

Facilitating Peace Leadership

Stan Amaladas

Abstract

Informed by the disciplines of Leadership Studies and Peace and Conflict Studies, the author offers an understanding of peace leadership as being an interconnected affair of the head (consciousness-raising), heart (feeling the need for transformative change), hands (to be moved to purposive action) and the holy (offering all the sacred gift of treating persons as persons). Building on an earlier publication in this Journal, this article reconstructs conditions for peace at intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cultural levels. It also offers a deuterio learning framework and model for coordinating the efforts for the sake of peace through an understanding of leadership as being a fourfold affair of the head, heart, hands and holy. The author reasons that a genuine community is constructed when people come together not in the name of religion, but when they come together bringing honesty, respect, and kindness to support an awakening of a sacred gift, namely the gift of treating persons like persons, with dignity and respect.

It is proper to every gathering that gatherers assemble to coordinate their efforts to sheltering; only when they have gathered with that end in view do they begin to gather. (Heidegger, 1977, n.p.).

Introduction

This article builds on Part 1 (Amaladas, 2020 where, I raised three questions. First, for the sake of reconciliation and healing, what *conditions* must be present for all to act from the perspective that ‘we are all in this together?’ Second, what *conditions* prevent us from seeing and acting from this perspective? Third, what learning *process* can we construct to make it possible for self and others to act from the perspective of ‘we are all in this together?’

In response to questions one and two, I offered seven conditions for all who *dwell* in this shared place called Canada and who *gather* in the name of Peace. These include:

- Situating ourselves within the ecology of caring and trusting
- Subordinating or surrendering ourselves to being governed by the principles of sparing, preserving, and safeguarding each other from harm or danger.
- Attending to and embracing the non-negotiable principles of social justice and treating persons as persons.
- Shifting away from either-or dualistic thinking that has come to dominate our modern era.
- Intentionally orienting to the possibility of increasing choices and to the possibility of more than two possibilities.
- Aspiring for what we want as a collective by intentionally turning toward rather than away from practices that they want to see avoided in their public sphere.
- Being willing to “let go” of hurt, pain, guilt, and a spirit of revenge and “let come” the courage to dream the impossible dream as a real possibility.

The inability, or the refusal to do so, as I argued in my earlier article, is that we all lose and we will all die from the cold within.

In this article, I reframe the third question in this way: What *conditions* must be present and what learning *processes* can we construct to make it possible for self and others to act from the perspective of ‘we are all in this together?’ Following O’Dea (2012), who suggests, that those who lead for peace, or peace ambassadors, as he calls them, are being challenged to transform “both inner blockages to peace and those blockages in external relations, culture, and systems that prevent peace in the world” (2011, p. ii), then, this article is organized as follows. From the perspective of *conditions*, I will first address the inner blockages to peace (intrapersonal quest). Second, I will speak to blockages in external relations (interpersonal quest), and third to culture and systems preventing peace in our world. From the perspective of a *learning process*, I will offer a deuterio-learning model and framework for radical and transformative change. In as much as the etymology of radical means root or forming the root, I will propose that we orient to the interconnectedness and interrelationship among four Hs (the *fourfold*) as forming the roots of peace leadership. This fourfold include orienting to the affairs of peace leadership from the perspectives of the head, heart, hands, and holy.

Conceptual Framework

My formulation of the *fourfold* is itself informed by Burns (1978) who is considered by some as the ‘father of leadership studies’ (Barbour, 2006). Burns notes that the “essential task” of leadership is “consciousness-raising” and that the “fundamental act is to induce people to be aware or conscious of that they feel- to feel their true needs so strongly, to define their values so meaningfully, that they can be moved to purposeful action” (pp. 43-44). And what is the purposeful action that he references? This purposeful action is reflected in his “practical advice” which he offers in the last page of his volume: “to treat...all persons like *persons*” (p. 462). The fourfold then, includes consciousness-raising (affair of the head), feeling their true needs and meaningfully defining their values (affair of the heart), that they can be moved to purposeful action (affair of the hands). The fourth H is connected to Burns’ (1978) question “leadership to what?” (p. 457). The ultimate purpose, namely a purpose that is desired as an end in itself, is to treat persons like persons. I would suggest that this is the unnegotiable and sacred purpose for peace leadership. Treating persons as persons is the sacred gift that we give to each other as human beings. And in so doing we care and spare each other from harm and danger. It is in this vein, that Kornfield (1993), a psychologist, notes that a

...community is created not when people come together not in the name of religion, but when they come together bringing honesty, respect, and kindness to support an awakening of the sacred. True community arises when we can speak in accord with truth and compassion. This sense of spiritual community is a wondrous part of what heals and transforms us on our path. (p. 24)

Allow me then, to continue on the path for truth, compassion, healing and reconciliation.

Section 1: Leading For Peace - An Intrapersonal Quest

From the perspective of the theory and praxis of reconciliation and re-building trust in our troubled world of violence, Confucius, the Latin name for Kong Fuzi, who lived around 500 B.C.E., already laid a path about what it means to put the world in order.

To put the world in order, we must put the nation in order,
 To put the nation in order, we must put the family in order,
 To put the family in order, we must first cultivate our personal life,
 And to cultivate our personal life, we must first set our hearts straight. (as cited in Estes, 2017, p. 10)

The implications of Kong Fuzi's thinking is that if we, as individual human beings, do not first set our own hearts straight, if there is no peace within one's own heart, then there will be disorder in the family, nation, and world. At an intrapersonal level, to set one's own heart straight is to think and act in ways that safeguards one's own self from danger and harm. The complexity of the human process of leading for peace at an intrapersonal level is captured well in a story of an old Cherokee who is teaching his grandson about life.

