'think-from-across-beyond', the predetermined cognitive boundaries that exist in the embodied or rational forms of thinking and behaving. Acknowledging the importance of these intermediate spaces and building them will help us shape further innovations that can assist in peacebuilding.

Eugene Gendlin's (1997a) process model, which builds on the work of phenomenologists such as Wittgenstein, Dilthey, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Gadamer and McKeon, has the ability to provide a conceptual framework for these aims. Gendlin's (1997a) model is a model of and about living. In places, particular emphasis on describing how living is an ongoing occurring process from which we differentiate various aspects. For Gendlin (1997a), life consists of process(es) that are already changed by any change in any aspect of the differentiated process(es). Life is necessarily bodied and includes 'our' bodies, but in a radical way. In the model, body is re-conceptualized to mean a whole process, which is called 'body-environment'. Instead of starting with our understanding of life and our living of it as separated out components (i.e. body tissue, cognitive, or perceptual bits), the concept of 'body-environment as one occurring' forms the basis of any conceptualization or theory about a topic and activity. This concept of 'body-environment' underlies all of the key principles described below.

It is possible to describe the way in which body-environment functions in any number of situations. Within peacebuilding, body-environment functions as a subjectively-oriented intermediating space which is authenticated by us through its implicitly moving, embodied character. Other intermediating spaces have been described elsewhere, including the relational (Finlay & Evans, 2009), the embodied (Todres, 2007; Todres & Galvin, 2008), and the intuitive (Anderson, 1998, 2004). In each of these intermediating spaces, there is recognition that prior to any single aspect of body-environment 'being set out', that is, differentiated conceptually or behaviorally, the entire territory of the living body-environment functions as a whole and continues in the differentiations, although this continuation is by definition imperfect.

Body-environment space births symbolization (Gendlin, 1997a). Symbolization is recognized in philosophy and psychology as a key process that enables human beings to develop skills such as language, creative expression, intentionality, theory, philosophy, and science. Phenomenologists such as Gendlin (1997a), Merleau-Ponty (1963), and Gadamer (1975) hold that symbolization is a kind of body differentiation, an act of consciousness that occurs although we are rarely aware of its workings.

Our philosophies have gone beyond merely acknowledging that some symbol (e.g. a perception, word, gesture, or expression) can stand for the great deal of meaning for which it is intended. Philosophy and psychology now recognize that human beings can use symbolization to expertly create patterns that have never existed before. In fact, whole academic disciplines (e.g. sociology and economics) and affiliated research enterprises have emerged as a result of the new patterns we have created. In a significant way, these new conceptual patterns function as intermediating spaces. The patterned symbolization of any intermediating body-environment space, and all intermediating body-environment spaces are patterned symbols, generates further differentiations and complexifies our living – sometimes with good results and sometimes with poor ones. We now live with patterns of living such as culture, identity, and society as if they have always existed and are fundamental. In fact, this newly recognized pattern-generating capacity can be characterized as an evolutionary step forward in human consciousness.

This 'step forward' can lead to mistaken essentialism wherein the pattern that has been called out through symbolizing is mistakenly viewed as a datum of existence. In the worst case scenario it would seem that we have lost touch with that which gives rise to the symbols and patterns in the first place. Our capacity to define patterns can stand in the way of fresh original thinking. Without body-environment specifically intermediating in our concepts and patterns we lose our grasp on something fundamental to being human. We lose touch with the feel for life and the feel for living in our patterns and concepts about living.

Four basic concepts

Before continuing this discussion, it is necessary to briefly describe the four basic concepts of Gendlin's (1997a) process model. These concepts are: (1) Interaction first; (2) interaffecting; (3) occurring into implying; and (4) carrying forward. This discussion is

necessarily brief, although hopefully it provides enough detail to allow the reader to follow my exploration of human generativity as fundamental to peacebuilding.

Perhaps the most fundamental element of a process model for peace is the tenant of interaction first. Interaction occurs implicitly long before any differentiation of specific events (occurrings). Separate events (occurrings) do not occur first and then interact. Instead, the process of interaction occurs prior to knowledge of something (knowledge of something being a sort of differentiating process).

