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Introduction

*Rui Marques*¹

Sometimes we need to step out of ourselves, to find ourselves again. It is important to know how to establish a critical distance from ourselves in order to glance at the essence of our inner selves. This glance allows us to see areas of personal weakness that make us learn from others.

To a large extent, this was the rationale at the root of the project that we are launching today.

The “Ubuntu Building Bridges for Peace” project emerged within the Erasmus Program, one of the European community’s most emblematic initiatives. The project left the European cultural and philosophical context and sought inspiration in another continent. Rooted in Africa Ubuntu is, nonetheless, mankind’s inheritance.

We have tried to break away from an overly individualistic perspective that enforces independence of the individual as an absolute value, and have highlighted interdependence and relationship as the main constituents of a Person.

The understanding of us “becoming people” through our relationship with others, which in Ubuntu translates in the principle “I am because you are; I am only a Person through other Persons “ may help us rediscover the roots of European identity and of its political project. If we return to the foundations of the European project with the Schuman Declaration, at its core the understanding that only interdependence and, consequently, effective solidarity, can protect us from war:

---

¹ President of IPAV
“(…) The solidarity in production thus established will make it plain that any war between France and Germany becomes not merely unthinkably, but materially impossible. The setting up of this powerful productive unit, open to all countries willing to take part and bound ultimately to provide all the member countries with the basic elements of industrial production on the same terms, will lay a true foundation for their economic unification. This production will be offered to the world as a whole without distinction or exception, with the aim of contributing to raising living standards and to promoting peaceful achievements”.

The year 2000 motto reinforced the European Union’s dream, “Unity in Diversity” - an European “Ubuntu”. It reaffirms that it is possible, respecting our multiple differences, to build a united and cohesive community and that our interdependence has become our strength and advantage. That is why the Ubuntu Building Bridges for Peace is very important to the European context, in times marked by speeches and structural policies on different walls to erect.

We believe that Europe and the World need new models of leadership and citizenship, based on this ethics of care and the ability to build bridges rather than walls. The peace we all seek lies here: if we do not build bridges we will be fast on the way to the abyss. That’s why Europe needs Ubuntu. It has Ubuntu both in its history and in the origins of the European project with Monnet, Schuman, Adenauer or De Gaspieri – and it can also learn from others in Africa, Asia or anywhere else in the world.

The project counted on the wisdom and experience of the Fundación Tomillo given its outstanding work with the most vulnerable populations; it counted also on the depth and knowledge of the Institute for Socratic Dialogue, given its capacity to make dialogue a powerful social transformation tool. We’ve also added the irreplaceable experience of the Jesuit Refugee Service in Greece as an example of daily construction of bridges and of service, due to its work with the refugees it welcomes and supports. Also,
the contribution of the Instituto Padre António Vieira given its experience in designing and developing the Ubuntu Academy; Everis contributed with entrepreneurship knowledge and Forum Estudante contributed with its knowledge on the different realities of the youth. A consortium was thus consolidated setting to work and finishing the project in the founded hope that it is useful.

The vision that was developed, the intellectual outputs created, the consolidated non-formal education methodology or the experiences that are being proposed, allow us to believe on a path that although filled with human imperfection is a path worth treading. The echo received impels us further because, as Mandela said, at the end of his book “The Long Road to Freedom”, “after climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb”.
I Chapter

Becoming Human
Opening roads

Carmen Garcia

“I slept and dreamt that life was joy.  
I awoke and saw that life was service.  
I acted and behold, service was joy.”  
R. Tagore

Nothing great can be done if it’s not done from the inside.

Those who devote our professional life and a good part of our personal life to serve and, somehow, to promote the improvement of the world around us and the life of those who accompany us, frequently live moments of despair, frustration, impotence and tiredness facing the difficulty of changing reality and generating a relevant and permanent change.

The passion or even the rationality that guided us to this labor of social improvement is, sometimes, hidden under a huge layer of tedious labor (organization, management…), immobility or difficulties of change of some ecosystem’s elements or even of those who we pretend to “help”. This situation is defined by Parker J. Palmer as the Tragic Gap: that space, that failure in the life soil in which we find ourselves between the reality of the moment- injustice, inequality, violence, ignorance…- and the possibility of something better that we know exists- responsibility, generosity, equality, knowledge…- In that area, we feel the great tension that can carry us from one end in which the more pessimist realism dominates, to the other end, inhabited by the most irrelevant idealism. The temptation of placing ourselves in one or the other shore or even of jumping from one to the other continually is more frequent that it might seem.

2 President of Tomillo Foundation - Spain
Stay in the gap, hold the tension and give space so that the proposal of change moves from what it is towards what it can be is a great value of those people who we consider true leaders serving the improvement of our society. Nelson Mandela is, without any doubt, a clear example of how to live in that gap and hold the tension so that a new possibility arises.

Remain and advance in that space of tension requires strength, tenacity and, of course, self-knowledge. The knowledge of ourselves, listening our inner voice and understanding what moves us, what took us to this labor, confirms that the calling is alive, authentic and an essential task of every person, of every team and of every entity that seeks social transformation.

Stop being Human Doings to become Human Beings

In social organizations we know well what service vocation and passion to make of this world a better place, more fraternal and healthier, is. To do… this is frequently our main passion both at an individual and institutional or group level.

Often, after shallow and little documented observations, we design, in an equally shallow way, interventions and programs that, with an enormous good intention, pretend to contribute to improve the lives of those, who closer or further, are in difficulty or disadvantage situations. Frequently, these actions generate some kind of improvement in those we intend to support, although it also happens that these are circumstantial or punctual. We rarely witness processes that generate truly systemic changes in relation to the complex and multiple causes that give rise to difficult situations.

After more than 30 years working to improve the situations of socio-educational disadvantage in which many young people from the peripheral areas of Madrid live, we perceive that our work, effective, with good results,
valued by many… requires a greater attention in the previous phase to Doing. Honest questions to advance in our task are: Who are we? What moves us? Where do we stand to serve? What do those whom we help really need?

All these questions are asked at the institutional level, but also at the personal level, by those who form Tomillo. When we’re tired and confused, when we feel that we draw water from the hole we dig in the sand, but there’s always more sand and more water… It is time to stop the passion for doing and start Being.

In the field of education, in which Tomillo develops its activity in different ways, the leadership of the individual educator and the group of teams and institution placed at the service of children and young people seems to us to be an essential part of the learning process. The answers of many students (all of us have been and continue to be) to the question: What has the teacher who has marked you the most? They point out that a good teacher is the one who, from the point of view of identity, personal knowledge and integrity, is present and at the service of the student. Then, there will be teachers with great or medium knowledge, dialogical, academic, experimental, even boring or funny… but it is essential that their deep self gets closer to the essence of the students. “The courage to teach is the courage to maintain the heart open… so that the three elements - the teacher, the students and the topic — can interlock in the fabric of the community that learning and living require”

This deep union, this social fabric that is woven together between those who place themselves at the service of others, the action and those who are — circumstantially — in the position of receiving, is key if we want to advance towards a non-violent but profound social change, deeply human in which we all grow.

---

Leading from the inside

Self-knowledge, exploring our inner landscape, understanding our needs, our strengths and, of course, our weaknesses, is essential to embrace with wisdom our responsibility in life.

Frequently in social fields—more than in other type of organizations, as in business, politics, etc.—we know leaders who find it hard to assume this role. They feel leadership is something linked to power and this moves them away of that true leadership of profound responsibility.

Leading is more related to being human and being present in the circumstances of the moment and the place. Being human involves not only self-knowledge and acceptance, but relying and being open to the community of human beings we are part of. All of us lead at some moment of the day, time or life. All of us follow other leaders in many occasions, whether their leadership is conscious or not.

It comes to my head at this point the leadership that parents perform with their children and a dialogue between a mother and her son’s teacher: “I don’t know what to do: my son never listen to me!” “Don’t worry”, answers the teacher, “your son looks at you all the time”.

Service leadership must be therefore conscious— not pretentious—, the effect all our actions have in our environment is much greater than what we consider and is not always correlated to the position we have in the organization or entity but with a certain degree of inner leadership, self-knowledge, will and clarity of purpose.

We observe with surprise how people in peripheral positions promote relevant changes in society or in institutions by simply being and doing in a conscious, coherent and integral way. These examples of inner leadership are less frequent than they could be due to the fact that, often, formal
leadership is exercised from the non-prenence, the non-listening and the non-conscious action.

Listening is one of the most valuable tools for the development of human beings. Listening is the inevitable way for self-knowledge and for knowing the other too. Silence, attention practice, reflection, honest questions around ourselves help to know us better and to explore our deep inner space. There are many means for human beings to dive in our inward and let our soul- our deep being, our inner master, whatever is the voice that resonates more for each of us- emerges and expresses. In all of them, silence and attention to what there is in the deep inward, is essential.

As the poet Mary Oliver lucidly says: “There is one thing I know, the oldest and the wisest thing I know: that the soul exists and is built entirely out of attentiveness". In the cultivation of the inner inquiry and the attention will show up our fears and our rigidities, but also our strengths and qualities.

Looking inside and discover our essence as human beings and, with it, there in the depth, our gifts, our joy, our fears and weaknesses, requires courage. That courage that arises from the authentic will of wanting to be, of wanting to be real human beings.

With that loom of our inner world, we can weave a healthy emotional world, know and manage our emotions and egotic impulses and rely on our gifts. Joining the others will allow us sailing in our life, enjoying the joys and healing together the wounds the trip will cause us. The ability to serve in an active and inspiring way is in the depth of our soul. This is the laborious and long way towards self-knowledge that allows us to know the other and serve the persons and the causes that moves us.
From the inside towards action: a non-divided life

Finding the thread that links our competences—passion and gifts—with our action is the key to live a non-divided life. Find our element, our vocation of service, that place where “a deep inner joy and a deep world need are joined” is, without any doubt, the way to develop a service leadership.

The injustices that today’s society tolerates, incorporates and promotes are innumerable and painful. Service vocation is always born from loving others and from the deep need of justice and equity, but as we know well, often, far away from going along with a loving and positive movement of service for a deep, systemic and permanent improvement, it provokes impulsive, isolated and far away from the true needs actions. Actions that, even if they can be occasional and individual aids, don’t result in activating profound change. Observation, from the inside out, is key.

Observation is not just looking, giving attention or analyzing from the outside. Observation involves seeing into, listening, being attentive, knowing, sharing the other’s life and reality, what makes others happy and what limits others development, what people enjoy and contribute to and what they avoid to do, what they would like to do or be and what they could become. Observing does not pretend to confirm our theories, ratify our reasons or initial hypothesis; it does not pretend to give our voice to other persons but to create a space so that they can feel, as we do, full of potential, with all their rights and responsibilities.

The external, interpersonal observation involves listening, giving attention to others and creating the conditions so that our inner self—that of all who participate in the same action—perceive that there’s a confidence space in which showing pain or feeling vulnerable does not place us in another step, that our weaknesses and difficulties doesn’t hide our bright and qualities.

4 C.F. Buechner. Wishful Thinking: A seeker’s ABC Harper One; Revised, Expanded ed. edition (September 24, 1993)
From this privileged place that allows us the honest observation and genuine communication between truly human beings who feel and acknowledge themselves mutually, we can, as organizations and, of course, as human beings, serve social improvement, design and lead processes that activate a real change.

I would like to make a last reflection about the importance of the teamwork between organizations and various approaches as an essential lever for the social change with a systemic view\(^5\). I’m firmly convinced, and not from an irrelevant idealist, but from a demonstrated evidence, that the union of diverse knowledges and points of view and the multidisciplinary communities are a source of innovation and social transformation deeper than the “unifocal” focus. Working together requires, nevertheless, high doses of generosity and personal and organizational egos decreasing; a profound understanding of how we contribute to each other in all levels.

Leading from the inside is, without any doubt, a key attitude for moving and holding change processes in which multidisciplinary communities approach from diversity, with generosity and a systemic look, innovative proposals that make all of us advance.

A poem⁶ to finish with hope on what we know it’s possible:

**Turning to one another**

“There is no power greater than a community discovering what it cares about.  
Ask “What’s possible?” not “What’s wrong” Keep asking.  
Notice what you care about.  
Assume that many others share your dreams.  
Be brave enough to start a conversation that matters.  
Talk to people you know.  
Talk to people you don’t know.  
Talk to people you never talk to.  
Be intrigued by the differences you hear.  
Expect to be surprised.  
Treasure curiosity more than certainty.  
Invite in everybody who cares to work on what’s possible.  
Acknowledge that everyone is an expert about something.  
Know that creative solutions come from new connections.  
Remember, you don’t fear people whose story you know.  
Real listening always brings people closer together.  
Trust that meaningful conversations can change the world.  
Rely on human goodness. Stay together.”

⁶ Turning to One Another: Simple Conversations to Restore Hope to the Future. Margaret j. Wheatly. 2004 Desclee de Brouwer
Purpose and meaning in the giving of self

José Luís Gonçalves

Introduction

The question at the heart of this reflection - “How do we become more human?” - Restoration of our humanity - emerges within “Ubuntu”, a philosophy of life and social ethics rooted in Africa. To answer this question, we’ve adopted the anthropological perspective of two of their reference authors when they interpret, complementarily, the key expression “I am. Because we / you are “, that is,” I am because we are / you are “. Thus, for John Volmink, the word “Ubuntu” is actually a combination of two terms: “Ntu”, which means person and “Ubu”, which means to become. For Dirk J. Louw, the meaning of Ubuntu is summed up in the traditional African aphorism “umuntu ngumuntu ngabantu” (in the Zulu version of this aphorism), which means: “A person is a person through other people.” For both authors, to be human means, therefore, to exist through others. If the relation is an a priori of being (existing), the anthropology of the inter-human, then man is (exists) in relationship.

Now, how can one become a person (J. Volmink) and be a person through others (D. J. Louw)? The following is our attempt at providing a response: one becomes more human when one gives of oneself with purpose and meaning! Our theoretical proposal is based on the Western anthropological concept of a (neo) relational personalism that conceptualizes the person as a ‘whole’ in its entirety-autonomy, in his/her giving to others and in his/
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her orientation towards an end-purpose which is congruent with his/her calling-mission. The following reflection aims, initially, at explaining the assumptions of an interdisciplinary approach to this giving of oneself and to emphasize its meaning. In a second moment, it aims to critically question its meaning and identify its assigned characteristics. Taking a step forward, it aims to exemplify the question of giving of oneself with meaning, namely through the Logotherapy of Viktor Frankl. Finally, the model of the Neurological Levels of Robert Dilts – adapted from Gregory Bateson’s original model to Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) - will be proposed as an instrument allowing a person to access his/her resources and grow harmoniously in this giving of oneself, and in opening up to something greater than oneself, creating a source of purpose and belonging.

1. Donation: Giving of Oneself

If we wanted to characterize the predominant nature of the social bond in our societies, we would quote Godelier (2000),

_“We are actually in a society whose own functioning separates individuals from each other, isolates them even within their families, and gives them hope only when in opposition to each other. It is a society which releases, like no other, all the forces, the potentialities that are dormant in the individual, but which also obliges each individual to isolate himself from others, using them “(ibid., 268)._

Contrary to a certain rational selfishness that dehumanizes conviviality and pushes many of our fellow citizens to the thresholds of an almost unbearable sociability, what makes us more human are the social bonds that regenerate the human condition, the giving of oneself. And the signs and manifestations of this gift of oneself have multiplied visibly throughout the varied spheres of personal and social life. Godbout (1997) identifies three
fundamental spheres of building sociability through giving: firstly, through interpersonal bonds generated within the family and friends; secondly sociability, expressed within the public organizations and through assuming functions and roles and, finally, the modern, unilateral, voluntary and free gift given to “foreigners” (eg, blood donors or refugees).

The term comprises the voluntary cessation of domination. At its root, a gift is neither a mere exchange nor a mere reciprocity and even less a variable of a mechanical application of retributive justice. The concept refers to the reasons, the meaning and the actions of those who take the initiative (donors) and those who receive it (receivers); therefore, it implies subjects in relationship in an ethical asymmetrical reciprocity comprising the will and the gratuitousness of this action, the free acceptance or refusal of this voluntary gesture. The gift defined as “any provision of goods or services made without guarantee of return, in view of the creation, maintenance or regeneration of the social bond” (Caillé, 2002: 192), the gift is clothed with an ethical paradox: being a real good, its value is not primarily economic but social and moral, because value is not centred on the object exchanged, but on the disinterested and gratuitous, asymmetric exchange that it establishes. In comparative terms, the structure of the gift is gratuitousness / gratitude and proposes a completely different ethical notion of the economic notion of exchange, where the interest / utility pair prevails; if the gift is motivated by the binomial gratitude / freedom, in an economic exchange the notion of debt / obligation stands out.

Unlike an economic relationship in which each exchange is complete, each relationship is timely and each debt must be finally settled, a “positive mutual debt” is established. It is, in fact, a debt that is permanent and reciprocal, which has no economic meaning, nor does it simply refer to “the things” that circulate in the relationship, but act within that same relation over the bond and relationship between people. The gift implants itself in the heart of the donor, at the moment of the gesture, an expectation, a hope or even a demand for a non-utilitarian response, a recognition of the symbolic act ini-
tiated and, to some extent, opening the relationship up to the unknown: the excesses or the overstrained recipient; or, on the contrary, the refusal and even the frustration of the non-acceptance of the gift (Cf. Gonçalves, 2012, 2014).