"A fight is going on inside me," he said to the boy.

"It's a terrible fight and it is between two wolves. One is evil – he is anger, envy, sorrow, regret, greed, arrogance, self-pity, guilt, resentment, inferiority, lies, false pride, superiority, and ego," He continued,

"The other is good – he is joy, peace, love, hope, serenity, humility, kindness, benevolence, empathy, generosity, truth, compassion, and faith. The same fight is going on inside you – and inside every other person too."

The grandson thought about it for a minute and then asked his grandfather, "Which wolf will win?"

The old Cherokee replied, "The one you feed."

The old Cherokee appears to be teaching his grandson (and anyone else who cares to listen) about the need to raise our consciousness and to be aware of what we are feeding ourselves. The complexity of human processes, as this Indigenous elder teaches, resides in what is within the heart of each human being – good and evil. And it is not as simple as ripping evil out for the sake of the good. To rip anyone part apart is to rip one's own heart out. It will in effect kill any human being.

Within the context of the old Cherokee's story, the internal blockage appears to reside not only in this "terrible fight that is going on between two wolves" inside every person, but also the lack of the head's awareness as to which wolf we are feeding. This blockage stands in the way of embracing the call that "we are all in this together." This blockage can only result in win-lose, lose-win, and lose-lose propositions. But is it simply a matter of being aware of which wolf we are feeding?

Cultural Violence: Survivor Stories

Let us turn our attention to the sad and dehumanizing stories shared by some residential school survivors in Canada.. As reflected in the Final Report of the Truth and Reconciliation

Commission of Canada (TRCC), the residential schools were in existence for well over 100 years. It was “created for the purpose of separating Aboriginal children from their families, in order to minimize and weaken family ties and cultural linkages, and to indoctrinate children into a new culture” (2015, p. v). At that time, it was the “culture of the legally dominant Euro-Christian Canadian society, led by Canada’s first prime minister, Sir. John A. Macdonald” (2015, p. v). The TRCC heard from more the 6,000 survivors of this school system. Some of their stories included:

- They said, the only good Indian is a dead Indian...Even the nuns told me that.
- One rule was that children were not allowed to go to the bathroom after 10:00 pm. Lafford said he became a bed-wetter as a result and was forced to carry his soiled bedclothes on his head through the cafeteria at breakfast every time it happened. Georgina Doucette of Eskasoni said leaving the residential school was also difficult.
- Coming back into my community, I felt as if I didn’t belong. ... We didn’t belong in the White world, and we didn’t belong in our community.

Georgina Doucette continued her story by narrating that it took her a long time to cope with her experiences, and she turned to liquor at a young age.

I passed on that legacy to my children. When I sobered up 24 years ago, I looked at them. And I kept apologizing. I feel deep down, this is the road I set for my children, with alcoholism. And their children drink and do drugs. I feel very guilty. It’s hard to shake that guilt when you’ve carried it for so long.

These stories of residential school survivors may suggest that the burden and trauma or resentment, anger, sorrow, healing, forgiveness, and reconciling self with one’s own experiences, belongs only to “them” – to the survivors, alone. If so, then it appears as if the process of reconciliation can only occur between the survivors and their own communities. This way of thinking would only affirm that “we are not all in this together,” and that it is a part of ‘their’ history, and not ‘ours.’ It will in effect be a confirmation that reconciliation is an “Aboriginal problem,” and not “a Canadian problem.”

The language of survivors suggests that there were/are perpetrators. Within the context of the TRCC, the perpetrators were (are?) the “culture of the legally dominant Euro-Christian Canadian society, led by Canada’s first prime minister, Sir. John A. Macdonald.” It is, in Galtung’s (1990) language a product of “cultural violence.” But how can those who were not a part of Macdonald’s time take responsibility for that which they did not perpetrate? Are they to simply feel guilty for all that went before?

It is here that we need to shift our focus to O’Dea’s “blockages in external relations, culture, and systems that prevent peace in the world” (2011, p. ii). Not taking collective responsibility, for O’Dea (2012) and Galtung (1998) might result in silently perpetuating intergenerational violence. Let us imagine peace travelers meeting O’Dea or Galtung on the road and asked them for directions: “Which way to peace?” We could imagine them as saying: “Turn right at Concord-ia Ave., till your reach Reconciliation Street. Turn left, and if you continue with courage and perseverance along that road, you will not only see peace ahead of you, but you will also experience peace along the way. But be careful of road signs that read, ‘Ours is the right

way.” Allow me now to turn our attention to thinking and talking about peace leadership from an interpersonal level and then move to talking about blockages to peace at a cultural level.

Leading For Peace: An Interpersonal Quest

Galtung affirmed that peace leadership does not reside with any one person. He used the metaphor/simile of a marriage to capture the nature of the relationship of peace and/or trust building. He noted:

..peace is not a property of one party alone, but a property of the relation between parties... like a marriage, it is not the sum of the capabilities of the parties. Which is why we can have lovely people related in a less-than-lovely marriage. And vice versa. (2014, n.p.)

Galtung could be heard as saying that lovely Indigenous and Non-Indigenous people may be in a dysfunctional (less-than-lovely) relationship. For lovely people who may be in a dysfunctional relationship, if they are committed to saving their relationship, is it reasonable for only one of the parties to go for ‘relationship counselling,?’ In relationship counselling, we hope that the relationship counsellor is able to facilitate a process where individual persons are able to see and take responsibility for the current state of their relationship, rather than creating conditions for blaming the other. We hope that relationship-counsellors come into the counselling relationship not with pre-determined solutions but rather, by looking for ways to facilitate a process where all parties are able to re-build and re-affirm their trust and love for each other. Building on Galtung’s (2014) metaphor that peace is like a marriage, the relationship counsellor can be viewed as enabling a process where all parties can pursue both negative peace (reducing or eliminating negative relations) and positive peace (building ever more harmonious relations).