Gendlin (1997a) describes the key principle of interaffecting in the following manner: "Interaffecting precedes their being many, and continues when they have become many" (p. 23). This principle emphasizes how something different in one process(es) makes the other process(es) different. There is thus no single identity or single hermeneutic to any event that is described. Instead an event is always more-than itself originally. If "we don't assume a single identity of our first process, then the difference **it** makes in the others depends also on how the other process**es** affect and differentiate our first one" (Gendlin, 1997a, p. 39, emphasis in the original). According to Gendlin, any process or event is thus already affected by others and by the differences it makes.

Occurring into implying is the third key concept in Gendlin's (1997a) process model. "Implying is never just equal to occurring. Therefore implying is not an occurring that has 'not yet' occurred. It is not an occurring in a different position on a time line" (Gendlin, 1997a, p. 10). Within this quotation Gendlin uses the two terms implying and occurring in a unique manner. They are not placed on a time continuum where one or the other has to occur first. Instead, the term occurring into implying signifies the entire sequenced 'version' of life that is currently being noticed. In other words, an event (the occurring) was implied by a host of other events that seemingly occurred prior to the event. However, based on the principles of interaction first and interaffecting, there is a better way to characterize any event (be it a behaviour or symbolization) as not just itself, not 'alone', but already affected by those other implied events, most of which will never be known. The whole complexity, not just the facets of this or that version of living we happen to want to study or know more about, is universalized in a new way as an ongoing process; thus occurring into implying into occurring into …

The concept of carrying forward is closely related to the concept of occurring into implying. The whole complexity of any event (any occurring which is also an implying with and of many other occurrings) is carried forward in a next sequence. Gendlin (1997a) sometimes refers to this process as "eveving" and "versioning" (p. 239). This final concept might actually be closer to what we notice naturally in our daily lives. For instance, when writing this paper I discussed several parts of it with colleagues who were working on similar ideas but in very different applications. One colleague mentioned to me how his particular concept seemed similar to one of mine, but with particular differences. Although the conversation was brief the impact of his observation stayed with me. I 'carried forward' this encounter and it (an entire string of other sequences) works implicitly in what I write now.

Gendlin's (1997a) process model's main contribution to peacebuilding lies in its ability to open up a vast territory from which we can articulate new principles that describe peacebuilding as a whole process that involves many other processes we can distinguish as well as processes for which we do not yet have words. From the simplest form to the more involved and troublesome problems we face, a process model offers new ways of conceiving, articulating, and demonstrating the intricate whole relevance of situations and how they can move forward.

Process(es) and applications

> The vastness of that space is thus understandable: It is not a space in the same way in which a situation is a space and we occupy the space of the situation. Instead, it is a space in which the whole situation moves. We are not in the situation anymore, but in the new space, as we are here, the situation is now a something, a new datum, there, over against us. (Gendlin, 1997a, p. 242)

Applying these principles to the field of peacebuilding brings with it an entirely novel approach to any of the many aspects of the entire process of peacebuilding we care to emphasize. As Gendlin suggests, it brings a vast space within us and within our thinking about peace from which we can speak freshly; it enables us to speak in a way that helps move the whole situation forward. We may reasonably ask how this process occurs. However, its very form belies an underlying rationally oriented assumption about causality. Process thinking does not privilege this sort of thinking. Thus, before any question of 'how' can be answered it is important to remember that I am describing a process for which 'causes' and 'outcomes' do not drive the dialogue and are not always predictable. Likewise, 'how' we get the whole situation to move, so to speak, is a result of the process itself and cannot be charted ahead of time. It requires that we adopt a listening stance that draws

us close to the situation without foregoing our relation to the situation. As Heidegger (1962) reminds us in *Being and Time,* "When we are explicitly hearing the discourse of another, we proximally understand what is said" (p. 207).

What I offer instead of causal rational proofs are three basic sensibilities of a process model for peacebuilding. These sensibilities contest the inherent hierarchical rationality of 'what peace is and is not' that is found in our passion for ordering experience. Thus, while I necessarily list the three 'in order' we must anticipate that they exist outside a prescribed notion of order. Additionally, these sensibilities are found in and through the practice of process work and as such are already, inherently of the wider process order.

First, the model is inherently inclusive, meaning that it invites and can involve existing strategies and pedagogies as each responds to the invitation to speak. The spirit of inclusivity is based in the embodied subjectivity of acceptance, willingness, curiosity, and welcoming. A process model for peacebuilding is also inherently open in that it is never 'finished' but ongoing. Finally, this model is inherently creative. Practices, theories, and evaluation schemes that emerge from an intermediating body-environment space confront hegemony squarely in such a way that the proximity of hearing and the distancing of languaging are both safeguarded.