The anthropologist Marcel Mauss (Essay on the Gift, 1923-1925) was the proponent of this gift, although he did not attribute a moral significance to the gift itself. First of all, he was concerned with discovering an alternative productive structure to the social bond: the symbolic ‘economy’ of the gift and the non-gift. The emerging sociability in this system is thus antinomic because at the same time it is voluntary and coercive, gratuitous and interested. Alain Caillé clarifies the notion of gift advocated by Mauss:

“It is an anthropological and not a moral notion. Marcel Mauss, the first theorist of anti-utilitarianism, wanted to find “the rock of eternal morality” which is universal. For him, all morals are based on the spirit of the gift: to leave one’s boundaries, to meet others to enter the cycle of “give-receive-reciprocate”. But this cycle is animated by a logic of reciprocity in the long run. We only give to those who are able to reciprocate, understood in a symbolic way, otherwise crushing them or breaking the social balance. Following on the footsteps of Mauss, we find that man’s desire is to be recognized, and what he wants to see recognized is his ability to give. “(Interview with Dominique Fonlupt., pp. 9-11),

Several authors argue about the practical impossibility of establishing the absolute gratuitousness of the gift. In Caillé’s (2005) perspective, this vision is the outcome of an irreconcilable anthropological and ethical imposition of modern times: that men are, at the same time, “radically selfish and perfectly altruistic” (ibid.: 250). In his perspective, the gift is not definable without taking into account the interest, on the contrary, it affirms that the gift must be defined against the interest. No gift is gift-in-itself, but it is always ambivalently linked to the other reality, not itself. In the words of Caillé:
“It is the reason why the gift is at the same time an exchange, without reducing itself to it, at the same time conditional and unconditional, interested and disinterested. [In this contradictory game of calculation and generosity,] there can be no gift unknown to the giver and to the recipient [...] ; there is gift when one knows that it is, when one is able to appreciate the reality of loss and risk. [What leads to confusing gift to unconsciousness] is the fact that although the donor knows that he is giving, he does not know, however, its value, since it is the receiver who gives value to the gift “[allowing, in this way] space to a set of endless manifestations of it”. (2005: 274–275)

In order for a relationship of respectful of people to be realized on a reciprocally constructive and morally mediated basis, Paul Ricœur proposes the practice of “solicitude” - “fundamentally composed by the exchange between giving and receiving” (1991: 221), an attitude of mutual “respect” to develop in inter-human relationship. Non-invasive solicitude should be moderated by respect: “out of respect I feel sorry for the pain or the joy of the other as yours and not mine. Respect deepens the “phenomenological distance” between beings, putting the other under the intrusion of my indiscreet sensitivity “(2009: 323). On the other hand, in an intersubjective relationship established by solicitude, the “giver (ing)” renounces the expectation of receiving, while at the same time releases the other from carrying the burden of “restoring” something, making it possible to estimate oneself as another and the other as the self:

“You too are able to begin something in the world, to act for reasons, to hierarchize your preferences, to cherish the ends of your actions and, in doing so, to esteem yourself as I myself esteem [...]. They thus become fundamentally equivalent to the esteem of the other as a self and the esteem of oneself as another “(Ricœur, 1991: 226).
2. Meaning

The question of meaning inquires about the existence of a goal for life or a reason to live, about the value of life, regardless of individual circumstances and interests. In the opinion of some philosophers, this is a question intrinsically metaphysical (e.g. religious) rather than philosophical:

“We define “meaning as “what means something by means of something else or that is designed according to a certain purpose. [...] What matters in determining the meaning of anything is the intention behind it. [...] What refers to the “meaning” of something is that it refers intentionally to something other than itself ... “(Savater, F. 2010: 267).

The philosopher Wittgenstein (Cf. Tractatus logico-philosophicus) asks: “The meaning of the world must be outside the world” (6, 41). Very well, but where? Does the world have an “outside”? (Chapter V). Does the question of meaning end where the world ends or can one continue to ask for a meaning “beyond”? The meaning of life is, therefore, questioning the purpose and meaning of human existence. The problem of the meaning of life is to ask whether life has an ultimate purpose, whether it has value and meaning. The question about meaning is linked to the question of value. What is the value of our life? Is it worth living?

*Meaning*, in this paper, is defined simply, as an existential perspective, similar to what it calls the ‘orientation’ and ‘rationale’ of life itself. If, from the anthropological point of view, every person needs to give meaning to his/her life, this question emerges from the uneasiness of human existence and the awareness of its temporality and finitude. The quest for meaning, in its distinct levels of signification and depth, is therefore intrinsic to the human being.
To grasp the *sense* (of the whole), beyond the (partial) *meaning*, it is necessary to enlarge life’s horizon. *Meaning* involves more than *significance* and materializes when the person integrates a particular action / event into a web of actions or events. In order for someone to find / give meaning to something, he/she needs to create some distance and see the events in relation to another reality. The sense always presents itself in a *relational condition*, especially when it results from configurative experiences. Hence, something makes sense when it has a purpose and acquires importance, weaving horizons of meaning and unifying the partial meanings and / or the strained situations of life into an end-oriented whole, possibly even integrating nonsense or absurd.

There are several types of meaning: the immediate, the mean sense and the ultimate meaning. This classification comes from the different intentionality that move the human being in the discovery of reality, but also the types of knowledge: the logical, the pictorial and the meta-logical. And if in education it is important to properly grasp these three levels, in a wholesome education it would be incoherent to reduce the idea of meaning to the strictly logical-rational or pictorial scope. There are certain experiences (silences, limit situations, happiness) that ‘exceed’ reality and whose meaning is meta-logical and has no necessary reference to the objective or descriptive world. The symbolic-utopian level of Ubuntu can be entered here...

The question of meaning emerges in the course of a process of personal development. In this, the best awakening to the senses is meeting with others and integration into communities of belonging. Within these, the question of who I am already and what I am called to become - “calling” and “mission” - are dynamically and tenaciously imbricated into one another.

Meaning is not presented, therefore, nor educated from a set of logical arguments, but from a world view (a philosophy of life or social ethics such as Ubuntu) that unifies and integrates the daily fragmentation into a unitary vision. It uses a language that is neither utilitarian (“what is it
for?”) nor objective (“what is?”), but symbolic and metaphorical referring to a horizon of “absent” meaning seeking reality. This encompassing and/or totalizing sense of life is an unavoidable requirement of human existence. Therefore, the rationality of meaning without an associated symbolic rationality is not envisioned.

3. **Viktor Frankl’s Logotherapy provides an answer to the search for life’s meaning.**

The psychiatrist Viktor Frankl is very important in our reflection on the quest for meaning. As a survivor of two Nazi concentration camps, he is able to testify that, even in extreme dehumanizing conditions, it is possible to find reasons for living (see *Man in Search of Meaning*). Later, as a university professor, he dedicated his time, with remarkable success, to help students with suicidal tendencies.

What distinguishes V. Frankl’s *Logotherapy* from other therapeutic approaches is the idea that “the existence of man always refers to something other than itself” (In *Psychotherapy in Practice*). In other words, he conceives man as someone who provides meaning and purpose to his life, regardless of his reality. He calls this phenomenon “the will to meaning”, that is, the orientation conferred to the path, regardless of its outcome. “We call the will to meaning simply to that which is frustrated in man whenever he is overwhelmed by the sense of meaninglessness and emptiness” (Frankl 1991: 25).

This expression of Viktor Frankl’s was, first of all, a response to the psychoanalytic approach of Sigmund Freud and Alfred Adler in which, in the opinion of the latter, they dismissed the users of freedom and responsibility, while at the same time advocating an individualistic motivational approach. Moreover, they denied the anthropological dimension of the self-transcendence of
human existence: “Self-transcendence is the fundamental anthropological fact that the existence of man always refers to something other than itself-something or someone, that is, to a goal to be achieved or to the existence of another person whom he/she encounters “(Frankl, 1991: 18). If this weren´t the case, any reality - including the other - would be unconditionally at the service of the internal equilibrium of the subject (identity), raising the ethical question of the place and function of the other (alterity).

The Logotherapy proposed by Frankl conceives the subject as man fulfilling his purpose seeking will to meaning, notwithstanding the suffering that may cause him and despite the failure he may experience, since they are two realities that cannot be excluded from human existence. Something should not be sought as an end in itself, but it must be motivated by a “reason”. This “reason”, however, is implicated as the effect of the realization of a meaning, not as something attainable by itself. Viktor Frankl explains:

“Self-actualization is not the ultimate pursuit of the human being. It is not even his primary intention. Self-actualization, if transformed into an end in itself, contradicts the self-transcendent character of human existence. Like happiness, self-actualization appears as an effect, that is, the effect of the realization of purpose. Only insofar as men seeks a purpose in the world does he realize himself. If he decides to realize himself, instead of filling a meaning, self-actualization immediately loses its reason for being.” (Frankl, V. 2012: 38)

The decentering of the subject in favor of purpose may, in a first analysis, seem strange insofar as, through it, one of the aims of education is fulfilled: to make life itself meaningful. The anthropological affirmation of self-transcendence confers spiritual and existential value to the development of each individual and allow for the attribution of meaning to the crises with which he is cyclically confronted. It would, therefore, contradict a self-conservative, self-interested and solipsistic conception of the person, dissociated from society as a whole.
4. The neurological levels of R. Dilts - a model of personal development that includes the dimension of purpose in the giving of oneself

The perspective adopted so far is related to a fundamental presupposition of personalistic anthropology when the person thinks: “the principle of overcoming is as essential to personal life as the principle of reality or of interiority” (Carlos Díaz, 2004: 35). Thus, it will not be possible to conceive the person in its multidimensionality without looking at a dynamic of maturation that implies an effort of intentional overcoming implied in the giving of oneself, assigning meaning to one’s own life.

With the pedagogical objective of enabling the principles stated earlier to be implemented, we have used a well-known model - the Neurological Levels of Robert Dilts - which has had little exposure in non-formal education environments. This model is a result of Neuro Linguistic Programming (NLP) integrating a 3rd generation of explanatory models and work tools that account for the integrality of the constitutive dimensions of each person. If NLP explored the adaptive and functional capacity of the person (centered on the external environment, behavior and skills), the 2nd generation sought to answer the reasons and motivations of these actions (identify beliefs and discover values). The mentioned 3rd generation aimed to answer the questions by identity (purpose-mission) and by spirituality (meaning and belonging).
Briefly, Robert Dilts’s (Neuro) Logic Levels model - based on the original model of the anthropologist Gregory Bateson who, in turn, relied on Bertrand Russell’s investigations of logic and mathematics - suggests that each person acts from six neurological (or logical) levels that make up the structure of the understanding and communication of self. These levels are hierarchically organized, as shown in figure 1:

Note: for reasons of scientific rigor and personal choice, the level of beliefs at the level of values, originally absent from the model advocated by Robert Dilts, was separated in this graph.
These levels correspond to certain constitutive dimensions of the person (dimensions of change) responding to concrete existential and action questions (when I want to act, I ask myself), as explained in figure 2:

![Figure 2](image_url)

From the point of view of the person’s completeness (congruence), it is important to have these neurological levels aligned. Thus, a simple language is suggested to explain to what extent the “parts” of the “whole” person are involved in this alignment, as suggested in figure 3:

![Figure 3](image_url)
It turns out that these levels can become misaligned creating a certain “ma- laise” (a sign of incongruity). If so, a process of change ensues - realignment – obeying Albert Einstein’s principle: the solution to a problem is always at a higher level from what created it. Thus, a double movement must be triggered: on the one hand, and in an upward dynamic, to identify the level at which the problem / impasse occurs and to introduce light on the next higher level; on the other hand, to test the congruence of the solution found by aligning in a downward movement the integration of all levels. In short, the maximum level of personalization will lie in one’s ability to feel ‘whole’ when one puts all his dimensions into the service of his Being and Purpose and feels fulfilled, as illustrated in figure 4:
By crossing Bateson’s logical levels of learning with the neurological levels of Dilts, some degree of correspondence is found when it comes to a person’s ability to understand and communicate as he or she is engaged in a process of change. Change elicits a response from the person in order to be able to perform while learning to meet the demands of his existence, as shown in figure 5:

Robert Dilts’ (Neuro) Logical Levels model therefore allows us to identify the neurological level that one mobilizes in each moment one acts, as well as providing the lens to help intervene in areas such as understanding and communicating with each other, the learning to be carried out or the changes to encourage in the life of each individual. The potential of this intervention can be explained when inserted in an educational process reinforced by educators who are aware of the dimensions to be developed in the learner.
However, the leadership style of each intervention should be different depending on the dimension one wishes to ‘touch / promote’ in the learner. Figure 6 designates the type of support most appropriate to the development or change to effect in each dimension:
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Figure 6

Figure 7 highlights the leadership style most appropriate to each type of support:
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Figure 7
In summary, it can be said that this model contemplates the multiple constituent dimensions of the person, going beyond the promotion of practical skills and values. It seeks, rather, that the person understands his identity, discovers his mission and purpose in the world. For this, it needs leaders who recognize and promote their uniqueness (identity) and point to horizons of meaning and belonging (spirituality) to something greater than the person himself, capable even of redoing it in his identity. This dimension is related to something that is ‘outside’ the person, the others, the absolute Other, capable of promoting the ideal of human achievement insofar as it manifests congruence or the alignment of the neurological levels.
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Reflections

Maurice Joyeux sj.8

1. A call to think, to discern

Many people in Europe, and beyond, have discovered the magnificent book by Etty Hillesum, a young Jewish woman from Amsterdam, titled “A life transformed.”

A passionate woman of great intelligence and sensitivity, who paid close attention to her compatriots whose lives were endangered and threatened under the nazi regime. She was deported with her parents and her pianist brother to the transition camp of Westerbork. They vanished in the hell of Auschwitz.

Etty Hillesum wrote in her diary in 1943: “I would like to be the thinking heart of this ward.” It is this sculpted expression, “the thinking heart,” that inspires these lines. In the Ubuntu spirit, it is good to strive to become more and more a “thinking heart in our world,” a “thinking heart” in any situation where our lives give and take, take risks as well and where the lives of others are found “.

The heart is the (biblical?) place where the living tension, memory, intelligence and will, come together.

Our heart awakens and shapes our impulses, our path, our consents and commitment as well as our renunciations. The heart guides us to generosity and it ought not relinquish thought. Moreover, it should be the cradle of thought. The heart has the vocation to be the intimate forum of our inten-
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tions and free interpretations, the precious sanctuary where the imagination desires to spread its wings, to articulate its phrases, and where a whole world is invented. God himself thinks the world with “rubber and pencil in hand.” Does so, lovingly, passionately and never without us.

An Indian girl, being told by a doctor that “it would take a miracle for her sick mother to be saved,” with half a dozen pennies in hand, rushed to a pharmacy and asked for “a miracle.” She pushed she insisted so much that she touched the heart (?), the thought (?) of a surgeon who amongst other customers was waiting for his turn. At the request of the surgeon, the girl took him to see his mother. He was able to quickly diagnose the disease and performed the necessary surgery without delay and free of charge. The mother was saved ...

The girl did not fall into dramatics. She did not lose her mind, did not go to a temple or sought out any magic charlatan. A woman of heart but also of thought she went to the appropriate place: a pharmacy. She saved her mother who was allowed to have a future again.

This is the art of thinking and acting with the heart!

The other exists because I exist, think and act. I exist because you exist, think and act in the same impulse.

We find in the breath of our hearts, as in our thoughts, the murmurs that create the possibilities of our lives. They prevent, or allow us, to live as “righteous” before God and before men.

Is it not of the greatest importance to recognize, in the opacity of our thoughts, the diversity of our heart movements? Those who serve with joy, with peace, as opposed to those who only induce ashes and sorrows? Those who make us grow in availability, benevolence, and security in the succession of our days, our nights?
Nothing works in true freedom and responsibility without thoughtful discernment, the spirit or the murmurs form the foundation of our decisions!

2. To act? A call? An answer?

A famous book of this universal library called “the Bible” (among other books of wisdom in various civilizations, such as the Koran in the Muslim world, Ramayana or Bagavad Gita in India), is entitled “Acts of the Apostles.” We are indeed told of all the acts described by the apostles (apostoloi = “sent” in Greek) of this great Teacher and Brother that Jesus was to his friends.

In this book happy and unhappy gatherings are told, “Action”..., like in the movies when a movie director starts filming!

We are made to witness a series of “performances”. The scenes are filled with comings and goings, ins and outs, travels, general and detailed plans, meetings and dialogues, etc. ... The “actors” perform in a scenario in which they are free to interpret, nevertheless inspired and guided, by what one can describe as the spirit of the creator of the scene. It is clear that the actors act, but they are also acted upon. Their willingness, their work and their talent, the quality of their presence and their interpretation plays its role in a positive creative tension willed and desired by the author and the director together.

Not thinking that our lives are mere “cinema” and a “mise en scene” (some would say ironically and cynically a’comedy”), a parabole may be meaningful. It offers us space to reflect how we act in our own lives. Simultaneously or alternatively ...
In different situations what is our share of free choice and free will? how do we respond to other external “wills” that ask for our own commitment?

Personal initiative and / or response to what we are doing, deciding and then living and experiencing?

The Indian girl who sought and found the “miracle” that saved her mother was the initiator of an event that united her will and her own action, overwhelming her with astonishment and happiness! She was “acted on” as well as being the “agent” and author of her mother’s new future.

Is it not interesting, vital (!), to be aware of what motivates, directs and guides our actions? In this watchful vigil lies all our dignity as firm men and women!

Is it not true that to act as free and worthy beings is to “want and desire, as much as possible, what we do and live” instead of “doing and living what we want and desire “? The reverse would probably be a sign of adolescence, an illusion of freedom that rapidly disappoints.

The Hungarian Jesuit, Hevenesi, coined this phrase: “At the time you’re preparing to act, do everything as if everything depended on you and not on your God. When you deliver the action, act as if everything depended on your God and not on you”.

Hevenesi’s phrase leads us to committed humanism, which is not an autonomy or autharchy dream, but an alliance with others and with the «Other.» We are invited to serve and love with our initiative, talents and freedom in an exchange of being actors and being acted on, where nothing is lost but where all the possibilities are open.
3. Connected, disconnected, allienated

Nowadays, autonomy is highly valued.

Paradoxically, the same is said about communication.

From local to global, from the singular to the most universal and vice-versa, walls and bridges are constantly being erected, being imposed. From the most intimate to the most public, there are numerous contradictions of thought and action in this domain of our lives.

Our five senses, the antennae of our body, are being deeply put to the test, because we are being submerged by multiple means of information, sensitization with personal or collective implications. Actions in the “digital” era like send or receive, express or print, record and memorize or delete, are facilitated and accelerated, requesting our freedom to the max, truth and accuracy of its contents (we do not speak of “fake news”), the authenticity of our relationships, the coherence of our intentions.

How to live connected without being alienated? How do we unite with each other, but also how to untie ourselves? How to live with distance and with proximity? Are we in a good and suitable place? How to succeed in relationships that are not purely ephemeral between Eros, Philia or Agape - according to a lifestyle often described as “liquid”, at the risk of evaporation of self and the other, victims of a false “fluidity “ – a term that is so popular nowadays. However, are we looking for durability (“sustainability”, according to the English), valuing it?
Between attachments and distances, we navigate as close as possible, often united, whether we like it or not. We only have control over some aspects of the events that affect us, worry us and mobilize us! Let’s observe everything that is practiced, voluntarily or by force: breaks, dismissals, abandonments, divorces and ... this frequent slogan “Leave!” or even these words in vogue in some countries according to “agreements” very difficult to manage: “exit”: Brexit, Grexit, etc ...).

How to live as allies, as friends and not as enemies? How to maintain trust, the credit received and given from one to another according to a respected happy otherness?

The games of convergence and divergence, of differences and similarities, sharpen our vigilance.

Our globalized, Baroque, times have given birth to the “make-believe”, to the “cheating”.

We should not be content with the mere generosity we project in our relations, and still less with the too naive implications of mere attractiveness.