We must, however, admit that what is different about Indigenous and Non-Indigenous people is that they did not choose to marry each other. Perhaps it would be appropriate to define that relationship as a shot-gun marriage. However, from the perspective of relationship building, we imagine Galtung as inviting us to consider the possibility of thinking about the broken relationship between Canadian Indigenous and Non-Indigenous peoples within the context of making a choice to build a life together (we are all in this together). To not do so would only mean that we remain indifferent to each other, and not care about the other. Indifference is a relationship other than being a friend or an enemy. Unlike Galtung (2014.), we would suggest that indifference is not a question of being in a ‘non-relation’ but rather to be in a relationship of the strangeness. We would suggest that the indifference of being a stranger not only kills individuals from their ‘cold within,’ but it also snuffs out the ‘fire’ that can keep friendly care alive. To engage with the other in a friendly conversation, is to offer friends, enemies, and strangers a real possibility to hear the need for care as the purposeful aim of conversation (Blum and McHugh, 1979). It is in this caring-conversation that we are able to build trust.

ATTUNE

Gottman, a psychologist, clinician, and ‘relationship expert,’ acknowledges that not only is trust built slowly and over time through processes of reconciliation, but that at the basis of trust is really the idea of attunement. His experience with couples struggling in their relationship showed

that the more highly skilled partners became in achieving attunement “the more resilient their friendship and the more solid and promising their future” (2011, p. 24). Brittle (2015) a certified Gottman therapist, asked his readers to consider ATTUNE as an acronym: Awareness, Turning Toward, Tolerance, Understanding, Non-defensive responding, and Empathy. Gottman suggests that we can build attunement, or become more attuned with each other, through ‘the art of intimate conversation.’ While we have already started down the road of awareness, allow us to stay a little longer on this notion of ‘turning toward.’

Within the context of protests, perhaps we need to turn toward the other side of trust, namely betrayal that leads to distrust. In the same way that peace/conflict, negative/positive peace, connection/ separation are concepts that belong together, ecosystemic thinking would also suggest that trust/betrayal/distrust are concepts that belong together. Betrayal exists in any relationships. Infidelity in a married relationship, for example, may result in a decision like: “I’m out.” We could hear a person say: “If my partner cheats, I’m out.” The challenge in turning toward betrayal with a zero-tolerance policy, is that it kills any effort to re-build trust. Whereas the threat of infidelity (betrayal) is that it can kill a marriage-relationship, the promise of turning toward that very betrayal with tolerance, understanding, non-defensive reasoning, and empathy is the possibility of creating higher attunement and a more intimate attachment. In saying this, we do not intend to diminish the pain that betrayals like infidelity introduces into a relationship. We must acknowledge that separation and divorce can be, and often is, in this situation, a real possibility.

In Canada, however, and within the context past and present practices among Indigenous and Non-Indigenous persons, and within the context of “we are all in this together,” divorce would only affirm that the problem is not a Canadian problem. Divorce would result in the break-up of Canada as we know it today. It would result in the separation of the Canadian population. Divorce would force us back into the “us” vs “them” relationship from the perspective of “irreconcilable differences.” It would mean the re-drawing of ‘borders’ to reflect one’s own needs and interests. It would fundamentally mean that “we are not all in this together.” If divorce is not an option, then as Canadians, we are all called to make the difficult decision to turn towards the pain of betrayal and distrust, for the sake of heeding the call to care.

Perhaps this is how we can understand what Burns (2006), meant by transforming leadership. Burns, for example distinguishes between the verbs ‘change’ and ‘transform’ in the following way.

To change is to substitute one thing for another, to give and take, to exchange places, to pass from one place to another. These are the kinds of changes that I attribute to transactional leadership. But to transform something cuts much more profoundly. It is to cause a metamorphosis in form or structure, a change in the very condition or nature of a thing, a change into another substance, a radical change in outward form or inner character...It is change of this breadth and depth that is fostered by transforming leadership. (Burns, 2003, p. 24)

To intentionally engage in the transforming process of re-building trust would necessitate all Canadians to turn toward the pain of the past and to the irreversibility of the consequences of past actions, in ways that enable a radical change in outward form and inner character. Following Galtung (1998) it is a transformative experience that needs to occur at the ‘root’ of the conflict relationship between and among all Canadians, Indigenous and Non-indigenous, survivors and

perpetrators. Turning toward this pain may be like looking into a horror cabinet, but like trauma, they reflect a reality that needs to be known and understood. Why? Because we care. And it cannot simply be a matter of transactional caring.

While researchers (Milke, 2013) at the Fraser Institute acknowledge that Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada's spending on Canada's Aboriginal peoples rose from \$79 million annually in 1946/47 to almost \$7.9 billion in 2011/2012, radical transformative change cannot remain *exclusively* at the level of transactions, monetary or otherwise. While we need also to move towards "'a higher order of change' constituting alterations in 'attitudes, beliefs, values, and needs'" (Burns, 2003, p. 24), it is unfortunate that monetary settlements are often viewed as "case closed," rather than reopening conversations at a deeper level and for the sake of a higher-order-consciousness of what it means to be together as a Canadian community.