The 'optical delusion' and a way forward

> A human being is part of the whole called by us universe, a part limited in time and space. We experience ourselves, our thoughts and feelings as something separate from the rest. A kind of optical delusion of consciousness … We shall require a substantially new manner of thinking if humanity is to survive. (Einstein, cited in Hoven & Weckert, p. 62).

> Body, situation, and language imply each other, but that means we cannot do with less than all three. The functions of the human body are not reducible to those of a separated language and a separated situation. (Gendlin, 1992, p. 112)

In these quotations, Einstein and Gendlin (1992) acknowledge that there exists in our thinking an optical delusion of consciousness, a hegemony of ideas about reality that obscure that reality. Stated differently, it is possible to observe how problems arise and then once concepts are created about the reality these problems inhabit we confuse the problems with reality itself. Reliance upon observation and objectivity is an example of an optical delusion in contemporary thinking. Aspects of thinking, observation and objectivity, as subjectivity, are modes of awareness that, along with sensing, give us the feel we have for being alive, at once distinct from and part of the world we experience. However, being reified into a preferred or dominant modality of thinking, observation or feeling is closer to blindness than to awareness. Without our larger bodily sensing available to observation and feeling, we are always distinct from each other and situations, separated from external and internal clues that serve to fill out our myopic perception of what is important.

The process model produced in my project is first person grounded and second and third person inclusive. It makes a contribution to peacebuilding by exploring the inner workings that fund or challenge the complex social issues addressed in traditional (though cutting edge) approaches to peace building. This distinct model is based on a process oriented foundation that is currently being used in a growing number of academic disciplines and social action causes. The key process component of my work, although it is founded in several different conceptual, cultural, epistemological schemes, is the conceptual and behavioural use of lived experience. The model states that how we understand lived experience determines both how we 'understand' and 'be in the world'.

There are other approaches that assist in solving the problems created by our collective 'optical delusion' of consciousness. Peacebuilding, as an inside and out process, is situated in a set of values found in contemporary culture. Today, the context for peacebuilding includes, but is not limited to, "community members searching for a better life, non-violent activists pushing for human rights; peacekeepers separating groups in conflict; religious leaders encouraging their followers to make peace with neighbors; relief workers bringing aid; community mediators and restorative justice practitioners; … business leaders …; government leaders initiating change through public policy (Schirch, 2004, p. 5-6)". Networking is essential, relationships are essential; they have the power to form and attain "social capital" (Schirch, 2004, p. 9).

As a scholar, qualitative researcher, and clinician, I am aware of the significance of and complications inherent in the term peacebuilding. As intended, the term resists structure-boundedness through being authentic, responsive, and ethical. The fresh understanding of peacebuilding that I advocate seeks to engage individuals, families, communities, businesses, structures, and governments in a process of reflection and discovery that moves away from destructive expressions of conflict and towards

constructive growth and reconciliation. This requires a reorientation from rational-linear logic toward a responsive logic that legitimizes listening and the processes involved in creative fresh thinking. Although this explanation does capture the significant elements of a new way of speaking about peacebuilding, there is still more to be said about the topic. In recent years many new and returning voices are raising the alarm and stating that we must and can do more to help establish, maintain and promote a peace-filled world.

John Paul Lederach (1997), in his classic book *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies,* speaks about four interdependent dimensions involved in the goals of conflict transformation and peacebuilding. These four dimensions are personal, relational, structural, and cultural. These four dimensions are underpinned by two very important concepts. The first concept is the movement from one particular point of conflict toward a dynamic negotiation leading to a peaceful resolution. The second concept is the notion of sustainability, that is, the "proactive process that is capable of regenerating itself over time" (Lederach, 1977, p. 75) For Lederach (1977), the transformation of conflict goes beyond the immediate resolution of a particular issue.

The reader will likely already have recognized in their own work the inherent limitations of holding on to a single solution or point of view. If the reader is involved in peace work, this is probably acutely known. A process approach is a better model. If we are wedded to a certain understanding governing the 'proper order' for things such as fulfillment or human achievement or peace building, then we are apt to be less receptive to the demands of the moment and perhaps oppressively apply our assumptions and epistemologies. In fact, we currently recognize that each of us carries a deeply embedded sense of 'how the world works' that reflexively shapes what we see and how we respond.