➤ Desiring a heart and an intelligence capable of judging and discerning is desiring a treasure.
➤ “Talk” to this desire, evaluate it with others,
➤ Choose the dialogue (from the Greek διάλογος) for and with others according to this wonderful “relational tool” that is the language,
➤ Dedicate the time necessary to listen, to consult and to deliberate.
➤ Allowing oneself to be altered and disaltered by the information, by the opinion of others, away from any jealousy or dream of autonomy or autarchy, from the “almighty” trap, is already savouring the fruits of the Covenant!
The Indian girl, her mother, the doctor who wanted a miracle, the surgeon who listened and diagnosed (discerned?) the mother’s illness and operated on her successfully, testify to this: this orchard, these fruits of life - life in authentic relation - it exists!

Tinos, March 2019
II Chapter

UBUNTU, an African Concept to the World
UBUNTU: Philosophy of life and social ethics

John D. Volmink

Introduction

The world faces numerous chronic crises, such as climate change, HIV and AIDS and ongoing financial crises. These global dilemmas and challenges do not respect national or regional borders. It is true, however, that these threats to stability and sustainability present the opportunity for high levels of global cooperation, which in turn could provide methodologies for a more humane redirection of the phenomenon of globalization. This could include a new global ethic, as opposed to traditionally constructed cooperation based on cultural arrogance and domination by the privileged, developed people and countries.

We would like to believe that the African Ubuntu concept will make a genuine contribution to such a new global ethic. Given its profound relational dimensions, Ubuntu crosses all kinds of borders, be they political, economic, cultural or from the civil society. Consequently, Ubuntu has the potential to influence all spheres of public policy, of citizenship, of people development and of governance. We can look at Ubuntu as a moral philosophy or, in postmodern language, as a meta-narrative.

---
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The Nguni speaking people of Southern Africa developed a world view (paradigm / concept / philosophy / way of life) that embraces humanity as a collective of individuals who are only human because they co-exist within the global community of other humans. This world view is embodied in the word “Ubuntu”.

The word “Ubuntu” cannot be translated literally from the Nguni languages into another word or expression, due to the density and depth of its meaning. Trying to capture its essence, the word “Ubuntu” can be described as “humanity to others”; “I am because you are”; “I can only be a person through other people”; “Becoming a person”.

The consequence of identifying with this common humanity is that you, as an individual, should always treat others as you wish to be treated. A deep identification of the common human-ness of others becomes a basis for considerate, caring, compassionate, empathetic, civil, benevolent i.e. “humane” treatment of others. You as an individual are one with all other people in a common human family. Put differently: “An injury to one is an injury to all” and “A blessing to one is a blessing to all”.

Thus, in a divisive world, the Ubuntu world view has become an important platform for bridge building, resolving conflict, inclusiveness, transformation, equity and proactive community development. This world view is practiced by considerate listening to other viewpoints, not being judgemental and dogmatic. Those who embrace Ubuntu resolve to not easily “descend to the level” of others, who may treat them with disrespect or discrimination i.e. with inhumanity.
Ubuntu and humanity

Ubuntu is based on a concept that as humans, people should naturally be attuned to each other. Finding and creating this resonance should bring people “onto the same wavelength”. In a world of noise, cacophony and chaos, Ubuntu in practise should bring harmony, congruence, synchronization, coherence, co-ordination, understanding, acceptance, accord and agreement.

The core of Ubuntu can best be summarised as follows: “A person is a person through other people”. This should strike an affirmation of one’s humanity through recognition of an “other” in his or her uniqueness and difference. It is a demand for a creative intersubjective formation in which the “other” becomes a mirror (but only a mirror) for my subjectivity. This idealism suggests to us that humanity is not embedded in my person solely as an individual; my humanity is co-substantively bestowed upon the other and me.

Humanity is therefore a quality we owe to each other. We create each other and need to sustain this otherness creation. And if we belong to each other, we participate in our creations: we are because you are, and since you are, definitely I am. The ‘I am’ is not a rigid subject, but a dynamic self-constitution dependent on this otherness creation of relation and distance.

The concepts of the oneness of human unity (“humanity”) embodied in the Ubuntu philosophy, are built on a greater platform of unity and co-operation that exists in nature. The earth has a diverse array of elements and non-biological inputs that support an even bigger diversity of life forms. These dissimilar elements and life forms sustain each other within complex ecosystems of harmonious co-existence.
**Ubuntu: Mutualism and Commensalism**

Mankind currently seeks to implement “Sustainable Development” as an inclusive and transformative approach to close the gap between the privileged and underprivileged. Sustainability thinking and Ecosystem thinking have recently impacted on rapidly developing and diverse technologies housed within multiparty collaborations called innovative ecosystems. These innovative ecosystems with embedded learnings from the collaboration of numerous natural resources and species, are being actively used to accelerate societal transformation. Examples are Neural Networks, Biomimicry, Social Networking, Peer to Peer Digital lending and Collaboration Platforms in Education and Agriculture.

The Ubuntu perspective is built on the natural ecosystem models of Mutualism and to some extent of Commensalism as observed by the Nguni speaking people in their close relationship with nature. These concepts have also been recently defined by modern day ecological and sociological scientists.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutualism as:</th>
<th>Ecologists define:</th>
<th>Sociologists define:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The relationship between two species of organisms in which both benefit from the association</td>
<td>The philosophy that the interdependence of social elements especially in the theory that common ownership of property, or collective effort and control is governed by sentiments of brotherhood and mutual aid that will be beneficial to both the individual and society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commensalism as:</td>
<td>The relationship between two species of a plant, animal, fungus, etc., in which one lives with, on, or in another without damage to either.</td>
<td>The peaceful coexistence among individuals or groups having independent or different values or customs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Ubuntu perspective is built on the natural ecosystem models of Mutualism and to some extent Commensalism. However, in nature there is another contending model to Mutualism and Commensalism. This is Parasitism. Parasitism kills off a species by infection and virulent invasive growth. The parallel to parasitism in social science is obvious: the privileged or socially exclusive groups elevate themselves beyond a common humanity and wish to protect themselves, their “kind” and their privileges, from the perceived dangers of otherness. Such groups become blind to the fact that the planet and all its people have in fact provided the foundation of their fortune. Disrespect, entrenched discrimination, divisiveness and genocide are the common result of recurrent upsurges of this world view throughout the history of mankind.

Ubuntu seeks humankind’s common fortune through brotherhood (more correctly: “human-hood”), complementarity and mutual sharing of the diversity of personality traits, individual gifts, skills, talents and cultures.

Furthermore, Ubuntu seeks to establish within the fabric of human society, the wisdom of sustainable, synchronous mutualism and commensalism, as they exist in nature, for the benefit of all people as well as the planet and all its resources and living organisms. It is therefore a Way of Being that not only synchronizes people as humane humans for social harmony, but humanity with all of nature to the benefit of all of creation.

This concept challenges many of aspects of Western philosophy because it necessitates a shift from individuality separate from the community toward individuality embedded in the community.
Ubuntu as a broad philosophy

The question can be raised whether the Ubuntu philosophy can influence the world or can only exert influence at a more local level. While it is clear that the Ubuntu philosophy has deep African roots, it is indisputable that its relevance extends beyond African borders.

Think for a moment about the ancient ideal captured in the Sanskrit term “Ahimsa,” which means “do not injure/ do not harm” providing the philosophical underpinning to nonviolence. Or even the term used by Mahatma Gandhi (who lived in South Africa for 20 years), of “Satyagraha” which loosely translated as an insistence on truth, truth-force, or soul-force that provided the basis for the non-violent resistance movement. And it was this philosophy of nonviolent resistance that influenced and guided the actions of men like Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela. Today there is also the concept of social justice in Christian ethics, which states that humans are created in God’s image, and as such have inherent values independent of their utility of their function.

All these philosophies lead us to see that Ubuntu is simply one manifestation of a universal philosophy, or common meta-narrative that transcends cultural and temporal demarcations.

I believe we should hear the voices of those who, rightly, understand Ubuntu as a guiding force towards embracing our collective humanity. One such voice is Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who tells us that Ubuntu is the essence of being human: not being South African, not being Portuguese, but being human. The essence of Ubuntu is to be Human!

We all share identity with others. According to the Archbishop’s articulation of the Ubuntu concept, each person belongs to something greater than himself/herself, which is diminished when others are humiliated, tortured and oppressed.
Nelson Mandela says in his book *The Long Walk to Freedom*: “I always knew that at the bottom of every human heart there is mercy and generosity. No one is born hating other people because of their skin color, origin or religion. People learn to hate. If they can learn to hate, then they can also be taught to love. Love comes more naturally to our heart than the opposite.” Nelson Mandela said that even in the darkest times in prison, when his comrades were tortured by the guards, he could see a small sign, perhaps only for a second, of humanity in those guards, and that this was enough to continue to believe that “Man's goodness is a flame that may be hidden, but never extinguished.”

Through the voices of Nelson Mandela and Desmond Tutu, the Ubuntu concept has moved us away from narrow nationalistic ideologies and towards a broad and humanistic universalism. These are not the only voices, but they are important voices. Nelson Mandela had a great and undeniable impact on the metanarrative in the world, contributing to global humanity and global ethics.

This is the kind of ethics that we need when we deal with challenges that go beyond national borders and call for global cooperation. It was this Ubuntu spirit that made us South Africans, at the heart of decision making, to choose the path of truth and reconciliation. It was not necessary, but it was important. Desmond Tutu said that “in the Ubuntu spirit the central concern is the healing of trauma resulting from rape, the repair of imbalances, the restoration of broken relationships, the search for rehabilitation of both the victim and the aggressor, where the latter must be given the possibility of integrating into the community‘. This is unique in South Africa, and I do not know of any other country that has done the same - this was the South African contribution to the meta-narrative.

In this context, one idea in the global citizenship discourse that deserves, in my opinion, more discussion is the concept of cosmopolitanism. This is the idea that all people, regardless of their origin and nationality, belong
to a single community and that this global identity needs to be developed.

The Ubuntu philosophy offers a moral framework for this debate in a broader discussion of the meta-narrative, but it is not only this that has been influential in the discourse of global citizenship, it has also been the discourse of human rights in the world.

It has further been argued that exploring the concept of Ubuntu can provide a link between rich, indigenous value systems and universal human rights enshrined at the international level. In addition, it is argued that the values of the Ubuntu philosophy should be incorporated into a reformulated version of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (there are people working hard for this to happen).

Allow me to return, to the smaller narrative, to the narrative of the South African people. If ever there was a system diametrically opposed to the spirit of Ubuntu, then this system is apartheid.

**My personal journey**

My first contact with Ubuntu comes from the experience of growing up in a system that promoted and imposed separatism. This system constantly assaulted my dignity and my humanity and differentiated the minority to the detriment of the majority as a fundamental model of social organization. Apartheid also defended, as many people throughout the world today argue, that in the name of an ideology, belief, or self-defense, a human being has the right to injure or even kill another. It was this system that made me leave South Africa and find perspective elsewhere.

The year 1976 was a difficult year in South Africa, young people revolted against the system. I had been married for one year. In that same year, I left
my studies and went to teach in a poor neighborhood in the suburbs where, at the height of the riots, I was almost killed. Meanwhile my in-laws, who lived in Stanford, South Africa (where my wife was raised, approximately 100 miles away from where we were), asked my wife to visit them urgently. That year apartheid had spread its tentacles to Stanford and by the time we arrived, there were cops everywhere and a bulldozer. The police had already warned my in-laws that they had to leave their home, but they had refused to do so. Our arrival coincided with the moment when the police decided that there would be no more negotiation and said: “You only have five minutes to get out of this house!” My in-laws refused to leave their home, but ignoring their will, the officials on site took some objects they liked best, and then destroyed the house with a bulldozer. This all happened while the whole family watched helplessly. And then to add insult to injury, my father-in-law had to pay a fine for not wanting to vacate the house.

Two months later, just before Christmas, I was at a function and asked an American friend, Margaret (who happens to be a White person) to bring my sister to the place where the event was held. While they were on their way, unfortunately, a vehicle driven by a person under the influence of alcohol, collided head-on with Margaret’s car. When I arrived at the scene of the accident and I could see that Margaret was pinned behind the wheel while my sister was beside her, bleeding profusely.

While I was trying to work out a way to deal with the situation, an ambulance arrived, and the driver said that he had come to take Margaret to the hospital. However, Margaret insisted that he should take my sister first because she was losing a great deal of blood and was in a critical condition. But the driver replied: “I am sorry I cannot take her; this ambulance is for Whites only.” An hour later another ambulance arrived without life support equipment and as a result my sister died on the way to the hospital.

When I got the news, I said to myself: the system killed my sister, my best friend (she was my best friend, we grew up together). I left the country a
few years later because I could not come to terms with her death. I left South Africa to re-orient myself and I was out of the country for about ten years. I knew how to forgive a person, but how could I forgive a System? I could not find an answer for ten years.

Ten years later, I was living in upstate New York, sitting in front of the television watching the moment Nelson Mandela came out of prison and when I heard him speak I said to myself “Although the system has done all this against him, yet he found it in his heart to forgive the system.” I told myself that if Nelson Mandela, as my leader, could do it, then I could also try to forgive the system also. So, I packed my bags and returned to South Africa. I wanted to be part of the reconstruction movement, building a new country, making a small contribution to a new South Africa, in my area of expertise, namely education.

The Re-orientation of a Nation torn apart

The White Paper on Education, based on the 1993 Interim Constitution of South Africa, was the document that marked my journey of starting the Ubuntu philosophy in a formal way, and I quote:

“This Constitution provides the historic bridge between the past of a deeply divided society characterised by strife, conflict, untold suffering and injustice and a future founded on the recognition of human rights, democracy and peaceful coexistence and development opportunities for all South Africans, irrespective of colour, race, class, belief and sex.

The pursuit of national unity, the well-being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the people of South Africa and the reconstruction of society.
The adoption of this Constitution lays the secure foundation for the people of South Africa to transcend the divisions and strife of the past, which generated gross violations of human rights, the transgression of humanitarian principles in violent conflicts and a legacy of hatred, fear, guilt and revenge.

These can now be addressed on the basis that there is a need for understanding but not for vengeance, a need for reparation but not for retaliation, a need for Ubuntu but not for victimisation.”

The White Paper on Education was the first official document where I found the word Ubuntu. Two other issues drew my attention to the document: one was the concept of common humanity, and another is the idea of a common future. Nelson Mandela made me realize that the sense of community is essential, especially in a society such as ours where we grew up fueled by unquestioned assumptions and myths about “the other.” We have always assumed that the divisions between groups of people based on race, origin, language, occupation, gender, religion, nationality are more real and enduring than our common humanity.

In the book Let Africa Lead by Reuel J. Khoza, the first chapter is dedicated to the Ubuntu philosophy. In this work, Nelson Mandela says that “Ubuntu is a simple big idea that affirms that the common ground of our humanity is bigger and more enduring than the differences that divide us. So, it must be, because we share the same human condition, we are creatures of flesh and bone, oriented by idealism and suffering, although we differentiate ourselves by culture and religion. And although history divides us into rich and poor, free and non-free people, powerful or important individuals, we are still branches of the same tree” We perceive the language of a humanistic universalism, and not a narrow nationalism, in the words of Nelson Mandela.
The Ubuntu Global Network

I appeal to the Ubuntu Global Network to always encourage a global perspective by celebrating what is distinctly human in all cultures, helping us to recognize that rivalries and unbridled national competition can only lead to total destruction. It is through diversity that we express our ultimate unity. In the work of the global network we must not escape from the differences between people but celebrate them as good news and as learning opportunities.

Regarding the idea of a common future and going back to the same White Paper on Education states:

“When all South Africans won equal citizenship, their past was not erased. The complex legacies, good as well as bad, live on in the present. Difficult as it may be to do so, South Africans need to understand each other’s history, culture, values and aspirations, not turn away from them, if we are to make the best of our common future.”

Making a difference in the World

One of the philosophical underpinnings of Ubuntu is that we are not in the world simply to adapt to the world. As human beings we have a responsibility to act on the world and change that world. We decide whether our contribution is for the betterment of the world or to make it worse. Selfishness and the propagation of conflict by individuals and groups make the world worse. Positive contributions to the world beyond man-made borders and philosophical boundaries will make the world better. There is no ready-made world into which we are born. We can participate in creating a new world and give meaning to this new world. I believe that it is a sad thing, indeed, when we lose our sense of humanity and neglect our
God-given capacity to make a difference. If we really want to make a difference in the world it is important to have a world-view that embraces all: those who are in the most advantaged, but also those who are traditionally excluded - the poorest of the poor. You cannot be an elitist and make a difference. If you want to make a difference in this world, the one thing you should do is to make a commitment to non-elitism. Without it, you won’t have any impact in this world.

So, this perspective of a common future is based on a world-view that sees the environment, the earth and all life upon it, including human life as essentially sacred. This reverence for life, both human and the environment, will help us as global citizens to become kinder and simpler and will assist us in seeking to understand the natural world with a sense of awe and a sense of reverence instead of trying to dominate or control it.

Within the spirit of Ubuntu, I often ask myself how I define success. It cannot be measured only by objective, tangible and quantifier standards such as test results, access to higher education and wealth, material possessions or prestige. It must also include supreme values of life, such as beauty, peace, joy and love, compassion and personal wholeness. These values cannot be measured by quantifiable standards but must be honored, nonetheless.

**Ubuntu, identity and practice**

Ubuntu has a philosophical dimension of non-fragmentation (keeps things, people and ideas together). This concept of wholeness, of non-fragmentation is a means of understanding African philosophy. The word Ubuntu connects ‘becoming’ with ‘personhood.’ These are two indivisible concepts that should not be broken: you are a person and you are becoming, all at the same time. This is a very important point: The Ubuntu philosophy views
the emergence of personhood through both individual expression and collective/community inter-connection.

It is important to remember that there is a difference between Ubuntu philosophy and uncritical collectivism. I do not believe in absolute collectivism. Ubuntu does not de-emphasize the individual even though it embraces the community. Ubuntu highlights two extremes, I would like to mention: you can tell yourself that you are so cut off from everyone that your expression as a human being has nothing to do with the expression of other people. I do not care about others, I’m in this world just for me, it’s almost an anarchist approach, a perverted self-interest that can lead to all sorts of crimes and corruption; at the other extreme is the view that I am a member of a group without them I cannot decide on my actions. Out of this collective world, I cannot differentiate myself from the other members of the group. This current of thought doesn’t leave room for self-reflection and for being critical of one’s own actions.

There is a merger and a commitment that tells me that I have a distinct role, and I believe my point of view is closer to what the Ubuntu philosophy means. I have a role to play in acting locally as I think globally. This role needs to be aligned with the roles of others. I must seek excellence as I am part of a whole (excellence being the standard that defines the whole), having in this whole an exclusive identity (I never lose identity).

The Ubuntu philosophy helps us realize that the basic moral reason for action is the greatest good for the greatest number of people (it is desirable to help develop the community). Ubuntu recognizes individuality at the service of the community.