Transforming the Attitude of Superiority

One fundamental attitude that prevents "a higher order change," is made nakedly visible by Galton (1869) in his published volume *Hereditary Genius*. Some like Zaccaro (2007) noted that the trait-based perspective of leadership dates back to Galton's volume and that it has informed and misinformed popular notions of leadership (p. 6). Zaccaro (2007) succinctly captured Galton's two basic points. First, what remains as a persistent view of leadership in popular literature is that "leadership (is) a unique property of extraordinary individuals whose decisions are capable of sometimes radically changing the stream of history" (p. 6). Second, Galton "grounds the unique attributes of such individuals in their inherited or genetic makeup" (Zaccaro, 2007, p. 6). As a result, personal characteristics defining an effective leader, were assumed to be naturally endowed and passed on from generation to generation. We would, however, suggest that what is at stake is more complex than the "practical implication" that the immutable quality of leadership is "not amenable to developmental interventions" Zaccaro, 2007, p. 6). However, in reading Galton (1869), we encounter a darker picture.

Galton (1869) considered his book title to be "more expressive and just...than *Hereditary Ability*" because ability includes the effects of education and genius does not (pp. viii – ix). While Galton (1869) specifically stated that he did not intend to use the word 'genius' in any technical sense, but "merely" to express "an ability that was exceptionally high and at the same time inborn" (Galton, 1869, p. viii), he does not stop there. He continues with a rather troubling attitude and belief. He claimed that

...there is nothing either in the history of domestic animals or in that of evolution to make us doubt that a race of sane men may be formed who shall be as much superior mentally and morally to the modern European, as the modern European is to the lowest of the Negro races. (p. x)

There is absolutely no doubt in Galton's mind of the mental and moral superiority of the modern European. How we have come to understand 'ethnocentrism,' namely as a perception that one's own culture is better than the culture of others (Gudykunst & Kim, 1977) pales in comparison to Galton's (1869) formulation of the formation of the superiority of a race of the sane modern European. Is his pseudo-biological-scientific formulation of the superiority of the modern European not a mark of arrogance? But then again, the voice of ecosystemic thinking would suggest that the mind (head) of superiority can only sustain itself by constructing and sustaining

its belief that all other non-modern Europeans are inferior. Within the context of the history of Canada's residential schools, are not attitudes like this that fed the Europeans' need to, at best, educate and convert Indigenous children, and at worst, to kill the 'barbaric Indian?'"

It is not surprising then to hear Burns (2003) formulating leadership as an 'aspect' of power and that transforming leadership is a cognitive process of engagement that raises both leaders and followers "to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Burns, 1978, p. 20). It is not accidental to hear him say: "*moral leadership* concerns me the most" [Italics in original] (p. 4). For him, moral leadership is "not mere preaching, or the uttering of pieties, or the insistence on social conformity" (p. 4). Instead, it is a power relationship that transforms relationships in ways that are grounded in the "Golden Rule," rather than simply complying with rules like the "Ten Commandments." (p. 4). For him, the Golden Rule is "to treat persons as *persons*" [Italics in original] (p. 462) and not like pawns to be manipulated. It is also to boldly interpret the nation's conscience in ways that "lift a people out of their everyday selves," by believing that "people can be lifted *into* their better selves" (p. 462). This for Burns is the secret to transforming and moral leadership.

Moral Imagination

We would also suggest that it is also this spirit of transforming leadership that moved Lederach, to raise a "simple and endlessly complex question," namely, "how do we transcend the cycles of violence that bewitch our human condition while still living in them?" (2005, p. 5). For him, "transcending violence is forged," not forced, "by the capacity to generate, mobilize and build the moral imagination" (Lederach, 2005, p. 5). The practice of solidarity (we are all in this together), in other words, cannot simply be mandated. For Lederach, moral imagination is mobilized when four disciplines are held together.

Simply stated, the moral imagination requires the capacity to imagine ourselves in a web of relationship that includes our enemies; the ability to sustain a paradoxical curiosity that embraces complexity without reliance on dualistic polarity; the fundamental belief in and pursuit of the creative act; and the acceptance of the inherent risk of stepping into the mystery of the unknown that lies beyond the far too familiar landscape of violence. (Lederach, 2005, p. 5)

To imagine ourselves in a web of relationships, is a concept that is rooted ecosystemic thinking, which speaks to the interconnectedness of all our relationships, including our enemies. If friends are assumed to already be a part of this creative pursuit, we would extend Lederach's formulation of the capacity to imagine ourselves in a web of relationships, to also include enemies (Discipline #1). Earlier in our paper, we addressed the problem of the polarity of dualistic thinking within our all too familiar landscape of violence (Discipline #2). Allow us to turn toward making explicit the creative act of forging and not forcing solidarity (Discipline #3). For Kouzes and Posner (2017) for example, "you cannot force unity; instead, you forge it by involving people in the process, making them feel that you are genuinely interested in their perspectives, and that they can speak freely with you" (p. 65). At the same time, we step into this process of forging unity by acknowledging the inherent risk in stepping into this territory (Discipline #4). There is no guarantee that we will succeed.

It is illuminating to hear Lederach speak of the mobilization of moral imagination as the practice of holding four *disciplines* together (2005). The word “discipline” is derived from the root Latin word *discere*, meaning “to learn.” Other derivatives of this word includes the noun *discipulus* (*pupil*) and the verb *to discern*. At a cultural level, how can we go about processes of learning that forges rather than forces solidarity/unity? At a cultural level, how can we engage in learning that holds all four disciplines together?