The need to examine underlying assumptions is well established; unfortunately, examination of underlying assumptions often involves using the very ideas and concepts that drive it in the first place.[3] A process model comes with a different logic, one that is grounded in being present and from which the kind of human living generative of peace building in any locale can be developed. This new logic of presence can be systematically engaged and studied.

---

[3] The former is an error often associated with a Cartesian or scientific worldview, the latter view is one commonly held by postmodernists. Much more will be said on this later.

The logic of presence, the logos of listening

Psychoanalyst and phenomenologist Gemma Corradi Fiumara (1990) insists that listening needs to be re-integrated into the way in which humans experience the world, their living together with other beings (both human and non-human), and the work they perform. She contrasts the logos of listening with the dominant logos of demonstration. Fiumara (1990) argues that we must find once again a logos of listening to lay alongside the mainstream logos of demonstration that is found in nearly all social and scientific discourses of our day. She writes of a lack of listening as a central problem in philosophical, scientific, academic, and public discourses. "At any moment in which reality is constructed we can identify an attitude which is able to say and not to listen – at that moment, in fact, a halved and overwhelming *logos* manifests itself" (Fiumara, 1990, p. 2, my emphasis). For Fiumara (1990), the problem presented by a logos that has been halved is a profound disinterest in maintaining a pursuit of and link with the complexity of human living.

A wider and much more troublesome use of a logos centered on explanation and proof, marginalizes or even expels the products of listening, namely curiosity, openness, tentativeness, and dwelling. The near fundamentalist attraction to 'evidence' as based in all things external, objective, and finite results in listening being shunned. It is our own entrancement with third-person objectivity that conditions our thinking to turn away from the generativity of listening and the possibility that embodied intelligence can be the new basis for a much wider view of evidence and proof.

Other phenomenologists have addressed the 'problem of listening'; particularly Heidegger, Gadamer, Vico, and Wittgenstein. These authors state that listening is absent from that which passes for discovery in today's sciences and social sciences. What Fiumara (1990, p. 2) terms the "radical reciprocal openness to listening" is a product of attuning the ear to the other and thereby countering the "magnificently dialectical and assertive" standpoint of our enlightened and cultivated forms of speaking. Intellect without receptivity and the gathering together of diverse paths of knowledge yields intellectualism, dialecticalism, and assertive power where the passion for ordering and evaluating becomes the only legitimate rigour and the basis for reasoning itself.

I agree with Fiumara (1990) and her phenomeno-logical predecessors, and believe that we find ourselves in an era of a divided logos wherein listening is cut-off from discovery. Whether applied to simple observation or critical inspection of peacebuilding theory and practice, listening's

generative powers appear to have been deemed superstitious or just silly. The sage Lao Tzu knew something of this some 2500 years ago when he reminded his students that the true master listens in such a way that the student becomes herself. In one of my favorite short poems, Lao Tzu says, "It is as though he listened and in listening such as his we become who we are meant to be" (Laozi, 1963, p. 6). Any discourse that excludes listening, while also appearing at the center of acceptable standards of knowledge claims, stands to mislead and apply half-truths to the rendering of increasingly abstract concepts and out of touch reasoning.

To allay this situation it is possible to look to inspiration from several others who in one way or another address the absence of listening. Martin Buber's (1958, 1965) work focuses on the importance of relations that honor the experience of the other and oneself. For Buber (1958, 1965), true dialogue dismantles any propensity to reduce or have dominion over a human life. He re-interprets logos as a dwelling with or, as Heidegger described it, as lying alongside in generosity (Heidegger, 1956). To continue in the present time in the best vein left to us by these thinkers will require something new from philosophy and psychology.

An experientially-oriented phenomenology and psychology

Early in his career, Gendlin (1997b) recognized that philosophy and other models describing life could actually inhibit new thinking and acting if they are separated from the rich territories of experiencing. He proposed an experientially based philosophy that is process oriented rather than one that assumes the 'old logic' of Newtonian science. He states:

> Philosophy can reopen the old assumptions and conceptual models if we think with our more intricate experiencing as well as with logic. Our more intricate experiencing may carry it forward, but is not thereby replaced. It (models, concepts, forms) is always freshly there again, and open to being carried forward in new ways, never arbitrarily, but always in quite special and precise ways. (Gendlin, 1997b, p.xxi)

An important symbol I have used to represent this idea is a modified Greek Theta, which was once used to signify the death and transformation of the soul in its regenerative journey[4]. In this context it is both a

personal and societal exemplar of the manner in which transformative process work self-organizes and is forward leaning.