In conclusion, the Ubuntu philosophy is a way of life and a perspective of the world that calls for moral action. It draws together a multiplicity of values and directs them towards the upliftment of both the individual and the community.
In the book *A Long Road to Freedom*, Nelson Mandela states: “During my long and lonely years in prison, my hunger for the liberation of my people became a hunger for the liberation of all people. I understood that the oppressor should be freed just like the oppressed. A man who steals the freedom of another man is also a prisoner of hatred, prejudice and intolerance. In order to be free it is necessary to break the chains and respect the freedom of others.”

**Towards an Ubuntu agenda for action in organisational contexts**

Researchers have suggested that Ubuntu is a worldview that holds promise for defining effective African leadership that counteracts the negative effects of corruption, discrimination, and scandals (Ncube, 2001). Indeed, Ubuntu is a prime example of African virtues that are being recovered in a post-colonial renaissance and held up as a model for authentically African leadership (van Hensbroek, 2001). Within management literature, Ubuntu is often conceptualized based on *five social values* (survival, spirit of solidarity, compassion, respect, and dignity) proposed by Mbigi (1997), although most studies combine respect and dignity into a single value (e.g. Sigger, et al., 2010; Poo van, et al., 2006). So we can see the following fourfold model emerging from the literature:

First, **survival** is central to Ubuntu and presupposes the sharing of resources based on mutual concern for existence (Poovan, et al., 2006). Unlike individualistic cultures, survival in African cultures is achieved through brotherly care and concern in light of and in spite of difficulties. In organisational contexts, this value may be expressed through open-handedness and concern for the needs and interests of others in the organization (Broodryk, 2006).
Second, **solidarity** entails valuing collectively according to a community-based understanding of self. This is similar to Bekker’s (2008) distinction of Ubuntu as “more than mere interdependence, as the identity of the self is defined in finding the other in community” (p. 19). In organisational contexts, this means that the organisation is viewed as a body (not simply a collection of individuals) that exists “to benefit the community, as well as the larger communities of which it is a part” (Lutz, 2009, p. 318).

Third, **compassion** involves understanding others’ dilemmas and seeking to help on account of the deep conviction of the interconnectedness of people (Pouvan, et al., 2006). Accordingly, individuals express generosity out of concern and “a willingness to sacrifice one’s own self-interest to help others” (Muchiri, 2011, p. 433). In business contexts, this value may express itself by the leader’s physical presence and willingness to suffer with organizational members during hardship and sorrow (Broodryk, 2006).

Fourth, **respect and dignity** within Ubuntu is explained as valuing the worth of others and showing deference to others’ potential to make a contribution (Mangaliso, 2001). In African cultures, human dignity and respect stem from the individual’s connectedness to others; therefore, connectedness is significantly related to morality and rationality (Prinsloo, 2000). In organisational contexts, this value may manifest itself in management’s commitment to developing employees (van der Colff, 2003), respect for age and experience, and a general helpfulness toward others (Mangaliso, 2001).
In Ubuntu we have a new identity – We lose our individualism in order to find that individuality in community. Most of our lives we live with individuality in spite of community, but Ubuntu makes us aware that to be really human we need to find our individuality within the community. When we move away from independence to interdependence. Ubuntu is tied up with the whole notion of dealing with the brokenness of society, bringing together parts of the community that are being broken apart like laws, by poverty and other circumstances and so for me Ubuntu speaks about wholeness.

Ubuntu also reminds us that we should never forget that who we are and where we are, would not have been possible without others, without community. Someone loved you enough to nurture you to support you, to defend you, to counsel you. There were those that taught you, there were others who came to sit alongside you when you really needed it most. All of these people continue to make you who you are. May we never become dismissive of their contribution and influence in our lives. “I am because we are”. We must develop a perspective which recognises that we exist within a delicate web of connectedness with others and ultimately with all living and non-living things.
Towards an Ubuntu non-formal leadership education model

Drawing on the theoretical and philosophical ideas embedded in the Ubuntu literature we have chosen five dimensions for an Ubuntu non-formal leadership education model:

**Self-knowledge** – This has to do with a deeper understanding of who you are. I think self-knowledge lies at the heart of what Ubuntu really is. The word Ubuntu is a combination of two words: “Ntu”, is a word that stands for person, and “Ubu” means “I’m becoming”. Two words that are actually one, two concepts that are indivisible and we must not break that wholeness. I am a person and I am becoming at the same time.

An appropriate self-knowledge begins with the realisation that I am already a person, but I am not yet complete - because you complete me. I am a person, and a better and richer person, because of others. I am because we are. So self-knowledge means “I know who I am, I know my own story” but this is a journey rather than an end point. Self-knowledge lies at the heart of Ubuntu. It says “I am because you are”, it says “any person is a person by virtue of other people”, and so self-knowledge is really truly the fundamental of Ubuntu because it is associated with self-awareness.

**Self-confidence** - Is equally an important part of Ubuntu because self-confidence makes a particular statement - but not an arrogant one. The statement that says: “I know who I am, and I know my value”. Self-confidence is related to a statement of value, not a statement of arrogance. Humility by the same token is not a call for having a bad self-concept. Humility is simply a non-overestimation of myself. In the same way, self-confidence is a non-underestimation of myself. So, humility is important so that I don’t overestimate myself, and self-confidence is important so that I don’t underestimate myself. But self-confidence is important because it is about focus and courage, and how to stay focused on where you want to go,
and how to have the courage, even in the face of opposition and criticism to continue working in the interest of other people. Therefore, Ubuntu is not about going on a personal mission, but going on a mission in the interest of community.

**Resilience** - All of us - whether we are rich or poor, whether we are young or old – have encountered obstacles. And those of us at school, know that there are certain subjects we gave up on, because after 5 minutes you say “I cannot solve this problem and so I’m not going to continue”. Resilience involves working through the pain threshold. If you want to achieve your goals, you must make sure that the goals are congruent with the things that you value most. Because if there is congruence, you will be able to overcome the obstacles and you will be able to work through the pain. It is the case that some people who grow up in conditions of hardship know from an early age what it means to survive and to fight to survive and therefore, their pain threshold is higher. They have ‘mental-toughness’.

We have to be aware of the critical role resilience in our lives. Even if you were born in challenging circumstances, you have to develop resilience in order to deal with the challenges of life, because there will always be challenges to face.

**Empathy** - Has got to do with feeling with others. It is a very important foundation before you can work with others and for others. At the end of the day, it is not only just feeling any feeling. It is a feeling of love for others. Love forms a very important part of Ubuntu, because you cannot work with people unless you care for them and love them. Empathy is the ability not only to work with my head and my hands, but to work with my heart. Ubuntu involves the head, the heart and the hands – empathy focuses on the heart.

**Service** - Captures everything, but service is connected with leadership. And service has got to do with servant leadership. However, these two
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concepts “being a servant” and “being a leader” are seen as opposite terms. And when two opposite terms come together it is called a paradox. So we have a paradoxical word in servant leadership. But it is important to bring those two together because you cannot lead a community unless you care for them, you cannot serve that community unless you care for them. So, servant leadership has got to do with the kind of leadership where I serve first and I lead second. I do not use my leadership as an opportunity to get something for myself only, but to serve the community. At the end, if you don’t care as a leader, if you don’t love your community, if you do not love the people you serve, you will end up using them, abusing them and dismissing them. It is very easy if you don’t love, that you use people for your own purpose. That is why service is not just doing things, because you can do things with all the best intention in the world, but there comes a time when service does not help: Service can hurt people if it does not subscribe to the principles of servant leadership.
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Three-tiered Ubuntu leaders – caring, connecting, and serving
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Background

There is always the temptation to look at the times we live in as unique and, above all, particularly dramatic. We even add, on more difficult days, a touch of “end of times” or an announced apocalypse. Even if, in a strict sense, nothing repeats itself, we know that history “repeats itself”, almost as if it was a swinging pendulum, in a dream and nightmare, of virtue and evil, of light and shadows. That’s why we must know how to read the signs of the times with the serenity that allows us to lose neither lucidity nor hope. Having said that, we must look with courage and forthrightness to the challenges we face, however difficult they may be, so that we can act on them.

What times are we living in then? We live in a European Union marked by turbulence and increasing strife, after decades of economic growth and consolidation of a remarkable social model that resulted from a unique political project. There is discomfort in the air, common at the eve of a storm.

At the beginning of this century, after two already elapsed decades, lines of fracture can be identified which require our attention. The dimension that most impresses us when we look at Europe today is, in our view, the cycle of fear. It may seem strange, but the fear of uncertainty, insecurity,
and complexity dominates much of our social life, from a micro scale or at a continental level. Bauman even says that “fear is the great demon of our time”. Vanier (2018) reminds us that “it is fear that prevents us from being more human, that is, it prevents us from growing and changing. (...) Fear always seeks a target.”

From where does this fear spring forth?

Let’s start with uncertainty. Postmodernity, marked by permanent change, highlights uncertainty as the only certainty. Bauman himself speaks of “liquid modernity,” in which “nothing is permanent” everything’s in a state of constant change. Today, some other authors describe our times as gaseous, highlighting the total volatility we live in. This change which in times gone by had a temporal scale, was made up of long cycles accommodating the predictability of life. Change is now constant. Nowadays it is highly improbable to be born, to live and to die in the same place, in the same community, but above all forecasting our tomorrow seems to have become an exercise of pure divination. With the increasingly diminishing of the capacity to foresee, the (serious) possibility of planning has been wiped out. Planning is now difficult. Today it is necessary to re-evaluate a” charting course”, to manage multiple possible scenarios, and to have permanent flexibility or adaptability.

This unpredictability also referred to by Taleb in his “Black Swan”, stating that “we just cannot predict it “ gains particular significance when the high impact of unimaginable (until its occurrence) events is added on to unpredictability, as was the case with the twin towers attack on September 11, 2001. It is easy to understand that when uncertainty acquires an extreme amplitude, the “number of real ones being greater than the number of possible ones”, the fear “of what can happen” becomes overwhelming conditioning everything.
Associated to this uncertainty, other thinkers, such as Ulrich Beck, stress the dimension of the “risk society” in a risk-management mode, whether be it environmental - our first concern - also economic or social. Giddens, on the other hand, stresses that this dimension of “risk” is naturally linked to the idea of probability and uncertainty and that its awareness has increased significantly over the last few centuries. Judt, in turn, in his *Treaty on Our Discontents*, stresses, economic, political and physical insecurities to justify a “policy of fear” and states:

“We have begun living in a time of fear. Insecurity is once again an active ingredient of political life in Western democracies. The insecurity generated by terrorism, of course; but also, and insidiously, fear of the uncontrollable pace of change, fear of job loss, fear of losing ground to others in an increasingly unequal distribution of resources, fear of losing control of circumstances and routines. And perhaps more importantly, the fear that maybe it is not just us who cannot shape our lives, but also those who command have lost control, to forces beyond their reach.” (Judt, 2010)

The growth of uncertainty (and consequently of insecurity) has an explanation. Uncertainty is the offspring of complexity. European societies (it is more fitting to speak in the plural) have experienced exponential increases in complexity. To better understand this reality, it is worth returning to the theory of systems. This approach leads us to understand reality, from the whole - rather than from isolated parts - from the interaction of its parts and the outcome of the interactions. It is, therefore, very important in systemic thinking to look at the “nodes” of the network and the “relations” established between the various nodes.

In these system interactions, a paradoxical dimension, called non-linear causality, can arise, in which a given effect is not the result of a proportional or predictable cause. Put in other words a (seemingly) irrelevant event can have catastrophic consequences and, on the contrary, a major event may
have no effect at all. This absence of a constant and linear pattern between cause and effect complicates everything. The systemic view also brings us the relational paradigm, in which it is emphasized that everything that happens stems from relationships and processes, almost always in a process of interdependence and feedback. However, what really triggers complexity is the difference between an “open system” and a “closed system”. While in a closed system it is possible to determine all of the elements that integrate it and to list all of the relations and interactions that can be established, in an open system that is impossible, since it is not possible to predict everything that can happen, that is why the surprise factor will always be present.

It has now become clear that our societies have been increasingly opening up, to this systems perspective. Globalization, and its gigantic trade growth in goods, services and financial flows, has transformed us into a complex and unpredictable web, given the increase in human mobility, the development of the information society (from global media to the planetary interconnection of digital communication networks and their flows) and human interactions. Innerarity (2009) states:

“Society is complex given what it offers us (heterogeneity, dissension, case, disorder, difference, ambivalence, fragmentation, dispersion), by the sensation it produces (lack of transparency, uncertainty, insecurity), by what it can or cannot do with it (ungovernability, inaccessibility) (Innerarity, 2009)
Going back to Giddens (1998), which focuses particularly on the correlation between globalization and risk, the following dimensions are emphasized:

1. Globalization of risk in terms of intensity
2. Globalization of risk, in terms of the increasing number of contingent events affecting all people
3. Risk arising from the created environment or socialized nature
4. Development of institutionalized risk environments
5. Risk awareness as risk
6. Well-known risk awareness
7. Awareness of the limitations of expertise

This expression of complexity is frightening not only due to uncertainty and unpredictability, but also to the impotence of action in the face of its results, or preventing its triggering. In the words of this Basque philosopher,

“the dynamics of society threatens us with systemic risks that really touch us, but these causal chains are so complex, indirect and opaque that it becomes very difficult to combat them” (Innerarity, 2009).

It has become difficult to live (with tranquillity) given this context.

There is another ongoing process which is, simultaneously, the cause and consequence of previous ones: the growth of mistrust. We are well aware that what allows us to live together is a significant amount of mutual trust which is vital to life in society. The levels of trust, expressed in social capital, make the difference between successful societies and those that fail, as Alain Peyrefitte points out, in his work “The Society of Trust.” Trust among citizens, among them and institutions and among institutions is a dynamic process, mediated - in part - by the media and by the perception of the proper functioning of institutions. An endemic mistrust has been
growing making us distrust everything and everyone at all times. It is a product of institutional errors and dysfunctions, such as the corruption or malfunctioning of justice, as well as a media culture of “attack dog” and “scandal factory”, with the most recently added perverse effect of “fake-news” in social networks.

It is not difficult, in this context, to realize that fear has grown and, to a large extent, has captured us. It is important, therefore, to reflect a little on this and what it awakens in us. At the individual level, we know that fear is a neuronal process of responding to a given stimulus and typically leads to one of three responses: it paralyzes us, generates an aggression as a result of a need to protect, or causes us to flee. In itself, it can be a positive instinct, self-protection when facing a threat is absolutely necessary for survival, but uncontrolled and irrational fear can correspond to a deeply destructive force: one’s self destruction and the destruction of those around.

In this article it is important to consider an aggressive response as a reaction to a perceived sense of fear, particularly when shared by many individuals in a given society. Turning from the individual to the group, Ethology experts, such as Eilb-Eibesfeldt, have warned of the risk that “a fairly effective stimulus-triggering (aggressive release) situation is the actual or imagined threat aimed at the target group. It arouses strong emotions in the group, and the demagogues of all ages have always understood how to activate this kind of enthusiasm and then put it to the service of their interests. (Eilb-Eibesfeldt, 1977). Here is one of the risks of our time, where fear can be the driving force of a process of violence, in which its agents are not even aware that they are being manipulated, in particular through the various “fear industries.”

Returning to the characteristics of human nature, evidenced throughout History, we know that every time fear-aggression emerged within a community, in a given historical context, it developed in tandem with the “Otherization”, the dangerous creation of the “Others” blaming them for the evils that arose.
Nowadays, with the European Union project (“EU”) in crisis, especially since 2008, warning signs are of concern. This phenomenon was expressed not only in the crisis stemming from the inability to accommodate the people who sought refuge at the EU countries, particularly those from Syria, but also the ostracized European Muslims as a result of fear due to terrorist attacks. However, this process, which began with the seemingly “Other”, continued in the EU with the increase of protectionist and nationalist discourse in several countries, most notably those of the “Visegrad Group” joined recently by Italy or Austria. When nationalism returns as a dominant tendency, there is a risk that the drums of war will resume drumming and that the number of “others” or “foreigners”, in the negative sense of the term, will increase significantly. This is already visible in the tensions between France and Italy, unimaginable some time ago, or in the echoes triggered by Brexit, awakening old ghosts in both Ireland (s).

This process is almost always characterized by a process of dehumanization of the “Other”. It was in the past with slavery, with the inquisition or with the genocide of the Jews, and the trend repeats itself. This dynamic implies an elimination of the human qualities of the victim, transforming it into “subhuman”, both in the eyes of the aggressor and of the victim itself. A process of fear and aggression is generated with a narrative that begins by highlighting the “difference” - cultural, religious, traditions ... - and that ends, in an explicit or surreptitious way, with the reference to the (supposed) threat they pose to the community. Hence there is a dangerously short distance linking the discourse to the need to eliminate them - or to exploit them.

These mechanisms of dehumanization are always prodigal in manipulation strategies, whose rules we ought to revisit. Manipulation occurs by using a small portion of truth, followed by the introduction of false information, of changes in the context, and framing biases, resulting in fraudulent messages. It explores what the target audience is already willing to accept as true, an outcome of their stereotypes and prejudices, creating a lie that
people are willing to believe. On the other hand, the spurious comparison of the best of “us” against the worst of the “other” is always made and the (small) part is taken for the whole, correlating the behavior of someone who identifies with a certain group with all the elements of this group (example: a jihadi terrorist is associated with all Muslims). Finally, negative characteristics are subliminally induced in a general category in a persistent and continuous way over time, generating the effect of priming, or pre-activation, in which conditions are created for an automatic and unconscious response to a given scenario, category of individuals or behavior that was previously characterized as threatening.

Sometimes this dehumanization of the “other” increases in scale and gains a dimension which Huntington described as the *Clash of civilizations*, the cultural and religious confrontation, the source of post-Cold War conflicts. This effect is far from spontaneous. Instead, it results from the intentional-ity of a radical extremist minority that is capable of triggering this process (for example, with a series of attacks “justified” - abusively - against Islam), which is allied to the manipulation that another extremist radical minority, supposedly of the opposite side, uses to create a hate speech with which it seeks to gain power (see the xenophobic and racist extreme-right phenomenon in Europe). But these extremes are only successful when the vast majority is allowed to be captured and adheres to the process of dehuman-izing someone. For this reason, it is fundamental to generate awareness of what it means to dehumanize and to be alert to manipulation.

Still on the subject of dehumanization, it is worth highlighting the contribu-tion of Adela Cortina to the understanding of these processes. These are not limited to categorizing as “other-foreigner”, in cases of “Xenophobia” but also - and perhaps increasingly - as the “other-poor” phenomenon that Cortina characterizes as “aporophobia” the “contempt for and rejection of the worse- offs, both economically and socially. “ The author draws at-tention to the fact that the recent phenomena of exclusion and hostil-ity, although not so stated, is more centered on poverty than on ethnic or
religious identity, and even less on nationality. All those from whom we have nothing to gain, financially speaking, or worse, who lack our support, regardless of whether they are nationals or foreigners, are treated as lesser people and are dehumanized. Curiously, people of the same foreign nationality can be treated either as businessmen or as poor refugees.