Leading For Peace: A Cultural Quest

Galtung noted that the study and practice of leading for peace must also include “cultural violence.” He defined cultural violence as “any aspect of a culture that can be used to legitimize violence in its direct or structural form” (1990, p. 291). As we noted earlier, within the context of Canada’s story, this includes turning toward, rather than away from, the experience of ‘cultural genocide.’ In staying with Kong Fuzi’s framework of “putting the world in order,” cultural violence can be interpreted as a disordered culture, and protests, like the Wet’suwet’en protests, can also be experienced an indicator of a disordered culture, and actions to restore social justice.

Allow me to share a personal anecdote. When I shared Galton’s (1869) version of the sane Modern European (as noted above), one consistent answer I received was, “well, that was how it was back then.” Galtung would argue that part of the problem with a response like this is that it can numb and dull our senses into seeing the reprehensibility of this form of thinking and accepting the cultural exploitation and/or repressions that follow, as “normal and natural,” or “into not seeing them at all” (1990, p. 295). Over time, he further opined, it may even translate into cultural and structural violence “look(ing), even feel(ing), right – or at least not wrong” (p. 291).

Wet’suwet’en protests and the economic havoc that was created, can serve as a critical event that triggers a need to turn toward and step into an all too familiar reality of conflict that has yet to be resolved. To accept protests like this simply as our ‘new normal,’ would essentially mean that (a) we are longer disturbed by these protests (indifference), or (b) we will only be annoyed and angry if those protests negatively affect our economy and pocket-books (enemies). On the one hand it is to remain indifferent (as strangers do) to what the protests are calling us to consider or take into account. On the other hand, the anger that is felt because such protests do negatively impact our pocket-books, can only lead to negative and disharmonious relationships against those who elect to protest. To treat protests as our ‘new normal’ would in effect offer us two options, in the web our relationships: strangers and enemies. It precludes and stands in the way of the appearance of a positive and harmonious relationship among friends, namely an acknowledgment that “what is bad-good for one is bad-good for the Other” (Galtung 2014). What is called for, instead, is the need to re-build trust. Trust is built when persons

- Experience the trust-worthy-ness of each other,
- Are confident that they each have the other’s back,
- Speak and act in ways the bears testimony that they are all in this together.

To choose not to connect with the other when opportunities present themselves in the moment, is an act of betrayal. It betrays the trust that “we are all in this together.” And Brené Brown, a psychologist, quotes Charles Feltman, who, as she said had the “most beautiful definition of

trust,” namely that “trust is choosing to make something important to you vulnerable to the actions of someone else” (as cited in Brown, 2019).

To think of the act building of trust in the way that Feltman proposes, is to suggest that learning to trust cannot simply be understood as learning the history of this or that population. It is not a matter of instructions or techniques. And while public protests may be a cultural aspect that triggers the need for rebuilding trust, processes of reconciliation cannot take place only by remaining in the streets of protests. Where emotions are high, voices tend to become elevated, and what we inherit is a continuum of reactions from shouting-matches, non-verbal stare-downs, and intended peaceful marches that may end up in violence. Where then can processes of reconciliation be appropriate? Allow me to offer one learning process as our way of answering our third research question: What *learning process* can we construct to make it possible for self and others to act from the perspective of: ‘we are all in this together?’

A Deutero-Learning Framework for Radical Change

Montville (1993) envisions reconciliation as occurring in specifically designed “workshop” contexts where participants from both sides feel secure in the company of trained neutral third parties who conduct various therapeutic exercises such as ‘walks through history.’ Rinker and Jonason (2016) describe these walks through history as a therapeutic process whereby victims of harm are offered the opportunity to tell their stories. Fisher (1999) also supports approaches like this through a process which is called Interactive Conflict Resolution because “full, successful reconciliation between alienated groups cannot take place without an adequate degree of genuine dialogue and conflict analysis of a mutual, interactive nature” (p. 82). We propose something similar and yet a little different. We would propose inviting all Canadians in their respective communities to facilitator-guided gatherings within the framework of deutero-learning.

Bateson and Bateson (1987) grouped three synonyms under the rubric of deutero-learning. First, “learning to learn” or metacognition. It implies that individuals have the capacity to learn about the context in which their world are constructed, maintained, and changed. It also implies that individuals can become aware of their own cognitive processes in maintaining their worlds. Second, includes “learning to deal with and expect a given kind of context for adaptive action” (Bateson & Bateson, 1987, p. 37). However, Visser (2007) warns us that while individuals have the capacity to adapt to contexts of socialization, their adaptations may range from healthy to pathological due to their socialized experiences. Finally, Bateson and Bateson also collect deutero-learning under the synonym “character change due to experience” (1987, p. 13). This third synonym is aligned with Burns (2003) notion of higher order transformative and radical change in outward form or inner character. Facilitating reconciliation within this deutero-learning framework would insist that each party focus on his or her own thinking, beliefs, and behaviour and not on the thinking, beliefs, and behaviour of the other. What would the application of this deutero-learning framework look like in our proposed facilitator-guided community gatherings?

Facilitator-Guided Community Gatherings

In this grassroots process, we would recommend smaller community gatherings – anywhere from 20-24 persons from both Indigenous and Non-Indigenous populations.. We would also recommend the presence of a facilitator, preferably one from each of the two communities who

are skilled in “holding the context of dialogue” (Senge, 2006, p. 226). We would suggest that “holding the context for dialogue,” would require facilitators to mindfully practice Naess’ (2002) ‘six ethical rules of verbal communication’ or what we would prefer to call “guiding principles,” for the sake of bridging polarizations.