Figure 1: Modified Theta

It is possible to conceive of the personal, social, cultural, or global process involved in building peace as traveling inward - following the arc of inward attending and discovery, emerging back upon its beginning only to be moved forward, often in unexpected ways; the doubling of inward referring in social behaving.

It makes little sense to keep viewing peacebuilding and social change work as either an inward perception or outward project – the single hermeneutic working independently. Unfortunately this kind of singular thinking characterizes much of our contemporary scholarship on peace, whether focused as a personal or social process. In a process model approach to peacebuilding, a philosophical and psychological shift is generated that moves our intellectual discussions toward an 'experiential order'. This order was first found among the phenomenologists but has emerged more recently within a growing number of other disciplines such as nursing, cognitive and neuro-psychology and theologies of liberation.

Leaders in the peacebuilding community also recently started to make use of something close to what I am proposing when they open national or international conferences with titles that include phrases such as 'coming from the inside' and 'first person'. Even positive psychology (Seligman, 2011), a relatively new sub-discipline within the field of psychology, now proclaims 'meaning' and 'body intelligence' as key factors contributing to a happy life.[5]

Although these are all good and even profound developments they often do not have the new forms of thinking needed to progress beyond what their disciplines demand are the legitimized standards of study, languaging and evidence. After all, it is well known that the best thinking and strategizing about

---

[4] Theta is used widely in many academic disciplines including, of course, Greek language studies and Latin. It is also used in theoretical mathematics and as a symbol in esoteric spiritual traditions and numerology. Its meanings

are thus varied. See http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theta for more information.

[5] Martin Seligman, considered the founder of positive psychology, may be well known to the reader. The reader may wish to consult his recent book, *Flourish* (Seligman, 2011), as it contains his latest 'revolution', the importance of meaning in happiness.

solving our most wicked personal, societal, and world problems, which include assaults on human dignity and freedom, have suffered from no lack of ingenuity. However, we remain ill equipped to think beyond the boundaries of our adopted philosophies and epistemologies. It seems possible that experientially orientated phenomenology may provide concepts, strategies, and modes of verification that are truly fresh because they are already beyond the assumed patterns, thus providing room to move our doing lived body forward into sociality.

I have been emphasizing that experience is not limited by structure-bound concepts such as subjectivity and objectivity, but is instead a profound interaction of body, language, and situation that we are able to recognize for its embodied feel. If tapped, our felt sense, or embodied intelligence, yields creativity potent enough to bridge the intrapersonal and social, conceptually and practically. We should therefore refuse the postmodern claim of the isolated, constructed individual drifting in a morass of competing relativities. We should also be suspicious of the embedded positivist logic found in some current thinking about peacebuilding that draws upon a natural sciences or holistic models of reality.

In short, we need to find and advance more truly human technologies that build relational transformation that encompass the larger field within which humans, animals, plants, and the entire ecosphere exists. To do so will be to think and act from both the inside and the outside simultaneously. This will revolutionize the way we live.

Ongoing discussions

Admittedly, exploring the nature of the changes and the transformation of thinking and doing suggested here, be it personal, social, cultural, or political in character, is certainly not new. However, a model that widens our understanding of what qualifies as 'legitimate' forms of knowledge and thereby widens what constitutes evidence is at least uncommon. The process model understanding of social change presented here begins from the already interaffected, where we discover the meaning of things, and helps us move beyond the patterns of thinking that bind us to see reality in either-or terms. It moves away from the structure-boundedness of position and conflict and the almost tyrannical contemporary notion of evidence.

The 'three sensibilities' of a process model for peace (e.g. inherent inclusiveness, openness, and creativity), arise in the environments that are supportive of embodied intelligence and are not originally distinct from these environments. The environments are newly intermediating, generative spaces that we are more likely to move in with care and diligence, such that we will legitimize speaking from the implicit knowing brought through listening. This wider view, which will assist in the generating of new, just approaches and theories for being and acting in the world, is, if not new, then at least distinctive. Speaking from (out of) felt experience may break the social linguistic contract, but not merely for the sake of anarchy. Deep listening, dwelling, and moving invites new discourses that are responsive, open, and creative. None of the current models can hold all of this complexity and promise adequately. What is needed is a process model.