In her book, she calls attention to the three levels of development of moral consciousness according to Kohlberg; firstly, people consider fair all that favors them individually; secondly, they regard as just when in agreement with the norms of their community, and finally, at a third level, with greater maturity, people evaluate fair with reference to all humanity.

Unfortunately, we’ve had a lot of regressive evidence, which places us on the first level - the merely selfish - of moral consciousness. And the strangest thing is that the results obtained, are the opposite of what was desired: that is, the more selfish the action, the greater the damage to oneself, as if generating a boomerang effect (although its effect may not be immediately felt).

This cycle of dehumanization, whether by xenophobia, aporophobia, or any other form of exclusion, fully targets the human dignity of the victim. And nothing is more painful to those targeted by it. Although it is an invisible wound, it bleeds abundantly and hurts deeply. There is a wealth of studies on the impact of humiliation.

We can find various definitions of dignity, but the definition in Donna Hicks’s book titled “Dignity” is worthy of note. The author says that “dignity is an inner state of peace that is achieved through the recognition and acceptance of the value and vulnerability of all living beings.” (Hicks, 2013). As far as humans are concerned, this is a fundamental and inalienable right. Under no circumstances, a human being loses the right to his/her dignity, even when he/she is no longer respected, in light of his/her morally wrong actions. This difference between dignity and respect is important.
Humiliation, a consequence of dehumanization par excellence, is deeply destructive and causes, sometimes unrecoverable damage, that causes resentment, disintegration and revolt. Hicks recalls that “threats to dignity provoke the reaction of our old center of emotions, as if our lives are at risk even when they are not. Once activated, instincts do not recognize the difference between physical threat and psychological threat. They only know that we have suffered an attack and we must be prepared to act - a reactive, self-protective, defensive, perhaps even violent action. In time, those feelings can be transformed into aggression and violence: against oneself, against the aggressor, against the world at large.

It is these signs of the times, as a backdrop, that lead us to argue that the Ubuntu philosophy is timely, adequate to tackle contemporary challenges and that must be taken as a gift from Africa to the world, since its validity is universal, not restricted to the African context.
Ubuntu as a response to the challenges of postmodernity

As is abundantly referred to in this work, the most consensual meaning of Ubuntu is: I am because you are: I can only be a person through other people. This view becomes particularly relevant at a time characterized by the ruptures and conflicts previously highlighted in the framework of postmodernity.

Humans need to be reunited with their relational essence and draw the necessary consequences to construct a new global ethic based on “unity in diversity”. It was from this assumption that the Ubuntu Leaders Academy and the method associated with it, was developed.

As Desmond Tutu tells us, “You cannot be human by yourself, alone. You are human through relationship. You become human. This is fantastic because, in reality, we are made for this delicate web of interdependence: interdependence! Therefore, being completely self-sufficient is, in fact, sub-human. I need you. For me to be “me”, I need you to be me in fullness.

We were made for complementarity. “And he further reinforces: “Ubuntu tells us that you are not human because you think; you are human because you are in relationship.”

John Volmink, the greatest inspirer of the Ubuntu Global Network, underlines in another text of this work, that the word Ubuntu consists of two parts: “Ubu”, meaning “becoming”, and “Ntu”, which means “Person”. “With Ubuntu I become aware that when we came to the world, we came incomplete. I can only complete myself in a relationship with you, “Volmink tells us, in the same vein as Tutu. This interdependence has relevant consequences in particular in the mirror effect or reflection that implies: “This means that your pain is my pain, if I hurt you, I hurt myself too; if I humble you, I humiliate myself also. Therefore, well-being cannot be considered separately. Our lives are intertwined.”
This vision grounded and strengthened Mandela’s political proposal in the post-apartheid transition by proposing a “rainbow nation”, rebuilt on the basis of recognition of the equal dignity of all and of the desire for a new model of inclusive society in that diversity (rainbow) was part of its wealth, not only with regards to the ethnic, but also to the political, cultural and social dimensions.

Another relevant reference is Jeroen Zandenberg, author of The Ubuntu Philosophy and the Origins of Democracy. This book contains an interesting approach to the philosophical concept of Ubuntu transferred to social ethics and servant leadership, materialized in the Ubuntu Leaders Academy project. In his perspective - which we share - “the Ubuntu philosophy is the best description of human nature and offers the best way for society to organize itself and to maximize justice and human survival.” Based on this assumption, Zandenberg argues that:

“Western liberal democracy assumes people to be atomized individuals. The philosophy of Ubuntu on the other hand places the Self as its centre whereby the Self not only consists of the physical individual but also includes the social environment with which we identify with. Without other people a person can never be fully human. Eastern philosophy also takes people as being part of their environment, while with Ubuntu the social environment is part of the people. This crucial difference makes for a completely different view of humanity and thereby also a different organization of the best society.

According to the modern view of humanity, people can be complete persons as atomized individuals. Other people are then unnecessary and often seen as a limitation to the individual. With Ubuntu others are esencial to become fully human. Others are then not a limitation but an expansions of possibilities. Ubuntu reasons from the Self, whereby the Self should be seen as the physical individual including everything with which it identifies” (Zandenberg, 2010)
The timeliness of the Ubuntu concept also lies in the pattern of the growing diversity present in today’s societies. It is almost impossible, given increasing human mobility, for the encounter of cultures, religions or ideologies not to occur. It is therefore necessary to find narratives that allow us to live together, not only to coexist peacefully, but also to develop mutual respect and social cohesion. Thus, returning to Volmink, it is reinforced that

“Ubuntu is related to our common humanity. It’s not just between two people, it’s between communities all over the world. If I do not have Ubuntu I will believe that differences based on religion, race, gender, social classes, origin ... are more important than our common humanity. Ubuntu makes us realize that we are branches of the same tree. We are bound by our shared humanity.”

Ubuntu represents a response to the “demon of our times,” Fear. It enables the development of new global ethics, a new tool to deal with the devastating effect of a culture of fear.

In the film Invictus, depicting real events from the first year of Mandela’s presidency around the Rugby World Cup, a dialogue takes place at one point in which Mandela asks his chief of security to integrate some white security guards who had worked with the previous president, on the bodyguard team. Faced with the resistance of the head of security Mandela says:

“Reconciliation begins here (in the Mandela presidency team). Forgiveness frees the soul, removes fear. That’s why it’s such a powerful weapon.”

This vision that inspired, for instance, the creation of the Commissions for Truth and Reconciliation, is deeply revolutionary in the management of fear and represents a risky bet for a more restorative rather than a retributive justice. It also involves the conscious refusal of a proposal of revenge or “reckoning.” It should be noted that in our view, in Mandela, reconciliation and forgiveness are not in the moral or religious sphere. They are pragmatic proposals that enable
the construction of a common future in a post-conflict world. Of course, they do not apply unconditionally, nor exclude the application of justice to serious crimes. These may be necessary and appropriate in specific cases. However, what none of the expressions of retributive justice resolves, is the rebuilding of social bonds and trust, particularly after large-scale conflicts. Restoring trust between parties, mobilizing them for a common, shared and caring future can only be feasible within a process of reconciliation based on truth and memory centred on non-repetition. To note that the Ubuntu reconciliation does not erase the past. Remember it, so that it does not repeat itself, but it opens the door to full social reintegration, without resentments, or standby hates.

Ubuntu is not, of course, the only humanistic philosophical approach, based on the recognition of our identity as in relation. It is likely that in all cultures we find similar expressions. However, Ubuntu has a specific strength that should not be ignored. It is, symbolically, a return to the cradle of humanity, born somewhere in Africa, to rescue from these roots essential elements for the present: a sense and a purpose, that allows us to (re) learn to live together. On the other hand, it allows for a “meta-identity” that embraces different religious, cultural, ethnic or political affiliations without the need for someone to stop being who they are through a “conversion” process. It allows one to maintain a particular and specific identity and, within respect for the identity of the other, is available to share a common code of values and actions for the construction of a fairer and more humanized world. It is thus possible to have believers and non-believers, Christians and Muslims, ideological militants from different quarters or distinct cultural identities working together with the same Ubuntu code of values. It is this understanding of both the context and the meaning of Ubuntu that since 2011 we have been reflecting on how this philosophical source can help inspire the leaders of the 21st century. This proposal emerges as original and specific; in the full knowledge that other Ubuntu readings may lead to other choices.

In our case, Ubuntu’s interpretation of empowering new leaders manifests itself in the ethics of care, building bridges, and servant leadership.
First tier: Caring – For a new ethics of care

In the interpretation we make of the Ubuntu philosophy, it leads us, first and foremost, to an ethics of care. Bauman (2001) reminds us that:

“We are responsible for the other, being aware or unaware, whether we want it or not, cheering or going against it, for the simple reason that in our globalized world, everything we do (or fail to do) impacts on the life of everyone and everything that people do (or not do) ends up affecting our lives.”

Nelson Mandela, being interviewed in 2006 the journalist Tim Modise, emphasized this aspect of caring, as the first example of Ubuntu, already present in ancestral times:

“any traveller that stopped at a village, did not even have to ask for water or food. Once he stopped, people gave him food and welcomed him. This is an aspect of Ubuntu, but there are others. Ubuntu does not mean that people should not get rich. The question is, are you going to use that personal improvement to help the community around you improve? This is the most important thing in life. And if a person can live like this he will have achieved something very important and admirable”

The awareness that we exist only through other people, who are only insofar as the “other” is also, in its fullness, impels us to take care not only of the other as an integral part of my “extended self” through my relationships, as well as taking care of myself. The care of the “other” takes us, inexorably, to the care of the community as a whole, in which we insert ourselves and also to take care of the planet that sustains and supports us. This 360-degree, external and internal, is both the foundation of Ubuntu and its consequence. Ubuntu generates care and through care it reinforces itself.

A strong and galvanizing concept - “caring” - must, however, be carefully interpreted so as not to generate a perversion of its meaning. Caring, in an Ubuntu perspective, can never be an expression of paternalism or infantilization, nor of the superiority of those who care in relation to the ones cared for. The Ubuntu type care should never disrespect the autonomy and self-determination of each person, as an expression of individual freedom and guarantee of human dignity. Similarly, it does not impose, from the outside to the inside, a model of being or doing, not even a single pattern of behavior. The Ubuntu caring is much more a walk together so that each one is what he/she is called to be, in the best version of oneself. In addition, it can be fully respected in its freedom, dignity and specificity.

In this care there is no application for the metaphor of the potter, the sculptor or even the gardener. No one should shape anyone, not even prune in the other what seems evil to him. In fact, Ubuntu caring is primarily intended to create the opportunity for one to become a sculptor, a potter or a gardener of himself, allowing him to be the “master of his destiny, captain of his soul” in an exercise of sensitivity and deep respect for each one.

Caring forms ties of solidarity and empathy, which can sometimes be a harbour and shelter for others, a network of support where protection can be sought during unexpected falls. It is important that you always do this in an exercise that judges little and loves very much. With its own wisdom of the “gentle breeze of the afternoon,” so often invisible and almost always discreet. Sometimes, passively, with the gift of listening to others with the prophecy of gesture or word.
That being said, the most significant feature of Ubuntu’s specificity of care is mutual care. Simultaneously caring and being cared, refusing a status of self-sufficiency and opening up to their true fragile and imperfect human nature. Vanier (2018) says in a special way:

“The healed and the one being healed constantly change places. When we begin to understand ourselves, we also begin to understand others. This is part of the process of shifting from idealism to reality, from heaven to earth. We do not have to be perfect, nor deny our emotions”

In this ethics of care is equally significant the transgenerational dimension. The Ubuntu care does not ignore the heritage of the past, nor the legacy to the future. Caring is also to preserve the memory and legacy of the ancestors, so typical of African cultures. Instead of the disdain with which our hasty and instant postmodernity looks at this trait, we should learn to avoid an amnesia regarding our inheritance. However, even more dramatic is our lack of responsibility for looking after the future. The resources around us seem destined to be consumed in the present, ignoring that the planet has been lent to us by future generations. The ethics of care in Ubuntu is always a reminder of our responsibility to the unborn.

This dimension is not only expressed in interpersonal relationships, at the individual level. It has, also, a focus on the community as a whole, as an autonomous entity, more important than the sum of the parts. Again, the gift of the African roots of Ubuntu reminds us that we are responsible for taking care of what unites us in different communities, in different scales: our neighbourhood, our city, our country ....
Finally, in the original understanding of Ubuntu, grounding is vital. As Dirk Louw, a South African psychologist and philosopher, says in an interview with IHU magazine (2010):

“African thinking is holistic. As such, it recognizes the intimate interconnectivity and, more precisely, the interdependence of everything. According to the ethos of Ubuntu, a person is not only a person through other people (ie the community in a broad sense: other humans as well as ancestors), but a person is a person through all the beings of the universe, including nature and nonhuman beings. Caring for “the other” (and thus of oneself), therefore, also implies caring for nature (the environment) and non-human beings.”12

It will be worthwhile in this context of an ethics of care, to take into account other contributions that could help us to understand in greater depth the thematic and cultural scope of this perspective. Authors such as Heidegger, Foucault, Ricoeur, or Levinas have worked on this theme in-depth, but this present article does not provide the context for a literature review of the different philosophical approaches of the ethics of care. There are, however, two exceptions: the contributions of Boff and Vanier as they help us to make the concept operational to be applied within the scope of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy.

In fact, one of the authors who worked on the concept of “care ethics” with an approach that inspires us in this reflection was Leonard Boff. In his book Caring, he warns us at the outset that “both ancient myths and deeper contemporary thinkers teach us that human essence is not found in intelligence, freedom, or creativity, but rather in the ability to care “. For Boff, care opposes indifference and carelessness and cannot be seen as an act, but an attitude. It involves more than a point of attention and zeal be-

cause “it represents an attitude of occupation, concern, responsibility and affective involvement with the other” and adds:

“Without care, man ceases to be human. If one does not receive care from birth until death, the human being is disarticulated, weakened, loses meaning and dies. If, in the course of life, everything he undertakes does not do so with care, he will eventually harm himself and destroy everything that exists around him. Therefore, care must be understood in line with the essence of the human being (...)” (Boff, 2011).

In his explanation of “Care”, the author states the following dimensions:

a) Care about our only planet (global dimension)
b) Care about our own eco-niche (local dimension)
c) Care about a sustainable society
d) Care for the other
e) Care for the poor, the oppressed and the excluded
f) Care about our body, health and disease
g) Care for the integral healing of man
h) Care about our soul: the angels and inner demons
i) Care about our spirit, the big dreams and God
j) Care about the Great Crossing: death.

This unfolding brings with it both the relevance and the complexity of an ethics of care. It requires full-time multidimensional attention, but it will offer, in return, meaning and purpose that all human beings seek. Additionally, we must also be aware of the “pathologies of care”, because everything that is human has, in itself, the solar side and the lunar side. Thus, the denial of essential care, obsession with over-care or lack of care (carelessness) are realities to be taken into account and avoided.

Another contribution we would like to highlight is Jean Vanier’s. The founder of L’arche, and an expert in “humanity in relation”, he went on to
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discover, in the encounter with the (apparently) most fragile how this care profoundly transforms us. Among his vast bibliography it is curious to see that one of his books titles coincides with the meaning of Ubuntu: Becoming Human.\(^\text{13}\) It is from him that we receive an inspiring contribution to the interpretation of the ethics of care.

Vanier (2018) begins by reminding us that “the discovery of our common humanity frees us from self-centered compulsions and inner sorrows; is the discovery that ultimately finds its fulfillment in forgiveness and in love to our enemies. The process that makes us truly human.” Starting from the theme of solitude finding its response through the sense of belonging, the author proposes a way to express this care for the other - he calls it more appropriately “love” - that guides us to what could be an “Ubuntu care ethics”, dividing it into seven dimensions: revealing, understanding, communicating, celebrating, holding accountable, communion, forgiving.

In **Revealing** it signals the importance of being able to, rather than doing something for someone, to reveal to him how unique he is, to tell him that he is special and worthy of attention. The way we treat someone reveals the value we give them. Vanier states: “All human beings are sacred, whatever their cultures, races or religions, their capacities or disabilities, and whatever their strengths or weaknesses. Each of us is an instrument to integrate into the vast orchestra of humanity, and each of us needs help to become the person we must become “(ibid.). Being able to show someone - and ourselves - how he/she is unique and indispensable is one of the strongest expressions of caring.

It follows the need to **understand**. Each person, in his specificity, with his strengths and weaknesses, needs to be understood beyond appearances or hasty impressions. This requires time and patience, but without these dimensions it is not possible to care.

---

\(^{13}\) Published in Portuguese under the title “Verdadeiramente humanos”
The third expression is **Communicating.** Being able to create spaces where something becomes common, opening to one another and knowing how to truly listen is essential for care to happen.

**Celebrating** is another fundamental step. Vanier says: “It is not enough to reveal to people their value, to understand them and to care about them and to value them. To love people is also to celebrate them.” Realizing an “Ubuntu ethics of care” is to cultivate this conscious celebration of each person in their full dignity regardless of their weaknesses and frailties.

This path is also about a **sense of responsibility.** As previously mentioned, it is not a matter of infantilizing or mismanaging, even with an apparent good intention. The challenge is to help each one to be autonomous, to do things by themselves, to be and to feel responsible.

Moving up another stage in this script adapted to the operationalization of an Ubuntu ethics of care inspired by Jean Vanier, “**Communion**” is proposed, interpreted by the author as trust and mutual belonging, seen as a dynamic process of mutual vulnerability and openness of one person to another. It is true that communion makes us vulnerable, but without it, we will hardly feel complete.

Finally, the dimension of “**Forgiving**” appears. “The bond between people in communion presupposes that we are able to forgive and ask forgiveness of one another,” the author tells us. Without forgiveness there is no future, Desmond Tutu reminds us too.

This ability to care is therefore an essential feature of the Ubuntu philosophy expressed in daily life, in small and large gestures. Relationships are built by people who know how to care.
Second tier: Bonding – Building bridges

The concept of the “bridge builder” is one of the essential marks in our interpretation of the Ubuntu philosophy. In interdependence there is always a bridge to be built and maintained. It is impossible to be Ubuntu without making this design one of the axes of its action. Linking is essential.

This is very clear in Mandela’s experience, around his dream of a “rainbow society.” Particularly striking in his biography is the determination to turn enemies (with whom dialogue is impossible) into political opponents (with whom one can dialogue and negotiate), the elimination of the “other” never having been an option, but instead seeking to construct of a just, inclusive and cohesive society, with the inclusion of all, however difficult it may be. Mandela did so, for example, on the bridges he was able to build with the government of Frederick de Klerk, the face of apartheid, negotiating a transition to the end of this regime and the implementation of a democratic model and the rule of law.