First, the facilitator would mindfully steer the gathering away from irrelevant talk. Second, he/she creates conditions where any formulation aimed at representing the other’s viewpoints must be such that the other considers the representation to be adequate. Third, she/he facilitates in a manner that does not allow listeners or speakers to interpret the other’s stories in an unfavorable way. Fourth, he/she is mindful that all in the gathering do not ascribe to the other, opinions that they do not profess. Fifth, holding the context for dialogue, would also require the facilitator to avoid presentations or stories that serve the interest of one party or person at the expense of others. Sixth, circumstances that do not concern the subjects in the conversation, ought to be kept neutral. The success of this facilitator-guided-community gatherings would fundamentally depend on the gatherers’ willingness and openness to be attuned not only with each other’s stories, but also with the larger purpose: reconciliation.

In this gathering we will intentionally expand Heidegger’s understanding of ‘dwelling.’ As dwellers, he noted, we dwell as mortals on the earth. For him,

... ‘on the earth’ already means ‘under the sky.’ Both of these *also* mean ‘remaining before the divinities’ and include a ‘belonging to men’s being with one another.’ By a *primal* oneness, the four - earth and sky, divinities and mortals – belong together in one. (Heidegger, 1977, p. 327)

Heidegger calls this “simple oneness of the four... *the fourfold*” (1977, p. 328), and that as mortals, human beings are in the fourfold by dwelling in ways that experience being brought to peace. And, as we noted in our first article, for him, to be brought to peace is to act in ways that spare and preserves each other from harm and danger. This understanding of dwelling includes and extends beyond relationships between and among Indigenous and Non-Indigenous populations. It extends and equally applies to our relationship with our land, earth, water, and climate change. What then would being in the fourfold mean for gatherers who come into our proposed process? To what would they need to pay attention? We would propose that gatherers be brought to peace and remain in peace by paying attention to the fourfold connection among and between the head, the heart, the hands, and the holy.

The Head

If the purpose of dwelling is to preserve each other from harm, then the conversation in this gathering is guided by exploring complex and difficult issues in ways that safeguards the other. Part of this process would involve giving the “heads” (minds) in the gathering an opportunity to surface their own prejudices and stereotypes of the other. What if the “head” chooses to hide its thoughts? What might the consequences look like in this state of hiding?

First, in hiding, the head cannot become aware that its active participation in stereotyping will in effect shape not only how that head interacts with other heads, but it will also shape the stereotyped head’s response. In surfacing those prejudices in a way that all can see, and in risking this vulnerability by exposing oneself to the actions of others, a person can become aware that their thoughts can present themselves in ways that pretends that they are not representations. From the perspective of ecosystemic thinking, ‘representations’ are the acts of the observer. The

pretense is that the observer makes an observation and then pretends that their presentations are in fact an objective truth (representation).

Second, ecosystems-thinking raises our consciousness in ways that are consistent with second-order cybernetics (Bateson, 1979; Mead, 1968), namely, in enabling an awareness that observers are and cannot not be a part of a totally interconnected universe. In showing what is hidden, in observing one's own participation in the making of their observations, the head frees itself from being trapped in the theatre of its thoughts. In the process of showing what is hidden, the heads offers themselves the possibility of becoming observers of their own thinking. There is an opportunity for a higher-order awareness that there cannot be a separation between the observer and the observed. Whereas our predominant scientific mode of thinking would ask observers to remove themselves from their observations for the sake of objectivity, ecosystemic thinking would say that we cannot observe without being actively involved in our observing. Ecosystemic thinking would call on the "head" to observe, observe its observations, and observe its observing its observations.

The Heart

In beginning with the imagination that "we are all in this together" the gathering hearts gather because they *feel* the need, as we noted earlier, for 'higher order transformative change.' The gathering accepts, as a starting point, that people feel the need for change because "where nothing is felt, nothing matters" (Langer, as cited in Burns, 1978, p. 44). A similar sentiment was fervidly expressed by Marx (1978) when he reflected on the glory and pain of industrialization: "But although the atmosphere in which we live weighs upon everyone like a 20,000 lb. force, do you feel it?" (p. 577). How then can they go about the process of creating conditions for feeling the need for transformative change?

Sharing of Stories

Feelings for change cannot come through formal processes like power point presentations or statistical charts. They do not, for example, touch hearts in the same way that stories do. Stories, according to McKee (2203) "involve people at the deepest level," in that it "fulfills a profound human need to grasp the patterns of living – not merely as an intellectual exercise, but with a very personal, emotional experience" (p. 52). In relation to social change, we hear a critical theorist, Habermas (1988), revealing one aspect of storytelling:

When we tell stories, we cannot avoid also saying indirectly how the subjects involved in them are faring and what fate the collectivity they belong is experiencing. Nevertheless, we can make harm to personal or threats to social integration visibly only indirectly in narratives. (p. 137)

According to a psychologist, Mair, stories are all we have in that we "do not know the world other than as a story world... We live through stories. We are lived by the stories of our race and place" (1988, p. 127). And from an acclaimed native American poet and novelist, Silko, we hear: "'I will tell you something about stories...They aren't just entertainment. Don't be fooled. They are all we have, you see, to fight off illness and death. You don't have anything if you don't have stories'" (1977, n.p.). While stories are all we have, Mair (1988) also cautions us in that that stories can hold us together and they can keep us apart. While some, over the period of

human history, have used stories to incite violence and to divide, Galtung also reminds us that “people cannot live apart and in agony forever” (1998, p. 14).