The model for peace discussed here marks a decided turn away from the way in which we usually approach understanding and advancing peace and change, which can be characterized by its foundational premises as a view from the outside. As mentioned above, the new positive psychology literature, while finally coming to appreciate 'meaning' as a distinct element in health and happiness, decidedly refers to the inner dimension of our existence in terms of its quantifiable nature alone (Seligman, 2011). Although psychology and other social sciences give an occasional nod to the qualitative aspect of human experience this is given within the narrow confines of supporting the 'more rigorous' and demonstrable, 'evidenced-based' quantitative view.

Regardless of whether our specific interests lay in conflict resolution or peacebuilding, Buddhist philosophy or positive psychology, education or social change, what is needed at the moment is movement starting from the inside, the micro, which then moves to the intrapersonal level and then extends the insights found in these realms to the macro or socio-political level of change. Peacebuilding as described here shows that change and transformation, even in the most difficult and intractable of situations, is always a real possibility when it starts from the wisdom that touches the heart and compels it to shift and change. The concepts I employ are the result of the intersection of inner resources and experiences that occurred in the field while I was involved in doing research. I contend that this inner knowing lies deep within all of us and provides the grounding for the choices and actions we make, despite the fact that in the regular work of our scientific and social change endeavours we make little or no claims of its existence or impact.

Our inward intelligence, our intermediating embodied knowing, possesses the resources, insights and knowledge to inform the actions we take in all cases. It is possible for us to learn how to intentionally slow down the driving forces urging us toward demonstrations and accomplishment in order to dwell first before we create. In order to do so we need to

consciously direct a listening ear to those very inner processes that have been relegated to the outer banks of discovery. This means allowing enough time for the saying to emerge and thus create new forms of doing our thinking. As the revised theta symbol suggests, the entire process turns our attentions first inward with a deep listening stance and from there we follow the non-linear, directional and forward moving arc of knowledge.

My project, like the theta, suggests a course but does not provide definite rules. Instead of offering 'steps of transformation' or 'rubrics for positive change' or simply avoiding the whole notion of behaving as a phenomenological space, the approach offered in this paper is process oriented. I offer a model of the very processes involved in personal and social change for peace that is implicitly responsive to local conditions, in fact the model grows from our localities outward. It is therefore not possible for such a model to propose invariant sequences for discovery or action.

This raises questions regarding the possibility of an alternative. What can we 'say' about building a peace-filled world from the inside that retains the responsiveness we want while creating strategies, concepts, or evaluations necessary to carry out such inwardly original movement? Although this may seem impossible or a fool's errand I believe that there is a solution. I have found that we can learn to touch and speak from the paradox between customary forms of thinking if this paradox is alive within us. We speak from the silence and wonder that wraps the apparent contradictions between the personal and the wider culture, between competing interests and the best outcome.

In order to listen and attend to the generative silences within we must pay attention to something so basic that we overlook its importance at nearly every juncture; we must pay attention to experience itself. This is the missing link - human experience as a singular ongoing process of the interaction of personal knowledge and public action. Drawing close to its origins calls forth in us a deep reverence that is unmistakably known. As the poet says:

> For they are the moments when something new has entered us, something unknown; our feelings grow mute in the shy embarrassment, everything in us withdraws, a silence arises, and the new experience, which no one knows, stands in the midst of it all and says nothing. (Rilke, 1992, p. 64)

We know now that "the new experience, which no one knows … and says nothing" actually has a great deal to say. However, in order to hear what is yet to be said we must dispose ourselves to its character and not impose upon its saying a form or construct foreign to its fledgling voice. With Rilke (1992) and others, this project is not alone in its quest to reassert that the foundation of personal growth and social change is found in human experience, which consists of enfolding silences and forward leaning steps. If we are to locate peacebuilding as an experience and a concept as well as a space of action, we will need to traverse the vast interior world of human experience as it makes its way outward into action and follow the process that unfolds and the wisdom it brings.