His determination was precocious in his political career. In his final statement in the “Rivonia Trials” in 1964 that would sentence him to life imprisonment, he declares with great courage:

*I fought against white domination, and I fought against black domination. I nurtured the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all people live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal that I hope to live to see realized. But, if need be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die."

It should be noted, however, that this ability to build bridges was not limited to the most obvious dimension of the black-and-white fracture in South Africa. He was also an eminent pontiff within his party and with other black majority-based political forces.
At the African National Congress (ANC), tensions between “hardline” perspectives, including Winnie Mandela herself, and Madiba’s pontiff strategy were evident. Similarly, the conflict between the ANC and Inkatha, the Zulu majority party, was another challenge for Mandela’s mediation in the run-up to the 1994 elections in the face of imminent civil war.

**But what does it mean to be a bridge builder?**

Another way of naming this mission - to be a Pontiff - comes from the Latin pontifex, and refers us to the sacred context in ancient Rome, but also to the strict sense of those who took care of bridges. This title, as we know, assumed in the bosom of the Catholic Church, through the figure of its maximum leader, the Pope, bishop of Rome, also invested with the function of “supreme pontiff”. However, even in the Catholic perspective, it is far from being the exclusive design of its leader. The challenge of building bridges is for everyone. Regardless of the religious context, there is a great need in a time when walls are erected and ditches are dug, that many may, instead, take on the mission of becoming pontiffs serving humanity.

In order to build bridges one must first have the ability to recognize the existence of margins - or obstacles - and be able to have the determination to unite them or to overcome them. This awareness is vital for the process to unfold. Often we do not even know that there are fractures that call for a pontiff. We do not see them or look away from the challenge. Understanding this reality, the nature of conflict, the weight of resentment, what separates and divides, is the first step. Immediately afterwards, we must invest in knowledge of the margins. Just as in the effective construction of bridges we must understand the geology, the orology, the geography of each margin in the construction of bridges between people, we need to know very well the margins that we want to unite. If we do not, mission becomes impossible. Therefore, when we speak of human margins, having
full knowledge about each of them, whether individually or represented by a group or nation, is vital.

Having fulfilled these first steps - awareness of the margins, knowledge of its nature and the drive to uniting them - the challenge of being able to plan its construction, remains. Pontiffs cannot ignore that the mission to which they are called for is always complex and therefore requires planning, avoiding the error of overconfidence, intuition, luck or chance. Such planning goes hand in hand with patience - the virtue of strength or the science of peace - that allows for safe and consistent steps. Precipitation or the search for an instant result are threats to solid bridges.

This aspect - the planning of the construction of a bridge - is closely linked to the technical skills that the pontiff must possess. Mediation, conflict management, dialogue, negotiation, among others, that require a set of knowledge and skills, are very relevant to success. Therefore, in Ubuntu culture, it becomes necessary that each person develops this portfolio of knowledge allowing for truly useful actions. Among these competences is the ability to understand human nature, to participate in its expression between divided margins. The ability to understand the mechanisms of prejudice, stereotype, resentment, distrust and even hatred is essential to the success of the pontiff. He/She will always have to be an expert on humanity. But its mission is not exhausted in the construction of a bridge. There are at least two later dimensions that must be taken care of by the pontiff. On the one hand, working for the bridge to be bidirectional. Only such a bridge will allow us to take advantage of one of the greatest riches that a bridge contains: cross-pollination of the banks. When they switch on, they switch between them. To gain from what they receive and what they share. They transform each other. No margin remains the same after being joined to another by a bridge. Finally, a dimension so often neglected: the maintenance of the bridge. We may be led to believe that when the bridge is built the task of the pontiff is finished, but it is not true. If it is not cared for and maintained, it will fall one day. Therefore, to be a pontiff
is also to take care of bridges built between people, between communities or between countries.

This longing to build bridges is ancient. We could, for example, place in the early days of the pontifical pantheon a young man named Benezet from the twelfth-century Europe, from Avignon who left his mark, founding the “Brotherhood of bridge-builders” (Fratres pontifices, in Latin) that gathered men who saw their mission in the construction of bridges, a fundamental element in a territory filled with rivers. He himself led the impossible-built bridge over the Rhine River in that city in 1171, and the effort of this community lasted for more than a century. Although blending legend and reality, this design inspires us, seven centuries after its extinction, to new communities of fraternity pontiffs, adapted to the challenges of our time.

But is it possible to build bridges in a world so marked by walls? We draw from the inspiration of Eng. Edgar Cardoso, a great builder of bridges, who taught us that in all of the rivers there is the right place where a bridge can be built. We only need to find it. This hopeful view that there are no invincible separations helps us to flesh out this realistic optimism of Ubuntu philosophy expressed in the mission of the bridge builders. This requires developing leadership qualities.
Third tier: Serving - Servant Leadership

Finally, caring led us to the dimension of serving, leading.

The Ubuntu Leadership Academy project started out as a training response for young people, particularly those coming from or working in more vulnerable contexts, so that they could be new leaders of a fairer and more humane world within their communities and at a global scale. The awareness that a new leadership culture is being ushered in is an incentive for us to engage in a significant paradigm shift.

Volmink draws attention, in his interpretation of this leadership model moulded by the Ubuntu perspective, to the apparent paradox between serving and leading. It is not usual to see the two concepts articulated, so this presents a significant challenge: an alternative model of leadership is possible which isn’t centred around the elected person, to whom everything is due, and who, from a superior position, commands everything, but instead, leadership expresses itself through a mission to which we are all called at some point in our lives, and which is exercised as a service to the community and not as self-service.

It is important to clarify the concept of “serving” in this context. In our societies, there still remains a social devaluation of the status of those who serve. They still have inheritances as “servants,” “servants of the land,” “servants,” or “servants,” as memory of inconsiderate social roles at the base of the pyramid, inheritors of the statute of slavery, dispossessed and deprived of full human dignity. Despite this, it is interesting to check the option, in the Anglo-Saxon context, of the use of “public servant” or “public servant” in Brazil, for those who serve in public structures of common interest, while Portuguese or Spanish realities uses the term “civil servant”.
It is true that in cultures with a Christian heritage, the concept of “servant” is associated with Jesus Christ, God made man, who came to serve and not to be served, emerges as a model of reference:

“You know that the heads of the nations have power over them, and the great oppress them. It should not be so among you. Whoever wants to become great, becomes your servant; whoever wants to be first, be your servant. For the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life as a ransom for many.” (Matthew 20:24)

This view is also shared by the teachings of Islam which point out that the service to humanity is part of the faith, and Muslims should be actively involved in promoting social welfare and responding to educational and health needs not only for Muslims, but for all.

Still, in our day, apparently, being a servant does not amount to much ambition status. There are, however, great figures of the twentieth century who could inspire us and help us realize the importance of serving.

Martin Luther King and Nelson Mandela are reference examples of service leadership. About this dimension of service, Luther King, two months before his assassination, on February 4, 1968, in his sermon “The drum major instinct,” states:

“If you want to be important, fantastic. If you want to be recognized, fantastic. If you want to be great, fantastic. But acknowledge that he who is greatest among you must be your servant. (...) Everyone can be great because everyone can serve. You do not have to have an academic degree to serve. You do not have to know how to conjugate the verb to serve. You do not have to know Plato and Aristotle to serve. You do not have to know the second theory of thermodynamics to serve (...)”. 
In this way, MLK identifies in service the greatest aspiration one can hope for.

Also Nelson Mandela gives this example throughout his life. When he paid with twenty-seven years of his life spent in prison, the high price of the struggle for the end of apartheid and the restoration of justice and human dignity, Mandela showed the ultimate exponent of the servant leadership: giving his own life for a cause. Several authors like Martin Kalun- gu-Banda, in his work Leading as Mandela, or Richard Stengel, in The Legacy of Mandela, underline this dimension of servant leader. The ability to cultivate a deep sense of respect for people, to lead by example, to be inspired by the good that exists in each person are some of the evidence that Kalungu-Band finds in Mandela’s leadership model. Stengel, for his part, emphasizes dimensions such as the ability to serve by leading from the front (assuming the risks in critical periods), or from the rear (in a more discreet coach role), as well as perceiving the good that exists in the others or knowing that leaving the scene is also leading are examples cited. It is particularly significant that Madiba requested that the “Mandela Day” celebration, set up by the United Nations in 2009 and celebrated in every 18th July, be centred on 67 minutes of service to the community, anywhere in the world.

The Ubuntu perspective is thus, in this approach, aligned with the appreciation of the servant being and, if necessary, servant leader. To serve, in our referential, results from the purest exercise of freedom and gratuitousness. It is the product of consciousness, made will and concretized in gestures and attitudes. It inspires us as a model of servant leadership, the proposal of Robert Greenleaf (1977), the main pioneer - and who has in this work the more detailed analysis in the text of José Luís Gonçalves (“Servant leadership: an inspiration in cultural countercurrent”).
Greenleaf’s proposal, with other contributions from Spears (1998), characterizes this style of leadership in ten dimensions:

1. *Knowing how to listen* carefully, listening effectively before speaking. Try to understand first; then it will be understood.
2. *Be deeply empathic*, knowing how to understand what is unique in the “other.”
3. *Know how to care* for those around you.
4. Knowing yourself and others as well as the context in which you move.
5. *Have persuasion and cooperation*, rather than an authoritarian approach. Convince instead of coercion.
6. *Conceptualize and have Vision*, being able to go beyond the routines of the day to day.
7. *Prospective capacity*, being able to understand the past and the present, drawing from there the lessons to project the future.
8. *Reliability*: serving by leading is to know how to deserve the trust of those who serve and those with whom they serve the common good.
9. *Commitment to the personal growth* of each team member and the people they serve. Know how to take care of the members of your team as people, transmitting them safety and being referential in crisis situations.
10. *Building community*: The common good above all private interests, with a view to building social capital, cohesion and trust.
Blanchard (2018) brings us a reading of the servant leadership in two axes: one that is associated with the strategic dimension (the leadership) and another with the operational dimension (the servant). Another contribution comes from Peter Senge, who thus characterizes the difference between a model of leadership “command & control” and that of the servant leadership:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Command &amp; Control</th>
<th>Servant Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metaphor</strong></td>
<td>The organization is a machine</td>
<td>Interpersonal relations organic structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Top down</td>
<td>The entire group participates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td>Production elements</td>
<td>Main assets and great source of creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership styles</strong></td>
<td>Distant and disconnected</td>
<td>Connected and present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supervision</strong></td>
<td>Dictates, controls and punishes</td>
<td>Listens, facilitates and provides encouragement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Orientation</strong></td>
<td>Self- service: what can you do for me and my organization?</td>
<td>Hetero service- what can I do to help you fulfil your objectives and mission?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Peter Senge

This view of servant leadership is always associated with the concept of “leading by example”, so often interpreted as a presumption (of the leader) and / or a demand (of the context) that the exercise of leadership must be “exemplary” infallible, incorruptible, perfect. This expectation is dangerous and mismatched to the imperfect reality that each leader represents. He often led a script of deification to disillusionment, beginning with a certain leader as being “exemplary” and ending in frustration when confronted with his inevitable imperfection and fragility. “After all, he / she ...” is the beginning of the phrase that so often reflects this error. Mandela (2010) stated in one of the collections about his writings in prison:
“One of the problems that troubled me deeply in prison was this created, unwanted false image of myself: people considered me a saint. I never was one nor even in its more basic definition, a saint defined as a sinner trying to mend himself.”

The Ubuntu servant leader, who leads by example, is the one who recognizes himself as poor and fragile, made up of brilliance and error, but with the permanent ambition to improve. She is the one who often sets the example by doing well, and who at other times, when she misses, sets an example by the way she deals with the mistake: she recognizes it, apologizes, repairs and corrects for the future.

Finally, servant leadership must take care to avoid the trap of any kind of moral superiority. A moralist - and even fundamentalist - discourse may emerge about the merits of the servant leader. It would be a contradiction in itself. The conviction that this style may be the most and best suited to the challenges outlined above does not give it the right to judge. On the contrary, it puts the servant leader in a humble attitude of one who sees himself imperfect, more than arrogant and presumptuous. Simplicity is one of the greatest attributes of servant leadership.
Conclusion

*Caring, bonding and serving* are three strong verbs. Interpreting the Ubuntu leadership through them is an ambitious challenge, and no full and definitive answer can be given in any leadership experience. We will always fall short and will always be an ongoing process to the end. With advances and setbacks, successes and failures. Always from the concept Ubuntu (becoming a person) what it means to assume this incompleteness and imperfection, from needing the “other” to be full, but also from those who are not exempt from completing the “other” in a relation of interdependence.

As Ubuntu leaders we will be called to take care of the other, of the community, of the planet and of ourselves, so that each one can be in full, in a balanced ecosystem and that we will leave it in good condition to the next generations. We will be called to connect what is distant, to build bridges where there are walls or abysses, with the patience and determination of those who do not give up easily. We will be called to serve, by leading. All this, building a common house, where all – without exception – fit in and where no talent is wasted. With the inspiration of Mandela, Luther King, Gandhi, Mother Teresa or Malala, as well as many others who remain anonymous building, every day, a more humane world, we can continue to add our drop of water to the ocean, as Teresa of Calcutta said, without which the ocean would not be the same.
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Servant leadership: an inspiration in cultural countercurrent

José Luís Gonçalves

Robert K. Greenleaf coined, in 1970, the term “servant leadership” in his work *The Servant as Leader*, and further improved it in his other published works. It deconstructs the cultural paradox that opposes the definition of leadership to that of service because the author favoured a hetero-centred perspective of the leader in his/her leadership role, in contrast to a self-centred approach.

This decentring in favour of others’ causes and needs, opposes the tenets of classical theories of organizational leadership and their respective metaphors. Thus, the Traits theory, focused on the personality of the leader; the Behavioural theories, centred on the interaction between the leader and the led; the Contingency theories that privilege the leader / led / situation interaction, only to name a few. Their common denominator is the centrality on the leader as a person, on his/her qualities over other factors / elements. In servant leadership, however, serving the people and their needs precedes and shapes leadership style. The motivation-inspiration to lead, is rooted in the cause or mission that the leader chooses to embrace, and not on his/her pre-existing leadership qualities. Let us remember, for example, how certain leaders with seemingly few human qualities became inspirational for many, when they took on humanitarian causes that many thought impossible to achieve.

---

14 Robert K. Greenleaf coined the expression “servant leadership” based on the leadership style of Leo, the humble central character of Hermann Hesse’s 1932 *Die Morgenlandfahrt*
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The concept of servant leadership distinguishes itself from the more classic models of leadership, and also from the less obvious ones that have emerged and which advocate a certain spiritual management of leadership (*spiritual management development* or SMD), stating that the personal resources of the leader must be oriented to the service of the organizations and grounded in spiritual motivations (Bell, E. & Taylor, S., 2004, Fry, L. & Kriger, M., 2009; Izak, M., 2012). From the perspective of these currents, spirituality (of a religious and private nature), provides *meaning* that albeit well-intentioned originates in a self-centred definition of leadership, although this is genuinely concerned with relational processes of leadership and touch the perspective defended by Robert K. Greenleaf. On the other hand, servant leadership also establishes rapport with the so-called “distributed leadership models” (Cf. Harris, A., 2007) and some of the styles that characterize it (e.g. charismatic, emotional, visionary, transformational and / or principle-based), without reducing it or confusing it.

**What do we mean by servant leadership?**

Applied to the field of social inclusion / innovation, we propose the following definition of servant leadership:15

The servant leader turns experiences of compassion for people whose dignity was wounded, into an ethical call, a mission call, putting himself/herself at their service acknowledging their common wounded humanity, inspiring them to become agents in the restoration of their own dignity.

This brief definition is based on some key ideas that are explained below. Firstly, servant leaders emerge in socio-political, economic and / or cultural

---

15 The most publicized work of J. Hunter (2004) with these characteristics was *The servant: a simple story about the true essence of leadership.*
contexts where inequality, discrimination or human segregation are acutely felt. In these contexts, servant leadership can be effected in a personal and direct way or through community movements and organizations; however, servant leadership aims at the simultaneous transformation of people and structures. Secondly, the servant leader’s call for commitment stems out of a concrete experience a compassionate encounter with the disregarded\textsuperscript{16} other (s) in vulnerability situations or with significant lack of social bonds. The dehumanization of the other (s) lead to ethical indignation and elicit in the servant leader, a call to embrace the cause he/she seeks to serve. In this service to the cause-need of the other (s), the servant leader experiences purpose and meaning. Therefore, as a third idea, the core mission of the servant leader is the restoration of the human dignity of the other (s) in several domains (self-confidence / love within the family sphere; respect / rights within the citizenship sphere, social-esteem/solidarity in the socio-community sphere) with the purpose of creating legal-moral obligations to a shared existence. Embracing the idea of commitment to a cause, the fourth and last idea presupposes that the practice of servant leadership becomes a service of persuasion, inspiration, bridge building, care, through participatory interdependence and attainable consensus, aiming at restoring, healing, (re)signifying and reintegrating. To be coherent, the “object” of servant leadership is both the restoration of the dignity of the other (s) and the (educational) relationship with leadership itself.

\textsuperscript{16} Two etymological clarifications that help the understanding of this phrase: a) “Experience” is here understood as ex-perior, as a projection, as if exiting from oneself in search of the other, and not as a mere experience. These two notions are clearly distinguished: while ‘experiencing’ configures an inner movement to the self that happens in the sensibility - as a reflexive self that relates to itself, dispensing with the other -, the experience happens in the interaction with the other; b) “Compassion”, from the Latin compassio, which means the sharing of another person’s suffering.
Relational dimensions to be cultivated by the servant leader

True to the perspective previously adopted, and to meet the challenges of servant leadership, we propose three types of preferential relations that should be developed and that allow, at all times, for the reshaping of this service-mission leadership:

a) In relation to himself/herself, taking care of his/her maturation process. Dynamic anthropological models (e.g. Erik Erickson) tell us that the tensional integration of bio psychic, social, existential and spiritual levels in a person are signalled through personal effort and the will to solve tensions / polarities that challenge each of us in our respective life stage. If there is no univocal criteria as to what it means to be mature, it is therefore important that we find ourselves in a permanent process of maturation. A servant leader takes care of himself/herself and others, but does not confuse or project his/her needs at each stage of life, with the needs of those whom he/she decided to serve. In this process of maturation, the servant leader must cultivate - and promote in others - self-knowledge (knowing and maintaining a unified and balanced personality), building his/her personal identity (reconciling with his life story and shaping a mission driven life project) and to form a worldview and a sense of belonging to something greater than himself/herself. Freud once said: “The mature person loves and works in freedom.”
b) *In relation with others, cultivating unconditional hospitality and care.* Hospitality is related to the act of welcoming and accepting the other unconditionally (E. Lévinas, J. Derrida). It is also the servant leader’s inner freedom’s mature fruit of compassion for the others cultivating and promoting intra and inter personal hospitality, valuing diversity, and channelling it to the common good. It is a challenge for the leaders and for the ones being led. On the other hand, the host is also the carer! Fostering an ethics of care through acts of empathy, solicitude and gift, requires listening and dialoguing skills and bridging between sides. Self-transcendence (V. Frankl), of going beyond ourselves, finding meaning in causes greater than ourselves, because centring life’s purpose on the self leads to existential emptiness and solitude. The focus must be on a greater Why that transcends people in relation and gives meaning to the same relationship.

c) *Actively inspiring others to jointly discern the common good.* Unconditional hospitality as service to the other(s), offered in love’s gratuitousness and freedom, is “leading by example” able to inspire and to attract. However, the transformation comes from discerning, that is, from the process and not only from the results. Focusing on learning to serve in action invites discernment, that is, the ability to separate, distinguish and evaluate the course of action and its outcomes. Discernment occurs in a triple movement: with, against, and beyond; with, as the affinity-proximity to reality, valuing people and structures capable of carrying forward the mission; against, as a critical distance that identifies the obstacles and contradictions of people, structures and cultures; as well as free and inspiring decisions in (re) building and pursuing a greater common good, envisioning a better future from the sharing of a common life.
References


III Chapter

Bridge Builder, an Ubuntu Identity
There are books very popular among young people all over the world and written especially for them; the demand for this kind of reading increased particularly after the turn of the century. The genre is called dystopian literature. It describes a world ahead in the not so distant future, which is the consequence of our current way of living: a destroyed civilisation, a damaged planet, with scarce resources left, contested by those few who survived the apocalypse. Those privileged, who manage to gain power, create a system of repression based on a total surveillance. It is supported by the ever-sophisticated technologies. Those underprivileged have to struggle for existence, full of anxiety and despair.