In community gatherings, like the one we propose, we would invite all in the gathering to share their stories of what they as a collective are experiencing while they are in the middle of this bigger Canadian story. So, it is not *only* a sharing of one’s experience (Person A) of being in a residential school system – as valid and important as they are – but also one that includes a sharing that includes an experiencing (Person B’s story) of what it means to be in the middle of that historical experience. Through this process, it offers all in the gathering to make visible through their stories “the harm to personal or threats to social integration.”

At the same time, we wonder if stories of harm to the person, or threats to social integration are all that we have? Are there stories that warrant celebration? Are there stories of ‘small wins’ that are waiting to be told? Are there stories of the courage of reconciliation, of being true to a deeply held the value of being in this together, that are waiting to be shared? The sharing of celebratory stories is that they give us the positive energy we need (as a possibility) to attend to that which has contributed to insult and injury.

The Hands

While grapes are considered as a fruit of the earth, the transformation of grapes to wine is the work of human hands (and feet). What this refers to us is that in these community gatherings all participants be offered an opportunity to share home-cooked meals together. It is one way of transforming our messy reality into another kind of a “mess,” namely a meal. There is a common human adage that says: ‘a family that eats together, stays together.’ Whereas eating is necessary for the preservation our own lives (eat to live), the sharing of a meal goes beyond the mere preservation of life (live to eat) and this distinguishes this action as human action. The sharing of a meal involves a consciously intended higher purpose, namely being brought to peace. It transcends mere utility and usefulness. It is choice worthy because it is deeply connected to its purposiveness.

In coming together over a meal cooked by human hands, those who partake in an ordinary event like sharing a meal or meals give themselves permission to converse with each other in ways that are free of internal and external coercions, repressions, social deformations, and free from feeling helpless. In so doing, it can become an opportunity to consider an embellished version of Chomsky’s (1965) use of linguistic competence. More that increasing grammatical sentences among a homogenous population, I would suggest that it can also be favorable, in heterogenous populations for no other purpose than to attain understanding by listening for the sake of understanding and not judging. Partakers offer themselves the possibility to share a meal in a way that sets their hands to the task at hand, namely, of communicating competently with a higher purpose in mind: healing and reconciliation.

The Holy

One critical non-negotiable in our proposed gatherings is that all gatherers are called to intentionally preserve each other from harm and danger. Preserving each other from harm and danger, is held by all to be holy and sacred.. In his *Call to Holiness in Today’s World*, Pope Francis shared that “we are all called to be holy by living our lives with love and by bearing witness in everything we do, wherever we find ourselves” (2015). This call to holiness is not the

work of persons who seclude themselves in prayerful solitude but rather the work of all to bear witness in everything they do. Within the context of reconciliation, we are all called to bear witness to our shared purpose, reconciliation, by lovingly embracing the work of sparing and preserving each other from harm and danger.

Perhaps it is precisely the presence of the holy/divine in our mortal world that inspired Jung, the psychologist, to have a Latin quote carved in stone above his front door: *Vocatus Atque Non Vocatus Deus Aderit*. Translated, it means: “Summoned or not, the god will be there.” In his interview with Henderson (2010), Thomas Moore suggested that this is an act of Jung the *magus* rather than Jung the psychologist. “The *magus*” Moore shared, “understands that everything in the world has its own spirit or spirituality” (as cited in Henderson, 2010, p. 137). For example, we may enter an open air-airied market-place and feel its spirit. We may take a hike in the woods and feel a special spirit. We may enter a shopping mall and feel the absence of spirit, or a place without soul. In this case, we leave the mall feeling empty.

For Moore, rituals and narratives keep the magic (*magus*) and spirit alive. He further articulated that we “need family, home, friends, works, sex, and the vagaries of everyday life to keep the deep soul engaged” (as cited in Henderson, 2010, p. 143). In our proposed facilitator-guided gatherings, all in the gathering can celebrate their connectedness through their rituals and story-telling. Rituals and story-telling offers the imagination to connect with the soul of any community and to keep the soul engaged. As noted earlier, Kornfield (1993), this is what it means to create community. It is constructed when people gather by “bringing honesty, respect, and kindness to support an awakening of the sacred” (p. 24). Exclude this and we risk the loss of soul. Ecosystems thinking could be heard as saying that the ‘loss of soul’ is the loss of a soulful relationship and interest in the wisdom of the soul (Moore, 1992). In feeling the need for reconciliation (heart) we connect to the wisdom of the soul (the holy) in the sharing of good food (the work of human hands), and in satisfying conversations (head) and we act as if we are in the company of genuine friends. The ‘holy’ of deutero-learning places us in the company of other storytellers and in a shared companionship. The promise of these experiences is that they can stay in memory and touch the hearts in way that are themselves unpredictable. It is in this way that we can stay connected to the human actions of building trust, being brought to peace, and remaining in peace.

Conclusion

In this paper, we raised a question: What *conditions* must be present and what learning *process* can we construct to make it possible for self and others to act from the perspective of ‘we are all in this together?’ From the perspective of conditions, I offered three. First, *soulful engagement*. I argued that the quest for reconciliation, must occur at three interrelated levels of soulful engagement: intrapersonal, interpersonal, and cultural. Second, I reasoned that the affair of peace leadership is an *interconnected affair* of the head, heart, hand and holy. Third, *purposeful dwelling*. I talked about a critical non-negotiable condition (holy) in cultivating peace, namely that gatherers gather with a purposeful intent- to preserve and spare each other from harm and danger. From the perspective of process, I offered a *deutero-learning framework*. In a proposed facilitator-guided community gatherings, the deutero-learning process would require all who gather to coordinate their efforts in ways that connect *the fourfold*: head, heart, hands, and holy. Deutero-learning promises the possibility for radical transformative change- of outer form and inner character. I end by extending an invitation to all Canadians to engage in the process of

reconciliation not only because it is a Canadian problem, but also because this is what it would mean to treat all Canadian persons like persons. And like all invitations, I understand that all invited are free to accept or reject. That choice belongs to one and all. So, what will your choice be?