Referencing Format

Krycka, K. C. (2012). Peacebuilding from the inside. *Indo-Pacific Journal of Phenomenology*, 12 (Special Edition, July: *Evidence-Based Approaches and Practises in Phenomenology*), 13 pp. doi: 10.2989/IPJP.2012.12.1.10.1123

About the Author

Dr Kevin Krycka is Director of the Master of Arts in Existential-Phenomenological Therapeutic Psychology at Seattle University. Since joining the faculty in 1989 he has taught both graduate and undergraduate courses in the area of abnormal psychology and the preparation of psychotherapists. Dr Krycka's scholarship utilizes phenomenological research methods to develop a deep understanding of how human beings experience and respond to change. Dr Krycka has extensive experience teaching Focusing, a mind-body awareness process, to those in the medical and allied healthcare professions (therapists, body workers, acupuncturists, etc.) as well as with persons with serious and life threatening conditions such as HIV/AIDS, cancer, EBV, MS and chronic pain conditions.

Currently, Kevin is developing a model for peacebuilding that helps bring the experiential order, found in moments of deep and lasting personal change, into public discourse and policy-making.

E-mail address: krycka@seattleu.edu

References

Anderson, R. (1998). Intuitive inquiry: A transpersonal approach. In W. Braud & R. Anderson (Eds.), *Transpersonal research methods for the social sciences: Honoring human experience* (pp. 69-94). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Anderson, R. (2004). Intuitive inquiry: An epistemology of the heart for scientific inquiry. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 32*(4), 307-341.

Buber, M. (1958). *I and thou* (2nd ed.). New York: Scribner & Sons.

Buber, M. (1965). Distance and relation. (M. Friedman & R. G. Smith, Trans.). In M. Friedman (Ed.), The knowledge of man: Philosophy of the interhuman (pp. 59-71). New York: Harper and Row.

Finlay, L., & Evans, K. (2009). *Relational-centred research for psychotherapists.* Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Fisher, S. (2000). *Working with conflict: Skills and strategies for action.* London: Zed Books.

Fiumara, G. C. (1990). *The other side of language: A philosophy of listening*. London: Routledge.

Gadamer, G. H. (1975). *Truth and method*. New York: Crossroad.

Gendlin, E. T. (1992). Thinking beyond patterns: Body, language, and situations. In B. den Ouden & M. Moen (Eds.), *The presence of feeling in thought* (p. 132). New York: Peter Lang.

Gendlin, E. T. (1997a). *A process model*. Chicago: Focusing Institute.

Gendlin, E. T. (1962/1997b). *Experiencing and the creation of meaning; A philosophical and psychological approach to the subjective.* New York: Free Press of Glencoe. (Original work published 1962).

Giddens, A. (1987). *Social theory and modern sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heidegger, M. (1927/962). *Being and time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell.

Heidegger, M. (1975). *Early Greek thinking* (D. F. Krell & F. A. Capuzzi, Trans.). New York: Harper & Row.

Hoven, J. V. D., & Weckert, J. (2008). *Information technology and moral philosophy.* New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies. (n.d.) *What Is Peace Studies?* Retrieved August 3, 2010 from http://kroc.nd.edu/aboutus/peacestudies

Laozi. (1963). *Tao te ching/Lao Tzu* (D. C. Lau, Trans.). London: Penguin Press.

Lederach, J. P. (1977). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1963). *The structure of behavior.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Peacemaking [Peacemaking: On the road to peace: peace process since World War II] (2010). *The encyclopedia of the new American nation*. Retrieved from http://www.americanforeignrelations.com/O-W/Peacemaking-On-the-road-to-peace-peace-processes-since-world-war-ii.html

Rilke, R. M. (1992). *Letters to a young poet*. San Rafael, Calif.: New World Library.

Risser, J. (1997). *Hermeneutics and the voice of the other: Re-reading Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.

Schirch, L. (2004). *The little book of strategic peacebuilding.* Intercourse, PA: Good Books

Todres, L. (2007). *Embodied enquiry: Phenomenological touchstones for research, psychotherapy, and spirituality.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Todres, L., & Galvin, K. T. (2008). Embodied interpretation: A novel way of evocatively re-presenting meanings in phenomenological research. *Qualitative Research, 8*(5), 568-583. doi: 10.1177/1468794108094866

University of Notre Dame (2010) *Origins of peace studies.* Retrieved from http://ocw.nd.edu/peace-studies/introduction-to-peace-studies/lectures/outlines/origins-of-peace-studies-1

_____