The central characters of these novels undergo a ‘process of awakening’ and rebel to restore the nature and a new – better – world order. It is interesting how those protagonists are portrayed – mostly females, they are tough-minded, resourceful and determined, but at the same time also kind, caring and sentimental. They have a ‘strong moral compass’ and a self-reflection capacity. Their personal traits make both young male and female readers strongly relate to them, as the central place of love in the gripping stories does. Katniss from The Hunger Games (2008) or Ria from Die Ver ratenen (2012), do not choose to become heroines in the first place. They find themselves in these roles due to dark circumstances, which require them to act. They respond to this call and take responsibility.
What are the possible reasons behind such a popularity of the dystopian literature among young people? Experts point out to a growing anxiety about the future, dominated by regular economic crises, war and terror, along with the tensions between the traditional and the progressive. The turning point could have been possibly marked by September 11th, 2001, with a ‘new focus on personal and social change’. Young readers make up a generation who grow up with rapid progress in technology and science. And this fiction makes them aware of the potential consequences of such progress. At the same time, it provides opportunities to reflect upon themselves, and their own lives.

The dystopian literature – through its capacity to warn - has managed to engage young readers in the present pressing social, ecological as well as political issues: inequalities, environmental destruction, impact of technology, identity, freedom. At the same time, and this is new, it offers the possibility of a ‘utopian hope’ and positive change. - When taking this warning seriously.

When the gruesome, corrupted dystopian regime, a clear reminiscence of Nazism and Stalinism, has been overthrown, a chance for restoring the world opens up. Ria then says that now the time has come for mediators and their highly demanded communication skills. They are needed to build bridges between the old and the new, those powerful and those vulnerable, the poor and the rich. And we can add between North and South, East and West.
The Ubuntu Leadership Academy has already started this work. The resourceful young people trained in the Academy – Katniss and Ria alike – have a social mission to fulfil; they often have experienced themselves precariousness. But now they become leaders to take ownership about their own lives and serve the community and the common good - and to build bridges. During the two-year participatory programme, supported by multidisciplinary teams, they learn self-awareness ad conflict-resolution; project management and self-motivation; storytelling and self-organisation.

They are inspired by leadership represented by Nelson Mandela, Martin Luther King, Mahatma Ghandi, to name but a few, and Ubuntu. Ubuntu, which the Academy’s concept is built on - comes from African culture and means *I am because you are.* ‘Our lives are intertwined and we only become complete when in relation with each other. A person that has Ubuntu is not self-sufficient, but envisioning on common and interdependent humanity’ – these words from a flyer sound like a mission statement.

The Academy combines participation and active citizenship, solidarity and employability, migration and inter-cultural dialogue with integrated governance. It develops a holistic view on young people’s life, and it offers alternative learning methods: learning from experience, peer-learning and mutual aid. It is a paramount example of social innovation in education while providing solutions to unresolved social problems. The strategic role of education in innovation processes does not need to be debated: ‘reforming the world means reforming education’, Janusz Korczak said. He is the author of the progressive ‘pedagogy of respect’, based on structured partnership and democratic participation.

Such an innovative vision of leadership meets the aspiration and imagination of young people. It is also echoed in the recent debates around education and learning. Critical thinking and sense of responsibility combined with empathy and compassion are becoming central in the evolving complex and interdependent world. These skills are ‘not new but have become
newly important’; when once ‘reserved for the few’, now there is a need for everyone to become a critical thinker and social innovator who aspire to change the world for the better. Or, in Hannah Arendt’s words: ‘the fragility of human affairs’ requires from everyone ‘an engaged approach, critical reflection and great sensitivity to social context’.

However, as scholars point out, no significant change is possible when it is not preceded by the transformation of values. This entitles giving freedom to education to debate its own purpose, ‘independently of social and economic conditions’. And rethinking the purpose of education raises no less than such big questions as what is the purpose of human life, and what is the world we would like to live in.

The Ubuntu Leadership Academy shows the way ahead: balancing individual competence development and personal growth, with active citizenship at the service of the community, and mutual care for each others: I am because you are. Scholars would say it is about balancing ethical discourses such as libertarianism, communitarism and the ethics of care. This means in practical terms that in order to solve the problems of our planet and our civilisation, we need to unleash the innovative potential of every one, we need the contribution of every one, we need the commitment of every one. In the innovation era, problem solving cannot be a matter of a small group of people any more (intellectual and creative elites), but a common responsibility in a truly inclusive and participatory societal processes.

For this, there is also a need to extend our horizon of comprehending and reflecting on the global and complex world around. It cannot be reduced to scientific knowledge only. There cannot be only one privileged worldview and only one possible answer. Scholars point out that we need to ‘heal the fracture between the science and the humanities’, to better understand the complexity of social systems and of human life at large.
The western civilisation has been underpinned by the ‘Cartesian dream’ focusing on science and materialism, but globalisation has open up the way to diversity of perspectives; It reinforces for instance the importance of consciousness and spirituality to human experience. (Some historians say that 21st century will bring about the ‘revenge’ of philosophies and religions from India and Far East such as Buddhism.) Opening up to the plurality of perspectives means however making the effort to accommodating unshared values, to ‘feel at home in the world’ (Hannah Arendt).

The French philosopher Abdennour Bidar, coined the term ‘l’école tisserande’, a school teaching three links: to discover the ‘springs of our interior’ (link to you); to develop a fraternity relationship with all human siblings, regardless of their colour and belief (link to the others); to respect life in all its formats and to ‘marvel at the show of the universe’ (link to the nature). For him the primer goal of education and learning is ‘growing in humanity’. ‘Cultivating human beings in humans’.

Such thinking has already started a while ago, when considering what one has to know and be able to do to thrive in the contemporary society. There is a reference to the 21st century skills, key competences for lifelong learning or change makers attributes – always in relation to oneself, the others and the world around. It has become clear that purely cognitive knowledge is not sufficient any more. The importance of the meta-skills, transversal skills or life skills arose.

Developing life skills means ‘engaging in the world of life’, learning from experience, sharing, engaging in a participatory, community driven process. This makes necessary rethinking the learning and teaching processes, the role of the educators and the learners, and the way how learning outcomes are defined and assessed. Education is changing, the borders between formal, non-formal and informal learning are clearly blurring, learning can happen almost everywhere, any time. How to combine the best of all the three approaches, how to link the dispersed learning settings and bring
together the diverse societal actors engaged in education – is the challenge of our times. The Ubuntu Academy, representing non-formal learning, has made also a step in this direction through its integrated governance.

Last point: While Katniss from The Hunger Games comes from underprivileged background, Ria from Die Verratenen represents the privileged ones. However, she learns to know and appreciate the others, who are called in her ‘spheres’ the Prims – the Primitives. This is maybe an area of expansion in building bridges for the Ubuntu Leadership Academy: any young person needs an Ubuntu experience: I am because you are.

Disclaimer: When drafting this text, I was inspired and used insights from a number of researchers, experts, my colleagues from the European Commission, as well as philosophers, writers and poets.
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What we talk about when we talk about dialogue

Sira Abenoza González
Diego Fonseca

What is dialogue?

In his brief text “The Inability for Dialogue” Gadamer exposes a concern: “Is the art of conversation vanishing? Haven’t we noticed an increasing monologization of human behavior in the social life of our time?”

The hermeneut, with Aristotle, believes that the capacity for dialogue is an attribute inherent to the human being: the man is a pig tied to language, and language exists only in dialogue, in conversation. And if it is true that we are losing the art of conversation, are we becoming less human, are we dehumanizing?

The issue is worrisome to say the least. The examples of “communication” that television offers are far from reflecting real dialogue—not to mention politicians in the Parliament or a group of friends in a bar.

Dialogue requires from each person to open up to the others and vice versa so that the threads of conversation can be weave. Without this openness, each vision of the world is present but isolated, therefore cannot build

18 Institute for Socratic Dialogue - Barcelona
19 Institute for Socratic Dialogue - Barcelona
22 Ídem.
23 Gadamer, H.G.; Íbidem, p.204.
bridges and exchange impressions. Communication does not arise without such interrelation, and according to Plato, our world visions cannot acquire a “truthful” character. Socrates’ student proposed as a principle for truth that words only find confirmation in the act of reception and approval from others, and the conclusions do not imply that the others’ thinking lose argumentative rigor. In that sense, our arguments today do not have zest or strength because we are unable to put them into play through the act of speech and communication.

Moreover, in line with Kant’s definition of reflective judgement and the theory of “open-mindedness” defended by Arendt and later by Benhabib, conversing with the other—both their objections and approvals, both their understanding or lack thereof—would be sort of an expansion of our own individuality. On the contrary, this expansion is not possible without dialogue. Each individual is a reflection of the entire world: “the many reflections of the universe, which are the singular individuals, in their totality are the one universe itself.” Only through the exchange, fusion, and clash of those multiple reflections of the world that are carried out in conversation can we walk toward the truth and expand our experience. Following Gadamer, what makes something a conversation is not the fact we have been taught something new, but that we have found in the other something we had not yet found in our experience of the world.

Dialogue demands opening ourselves to the other and from the other for the exchange of world visions. This exchange expands our thinking and our experience: it transforms us. The term “dialogue” has two roots “dia”, which means “through” and “logos”, that means “reasoned word” or “reasoning”. Dialogue is the process through which meaning is created by several peo-

26 Ibidem.
ple, a discipline of thought and collective inquiry that transforms the quality of a conversation and, especially, our underlying assumptions. This type of communication can only happen when the participants eliminate their tendency to hold a defensive stance. If they do not do so, it is impossible to reason collectively about complex topics because the thoughts remain fragmented and isolated in each person.

Dialogue, however, is not synonymous of consensus. Building consensus tends to limit options. It also searches for propositions that are acceptable for the majority. Dialogue, on the contrary, aims at exploring and discovering new meanings. It does not intend to eliminate differences, but to create a space of openness in which differences can emerge and be studied—not ignored—to reach an agreement.

Dialogue is not the same as debate, either. In the latter, each person tries to win over the others or convince them to assume its own, personal version. The intention of the conversation is not to change the behavior of other people nor guide them to a concrete point or vision. Doing that would break the nature of the process. The dialogue aims at sharing meaning and discovering new realities among all and for all.

The exercise of dialogue is one that, far from achieving a perfect understanding or a definition of an irrefutable truth, gets to bring us progressively closer to principles, ideas, decisions, and norms every time fairer and more inclusive of the experience and needs of every person.

---


30 Isaacs, W.; op.cit.

31 Isaacs, W.; op.cit.

Therefore, in the search of consensus in the context of dialogue as we understand it people must feel able to participate, and that is why complex topics can be discussed: In dialogue, people ought to suspend their judgement and learn to listen to what the other says and thinks, without reaching a conclusion. Thus, it is imperative that everyone sees the other as “equal” and sets aside the differences of power or status. Moreover, it is important to create an atmosphere or context in which all participants have space to talk, and in which the norms of universal mutual respect and of egalitarian reciprocity that Benhabib points out are abided:

Norm of moral universal respect: We must respect each other as beings whose point of view is worthy of equal consideration.

Norm of egalitarian reciprocity: We must treat each other as concrete human beings and strengthen the capacity to express this point of view creating, as much as possible, social practices that materialize the discursive ideal.

Dialogue has other requisites besides those of participants suspending their judgements with regards to the others and seeing each other as equals. Amongst these are the presence of a neutral facilitator; to consciously slow down the thought process; to recognize abstractions, clarifying hidden assumptions and emotions; to balance the research and defense of an idea, and to differentiate between aspirations and that based on actual experiences.

36 Ver sección 3.4.
37 Senge, P.; op.cit.
On top of these needs, Isaacs proposes that participants listen their own listening, observe the observer, and appreciate polarization.\textsuperscript{38} Stewart and Thomas, on the other hand, add that the dialogical listening must be focused on what is “ours” not on what is “mine” or “yours”. That is, to work on the notion of building shared meaning. That is why it must be open and have a game-like character, since the conversation does not always have to be accurate, controlled and focused on the closing. It should work in terms of the present, not the past; building contexts with focus on the circumstances that surround the topic rather than on the topic itself.\textsuperscript{39}

The facilitator, going back to Senge, is paramount for the process. Its presence guides and ensures that the dialogue does not turn into a debate—society is not used to this sort of communication. Since the goal of the dialogue is the openness for particular visions to arise—which at times might seem “eccentric”—, it is important that the facilitator helps the participants to obtain space for everyone to speak openly.\textsuperscript{40}

## Differences between debate and dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debate</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric.</td>
<td>Dialectic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The objectives are decisions and actions.</td>
<td>The objective is the understanding of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>value of judgement—then decide, and act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derogative judgement.</td>
<td>Judgement only after understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attack and defense.</td>
<td>Research and examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To have one’s way.</td>
<td>Wanting to know the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defensiveness — and offensive attitude.</td>
<td>Open attitude.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuade.</td>
<td>Investigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defend a point of view.</td>
<td>Listen to others and oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on responding and convincing.</td>
<td>Focus is on asking and wanting to know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast.</td>
<td>Slow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuality: Problems are personal.</td>
<td>Community: Problems are common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeks approval.</td>
<td>Seeks mutual understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belittles the other.</td>
<td>Understands the differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say what works.</td>
<td>Say only what one thinks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the truth.</td>
<td>Seek for the truth together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## The benefits of dialogue

What benefits we can earn from the effort of breaking the inertia of protecting ourselves and clinging to the old ideas we have already built? The advantages are several, and they heavily outweigh the exhaustion of breaking habits and the mechanism of protection and fight that might seem comfortable and advantageable for some of us.
The 21st Century is characterized by a continuous change that overwhelms the thought structures with which we make sense of the world.\textsuperscript{41} If we intent to face the problems alone, autonomously, we are at risk of failing. Collaboration is almost a basic need. And learning to dialogue is, ultimately, learning to collaborate and hence, to have more tools for survival in a complex environment.

In this collaborative environment, dialogue facilitates decision-making teams — probably to all of them\textsuperscript{42} — to act in a more cohesive manner, as a whole, and not as separate parts, one and each other defending their position without fully understanding other people perceptions.\textsuperscript{43} Delving into a true conversation we learn from others and ourselves, creating the type of shared meanings needed for effective communication.

Dialogue helps participants to focus themselves on speaking and listening. It allows us to become more sensitive and perceptive to the hidden assumptions that accompany the creation of meaning.\textsuperscript{44} Without reaching an understanding of “what we mean beyond what we say” it is difficult to understand the others and their perspective. Open dialogue grants access to the most profound beliefs that live under the surface of conversations.

Another moment when dialogue is critical: During the process of change. Open communication and conversation prepare people for the positive and negative effects of transformations\textsuperscript{45}. It helps to increase the comprehension of others and the commitment to change\textsuperscript{46} therefore reducing con-

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{41} Marris, P., 1974; \textit{Loss and change}. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, p.15-17.
\item \textsuperscript{42} McCambridge, J.; \textit{op.cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{44} McCambridge, J.; \textit{op.cit.}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Jick, T., 1993. Implementing change, en T. Jick (Ed.), \textit{Managing change}. Irwin: Homewood, p.192-201
\item \textsuperscript{46} Beckard, R., & Pritchard, W., 1992; \textit{Changing the essence: The art of creating and leading fundamental change in organizations}. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; Morgan, G., 1988; \textit{Riding the waves of change: Developing managerial competences for a turbulent world}. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
\end{itemize}
fusion and resistance. Communication gives us access to information and knowledge, which generates understanding and trust, promotes an appreciation for diversity, validates the life experience of others and sets the ground for true commitment and cooperation in change management. Dialogue democratizes voices and emotions.

We would say with Plato that the values of an organization and its acting criteria gain argumentative value only through dialogue. Only then these ideas reach the paramount of “truthful values.” This dialogue goes beyond the mere debate and the attempt to influence or convince. It becomes a powerful way of mutual understanding, empathy and creative action that benefits all parts.

For all these reasons, dialogue “is worth it.” It is not that easy to break out our own individual isolation and listen to the other nor to be willing to allow the others to highlight that our truths, as Tugendhat would say, hide our own interests.

Nonetheless, there is a lot at stake. As much as the true humanity of men. Or in the opposite way: If we succumb to an environment where debate prevails, if we turn inward and fill up with ourselves, if we quit opening ourselves up to the experience of conversation, we lose our humanity. That is precisely why, unless they think on the opposite direction, organizations consolidate themselves as spaces of intensive dehumanization.