References

- Amaladas, Stan (2020). An Ecosystemic Approach to Facilitating Reconciliation: We Are All In This Together. *International Journal of Peace Studies* Vol. 25, No. 2, Article 5.
- Barbour, J.D. 2006. "Burns, J. M." *Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and Administration*. (Ed.) Sage 93-94.
- Bateson, Gregory. 1979. *Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity*. E.P. Dutton.
- Bateson, Gregory and Bateson, Mary Catherine. 1987. *Angels Fear: Towards an Epistemology of the Sacred*. Macmillan.
- Blum Alan and McHugh, Peter. 1979. *Friends, Enemies, and Strangers*. Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Brittle, Zach. 2015. How to Build Trust in Your Relationship. <https://www.gottman.com/blog/trust/> Accessed March 21, 2020.
- Brown, Brené. 2019. How do you trust? – Episode 281. <http://therecoveryshow.com/2019/02/how-do-you-trust-episode-281/> Accessed February 10, 2020.
- Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. HarperCollins.
- Burns, James MacGregor. 2003. *Transforming leadership: A new pursuit of happiness*. Grove Press.
- Chomsky, Norman. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press.
- Estes, Richard. 2017. The Search for Well-Being: From Ancient to Modern Times," in Richard Estes and Joseph Sirgy, eds., *The Pursuit of Human Well-Being: The Untold Global History*, Springer International Publishing, AG pp. 3-30.
- Fisher, Ronald. 1997. *Interactive Conflict Resolution*. In William Zartman and. Lewis Rasmussen, eds., *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques* United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Galton, Francis.(1869. *Hereditary genius*. Appleton.
- Galtung, Johan. 1964. An editorial. *Journal of Peace Research*, 1(1), 1-14.
- Galtung, Johan. 1990. Cultural Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27 (3), 291-305.
- Galtung, Johan. 2001. After Violence, Reconstruction, Reconciliation, and Resolution: Coping with Visible and Invisible Effects of War and Violence," In M. Abu-Nimer (Ed.) *Reconciliation, Justice, and Coexistence: Theory & Practice*, (pp. 3–23). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Galtung, Johan. 2014. A Mini-Theory of Peace. Retrieved from <https://www.galtung-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Mini-Theory-of-Peace.pdf> Accessed April 5, 2020.
- Gottman, John. 2011. *The Science of Trust*. New York: W.W. Norton Company.
- Gudykunst, William and , & Kim, Young Yun. 1997. *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Heidegger, Martin. 1977. *Basic Writings*. Harper & Row, Publishers.

- Henderson, Robert. 2010. I Rarely Use the word 'God': An Interview with Thomas Moore. *Psychological Perspectives*, 53 (2), 135-145
- Kornfield, J. (1993). *A path with heart: A guide through the perils and promises of spiritual life*. Bantam Books.
- Lederach, John Paul. 2005. *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford University Press.
- Lumsden, Malvern. 1999. Breaking the Cycle of Violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 34: 4. 377-383.
- Macdonald, Joyce. 2011. Residential School Survivors Share Their Stories. <http://www.dominionpaper.ca/articles/4251> Accessed April 4th, 2020.
- Mair, M. (1988). Psychology as storytelling. *International Journal of Personal Construct Psychology*, Vol. 3, 125-137.
- Marx, Karl. 1978. Speech at the anniversary of the people power. In Robert Tucker, ed., *The Marx-Engels Reader*. W.W. Norton & Company.
- Mead, Margaret. 1968. Cybernetics of Cybernetics. In Heinz von Foerster, John White, Larry Peterson and John Russell, eds., *Purposive Systems*. New York: Spartan Books.
- Milke, Mark. 2013. Ever higher government spending on Canada's Aboriginals since 1947. *Centre for Aboriginal Policy Studies*. Fraser Institute. <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/studies/ever-higher-government-spending-canadas-aboriginals-1947> Accessed March 10, 2020
- Montville, Joseph. 1993. The Healing Function in Political Conflict Resolution. In Dennis Sandole and Hugo van der Merwe, eds., *Conflict Resolution Theory and Practice: Integration and Application*. Manchester University Press.
- Moore, Thomas. 1992. *Care of the Soul*. HarperCollins.
- Naess, Ane. 2002. *Life's Philosophy: Reason and Feeling in a Deeper World*. University of Georgia Press.
- O'Dea, James. (2012). *Cultivating peace: Becoming a 21st century peace ambassador*. Shift Books.
- Pope Francis. 2018. *Call to Holiness in Today's World*. Retrieved from http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20180319_gaudete-et-exsultate.html Accessed April 2, 2020
- Rinker, Jeremy., & Jonason, Chelsey. (2014). Restorative justice as reflective practice and applied pedagogy on college campuses. *Peace and Conflict Studies*. 11(2) 162-180.
- Senge, Peter. 2006. *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Silko, Leslie. 1977. *Ceremony*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Truth and Reconciliation Commission. 2015. *Honoring the Truth, Reconciling the Future*. Retrieved from, <http://nctr.ca/reports.php> Accessed March 15, 2020
- Visser, Max. (2007). Deutero-learning in organizations: A Review and a reformulation. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 659-667.
- Zaccaro, Stephen. 2007. Traits-Based Perspectives of Leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62:1, 6-16.