---
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Socratic Dialogue: A particular way of dialogue

Socrates\textsuperscript{52} argued that we all have internal knowledge that must be depurated of its blind spots, contradictions and inconsistencies. For that reason, the philosopher from Athens did not build any system, but sought out to find the underlying truth behind every statement. Socratic Dialogue—the method used by Socrates to practice philosophy—postulates that in order to reach knowledge we must first unlearn what we think we know, and we actually ignore.\textsuperscript{53} Thus, as can be seen in “Apology of Socrates”\textsuperscript{54}, the philosopher dedicated his life to examine and re-examine his fellow citizens, not to show them a new truth, as any instructor would do, but to indicate that said truth could be found.\textsuperscript{55}

The so-called father of philosophy used to walk around the streets of Athens bothering his fellow citizens so they would worry about virtue instead of superfluous matters. To make them change their lives,\textsuperscript{56} he would proceed on the basis that that people he would ask questions they might be wrong, but they were never completely ignorant. They possessed a latent of which they were not aware of and that could arise by means of the maieutics,\textsuperscript{57} who would facilitate the spring of ideas. According to Socrates, if you ask people in the most appropriate way, they will answer accordingly. They have the required knowledge to discriminate.\textsuperscript{58}

\begin{flushright}52 In his method of making philosophy he priviledged dialogue over writing, to the extent he did not write any pieces. Socrates’ legacy is the one transmitted through the work of his two main disciples: Jenofonte and Plato. Because the image and theories that they assign to Socrates do not always coincide, there is a permanent discussion about the truth or the interpretations offered by the disciples. In our case, without entering in this dispute, we will always refer to “Plato’s Socrates”, as it is his who develops the theories we are interested in for our work.


56 Platón, op.cit

57 Mayéutica en griego significa ‘dar a luz’.

The Socratic Method, then, assumes that the answers of the other have value: These are the visions of a person who has a partial view of the truth thou he or she cannot see it that truth completely. If the philosopher asks the precise questions to highlight the inconsistencies, she or he will help people to realize that they knew less than they thought, but, also, that they have access to knowledge.

To do so, the first fundamental mechanism was *elenchus*, the exercise of examining and rejecting, or destroying, the moral beliefs the other expresses. Only thanks to the embarrassment of recognizing their own ignorance, Socrates believed, can they reach or create a profound inquiring. It is through careful examination that believes are depurated and we approach truth or coherence. This questioning does not refute with the aim of destroying, but it understands destruction as a therapeutic element. The *elenchus* would be a way to “fix” and purify a troubled soul.

Socratic Dialogue puts the pressure on both participants, the one who asks and the one who responds. The facilitator should be a good guide and make the adequate questions. Both of them must say what they really think. If the focus is on proposing hypothetical ideas, the process of discovery is hindered.

Therefore, Socratic Dialogue can only happen in a context in which people can express themselves freely because what is at stake is not the logical relation between the propositions but the intentions of the moral agents.

---
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The person questioned by means of the *elenchus* has to fulfil three “virtues,” every one of them crucial for the result of the process: the honesty to say what he/she thinks, the reasonableness to admit what one does not know, and the courage to continue the investigation.\(^67\) To achieve knowledge, that person must also work on his/her own emotions: The mind or soul should be freed from rage, arrogance, and laziness.\(^68\)

The discoveries one would have access to if they venture into a process of Socratic Dialogue would not be knowledge in the sense of the common logic of professor–student. Socrates was not a master that sought to teach those who were doing the answering\(^69\). To him, it was impossible to teach a true proposition and expect the other person to obtain knowledge. The one who asks is a guide, not a judge. That guide cannot dogmatize or say what is evident, he or she cannot do anything that is not previously approved by the one who answers. On other words, the objective is to help the one who answers to find satisfactory answers for him or herself.\(^70\) While the classical logic of teaching assumes the student is an empty receptacle who receives knowledge, the Socratic Method of dialogue suggests that knowledge required an active receptor because it is from him or her that that knowledge is “born”.

In that sense, Socrates is not a professor because it is impossible to teach.\(^71\) His role is to guide through the questions and answers. As a guide, he must also obtain determined intention and emotions from the other person, because a philosophical discovery can only be done when people ask and answer benevolently and without envy.\(^72\) That is the root of the importance

\(^{67}\) Seeskin, K.; *Íbidem*, p.3.

\(^{68}\) Seeskin, K.; *Íbidem*, p.3.


\(^{70}\) Seeskin, K.; *Íbidem*, p.101.

\(^{71}\) Seeskin, K.; *Íbidem*, p.13.

of feelings, the desire to learn and know and achieve what is lacking\textsuperscript{73} from the one who answers, but also from the feelings of the one who is asking, as well as one with regards to the other: the one who asks must be benevolent. In other words, there has to be a positive inclination of sorts between the people who attempt to practice Socratic Dialogue. They must “love each other well”.

On the other hand, it is important to understand that the Socratic Method is not a theoretical proposal but a practical one. Its mission is to achieve correct definitions that can be the basis for an ample array of judgements and conclusions about our life\textsuperscript{74}. The inquiry does not look for a correct definition of an ensemble of beliefs, but to articulate a definition compatible with our beliefs and accept the consequences derived from that, in terms of both action and life.\textsuperscript{75}

Therefore, any definition we reach, rather than an affirmation of a fact, it would be a recommendation on how to live.\textsuperscript{76} And this is the second part of the Method: after the “destructive” part of the \textit{elenchus} comes the “constructive” phase. The search for definitions is a good way for people to examine their lives and live a better life.\textsuperscript{77} The result of the exploration will be a practical result, an interpellation of our life.

Socratic Dialogue and the “truths” they give us access to are, in that way, a form of “therapy.” They eliminate the obstacles that prevent our own satisfaction with our very own answers, helping us to find coherence between what we say and what we do. In that process, the intelligent criticism or questioning coming from the other allows us to discover if our own opin-

\textsuperscript{73} A desire aligned with Plato’s definition of eros presented in \textit{El Banquete} through the voices of Socrates and Agatón. (Platón, 1986. \textit{El Banquete}. Madrid: Gredos.)

\textsuperscript{74} Seeskin, K.; Ibídem, p.32.

\textsuperscript{75} Seeskin, K.; Ibídem, p.33.

\textsuperscript{76} Seeskin, K.; Ibídem, p.34.

\textsuperscript{77} Seeskin, K.; Ibídem, p.43.
ions reflect our true convictions. The other leads us to open ourselves to the opportunity to have a life that shows coherence with the beliefs and truths we have had access to thanks to her or his guidance. Thus, dialogue opens the door to knowledge and virtue.

Socratic Dialogue allows us to reach the truth and alleviates us from the false solace of ignorance. Through his questions, Socrates would help us to know what we do not know, to admit our basic knowledge as a starting point for all knowledge. This will make us better people as long as we are willing to accept refutations to our statements. Hence, Socrates gives us the opportunity but it is up to us to open up to the other and let them guide us to discover the essence of truth.

Knowledge and virtue, under Socratic optics, are the same thing. In other words, people never act in opposition to what they understand to be their own good. They never do anything thinking that the consequences will be harmful to them. Due to our own ignorance we do things we regret. Therefore, in getting the others to accept their own ignorance, Socrates not only help them to say what they want to say but, as well, to live the way they want to. The only reason why a person might decide to do something bad it’s because that person wrongly believes the action will carry personal benefits for him or her. According to Socrates, thou, it is impossible to desire something bad knowing that it is bad because we always desire what is good.

In other words, we all want to be happy. The problem is we do not always know how and, sometimes, we choose the wrong path involuntarily. Our wishes can bring unhappiness but we follow them because we ignore that

80 Seeskin, K.; Ibidem, p.112.
82 Seeskin, K.; Ibidem, p.139.
possibility. Ignorance is involuntary, and since we all want to do things that do us well and bring us closer to happiness, a person who gains consciousness of his or her ignorance would do everything in its hands to find the truth\textsuperscript{84} simply because happiness and well being are at stake.

The way to alleviate our ignorance and to improve our happiness is to examine our own believes on virtue and make their contradictions noticeable thanks to the help of a maieutics guide. If we examine virtue as a desirable concept, we transform ourselves.\textsuperscript{85} Dialogue, as opposed to dissertation, fully questions us and brings into play other participants in their moral dimension.\textsuperscript{86} In dialogue, people are actively involved and their learning is not only theoretical but active as well. Thus, dialoguing we open the door to educating better human beings.

The benefits of Socratic Dialogue

Socratic Dialogue is currently used to research on philosophical questions and ethics inside groups\textsuperscript{87} because it brings tangible benefits to processes of change management.

Firstly, Socratic Dialogue is a communication tool for team work. It creates a safe space where people can clarify ideas and understand the underlying assumptions of every member’s perspectives. Participants learn how to verbalize their own prejudices—and those of the others— making implicit knowledge explicit at once.

\textsuperscript{84} Seeskin, K.; Íbidem, p.139.
\textsuperscript{85} Seeskin, K.; Íbidem, p.144.
\textsuperscript{86} Seeskin, K.; Íbidem, p.149.
\textsuperscript{87} Bolten, H.; \textit{op.cit}. 
On the other hand, it allows an entire team to amplify its understanding of a topic from the individual interpretations of a concept or a life experience. The more we practice this type of dialogue, the more our world broadens, contributing to personal and collective discoveries. New ways to perceive and evaluate situations emerge in a way that hidden thoughts, rules, and critical values can be revealed. That allows the group to develop strategies in a different way.

As an epistemological and discovery process, in Socratic Dialogue processes people learn to formulate the most adequate questions to achieve the information they need and learn to listen to—and to understand—perspectives diametrically different from their own. Their knowledge is amplified thanks to the new individual and group capabilities to see the situation from a different perspective.

Moreover, as diversity of ideas appears, they can construct a common vision. Practicing dialogue fosters the development of a common language with which teams can solve problems and reach consensus thanks to a greater understanding of what is in play—the values, principles and assumptions that lie underneath the differences. The open and investigative attitude that Socratic Dialogue requires helps explore common objectives and to enhance the understanding amongst people—to recognise each other as equals. In this way, dialogue is a tool for organisational learning.

When dialogue is practiced in a decision-making context, it facilitates a more democratic process—because all voices are included,—more informed—it allows the incorporation of everyone involved,—and more symmetrical—because it suspends conceptions based on “power logic” and situates all people in the same egalitarian plane.

90 Laurie, N., op. cit.
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On a personal level, dialoguing promotes personal courage because participants are pushed to openly say what they think. And it also favours humility, given that others can have contrary opinions, at times more elaborated. As a verbalization exercise, it facilitates the development of a new capacity to reflect on experiences, learn from them and create new perspectives. Dialogue contributes to people improving their verbal and non-verbal communication on real time as well.

At the same time, thanks to the space given to everyone to express its more personal voice, every participant learn to listen and respect the others and all gain confidence in themselves and in the value of their experience. Moreover, dialogues foster the inclusion of those who think differently, reinforcing a group’s capacity to understand empathically. In a different way: Socratic Dialogue promotes people’s ethical behaviour.

As opposed to debate or discussion, this from of communication contributes to creating an organizational structure in which, as a rule, people assume the moral responsibility with regards to their own actions. Not only do they acquire the ability to provide reasons behind their actions but also the will to do so—and that is key for moral action. In this way, people develop their ethical capabilities and a sense of personal responsibility, they promote transparency and compromise, and the value of words. They learn to make decisions based on ethical values and to acquire consciousness and reflection through a proceeding that takes into account the others and makes them feel included and valued.

To summarize, the benefits that Socratic Dialogue provides to people and organizations are encompassed in six key areas:

---
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Benefits of Socratic Dialogue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Improvement of Environment and Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a safe space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation of open communication; people are not judged and they are treated with respect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) Epistemological Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of assumptions hidden behind personal statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion of knowledge thanks to the capacity to understand a situation from another person’s perspective — and your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better capabilities for analysis, reflection, and investigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better capabilities for self-learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An inclination for constructive doubt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Personal Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment of people as they feel listened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of abilities for communication and expression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of motivations — our own and those of the others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement of humility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement of courage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Ethical Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of consciousness about our responsibility over our own actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of the impact of our actions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Relational Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved treatment—and a better consideration—of the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved capabilities for emphatical comprehension of the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened ability to cooperate and work with others for a common goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Organizational Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a common meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened relationships within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened cooperation between people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of the decision-making process: more democratic, more informed, and symmetrical.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Compiled by the authors based on: Bennett, C.A., Anderson, J. & Sice, P.; Reflections on Socratic Dialogue I: the Theoretical Background in a Modern Context, Philosophy of Management, 2015, 14: 159.
Conflict resolution and reconciliation

Mariana Barbosa & Francisca Magano

The end of the Cold War triggered an increase in research in the area of conflict resolution and reconciliation. The bipolar world power dissipated rendering the traditional view of war, as a matter of dispute between states, obsolete (Barbosa, Matos & Machado, 2013). These ‘new wars’, relating not so much to the frontiers of States, but to ethnicity, religion, economic well-being or environmental sustainability, have led to the need to complexify notions of violence and peace in different dimensions and levels of analysis (Christie, 2006). The end of Apartheid in South Africa and the completion of peace agreements in Europe in the 90s led to “a growing optimism in conflict resolution” (Ryan, 2002, p. 77). In this sense the United Nations defined in 1992 the “Agenda for Peace” (idem), which incorporated a new terminology: peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

Also in peace studies, with the emergence of new threats to human rights and world peace, researchers felt the need to complexify the notions of conflict and peace, (Christie, 2006, cit. In Christie et al., 2008). One of the promoters and founders of peace studies was John Galtung (1969, quoted in Christie, et al., 2001). Galtung, in his studies on conflict and peace, distinguishes two types of violence, direct and structural. The first refers to a type of violence in which there is a threat to the well-being of an individual or a society, in an instrumental and intentional way (Christie, 2006). Structural violence is related to the “chronic offense to the integrity of the human being that originates in the economic and political structures of society, occurring when people are victims of political oppression, eco-
nomic exploitation or social subjugation” (Barbosa, Matos & Machado, p. .55, 2013). Galtung also describes the symbolic dimension of society that reinforces structural violence, and which it calls cultural violence (cit. In Christie et al., 2008). For Galtung, cultural and structural violence are two forms of invisible violence, while direct violence is visible in the form of actions and behaviors, based on violent cultural assumptions or motives such as repression or exploitation (Galtung, 2004). These three types of violence are mutually influential: human and material damages (direct violence) reinforce structural and cultural violence (Galtung, 2004), which in turn can increase direct violence. Thus, from the author’s perspective, the absence of direct violence does not mean peace. For example, the “ceasefire” can be considered a period between two wars, since there may remain structural conflicts that may trigger new waves of direct violence.

In view of this broader conception of violence, the traditional view of peace as meaning the absence of direct violence becomes limited, so Galtung differentiates the concepts of negative and positive peace (1985, cit in Christies et al., 2008): “Negative peace exists when, after a conflict, direct violence ceases but structural violence remains. Positive peace also presupposes the absence of structural violence “(Barbosa, Matos & Machado, p.56, 2013). In this way, positive peace is present when the State encourages inclusion, values human rights, equality in access to essential goods and promotion of the basic living necessities of all citizens (Galtung, 1990). The latter demands an intervention in cultural and structural violence, in the consciousness of the state, in order to eliminate political discourses of power and oppression (Freire, 1970, cit. In Christie et al., 2008). Fostering positive peace depends, therefore, on social efforts to promote human rights and justice (Christie et al., 2008).

The evolution of conceptions of violence and peace has led to the differentiation of peace processes, namely peacekeeping, peacemaking and peabuilding (Christie et al., 2008). Peacekeeping concerns the post-war response, involving ceasefire attempts and the prevention of further cycles of
violence (Blumberg, 2006). When peace agreements are reached to achieve “lasting peace” (Blumberg, 2006, pp. 157), the peacemaking process takes place. In addition, the peacebuilding process aims to restore and reorganize society by reducing structural violence (Christie et al., 2001), promoting social, economic and political systems, acting on phenomena such as discrimination or poverty (Blumberg, 2006). The processes of peacekeeping and peacemaking refer to a set of actions aimed at reducing direct violence, with a focus on the means, that is, with the aim of using non-violent means in the resolution of conflicts. On the other hand, peacebuilding aims to reduce structural violence, with the aim of being socially just (Galtung, 1990). Since direct violence and structural violence are interconnected and cyclical, the processes of peacemaking and peacebuilding end up influencing each other. Peacemaking efforts may reduce the likelihood of post-conflict structural violence. On the other hand, peacebuilding efforts can prevent direct violence by eliminating its structural bases.

Peacekeeping and peacemaking tend to be reactive processes, depending on the threat or actual use of direct violence. Peacebuilding is a continuous process in time and space, requiring profound changes in economic, political and cultural structures with a view to promoting social justice. At an economic level, peacebuilding requires the transformation of economic structures that exploit and deprive people of the resources needed for sustainable growth and development. At the political level, it requires the transformation of oppressive political systems that limit civic rights, such as freedom of expression or political representation. At the cultural level, peacebuilding requires the transformation of cultural beliefs or narratives that feed the dominance of one group over the other (Christie et al., 2001, cit in Barbosa, Matos & Machado, 2013). Thus, the peacebuilding process are “deeply threatening to the relations of power and prevailing social order in a given society (...), which can lead to a perverse use of peacemaking efforts by those in positions of power: by insisting on peaceful means, in order to maintain the current status quo, but ignoring the socially just ends. Thus, peacemaking, which occurs in isolation, can contribute to the perpet-
evaluation of inequalities, hence the importance of peacemaking efforts taking place in the context of peacebuilding efforts (Wunter, Christie, Wagner & Boston, 2001).

The peacebuilding process introduces a new topic of interest in peace studies and conflict resolution and reconciliation. Reconciliation can be defined as a process through which the “divided past” of a society becomes a “shared future” (Bloomfield, Barnes & Huyse, 2003). Reconciliation can be understood as an “end” to be achieved, or as a process. Main (2005) states that the most frequent definition is to view reconciliation simultaneously as a process and as an end in itself, requiring a long and indeterminate period (Bloomfield et al., Cit in Main, 2005). A period through which peace (re)settlement is made in a lasting way (Long and Brecke, 2003, cit. In Christie et al., 2008), involving an awareness of the suffering and deprivation of the past and an attempt to change for sustainable peace. This process should be based on the elimination of destructive attitudes and behaviors (Brounéus, 2003) and on preparing people to anticipate a shared future in order to achieve a harmonious coexistence (Hamber & Kelly, 2009). It can be analyzed as a construction of new relations (Lederach, 1999, cit. In Brounéus, 2003), based on the change of identities, and on the creation of cooperative relations (Van der Merwe, 1999, cit. through social change. For Galtung (2001), reconciliation is built when “moral debt no longer exists; anger and resentment are eliminated; there is no vengeance “(cit. in Santa-Barbara, 2010, p.174).

Reconciliation may be interpersonal or national (Mani, 2005; Huyse, 2003). Promoting coexistence, empathy and truth between victims and perpetrators of violence, corresponds to interpersonal reconciliation. This process may also include intervention at the level of groups and the community at large, and the promotion of a sense of common national belonging - national reconciliation (Foster, 2006). There is a set of dimensions that literature tends to associate with the process of reconciliation: the religious dimension, where reconciliation depends on forgiveness; the sociocultural
dimension, related to the cultural roots, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors of society which underpin the promotion of lasting peace; the psychological dimension, which concerns the need for psychological rehabilitation; at the political level, reconciliation may also depend on the recognition by state leaders of atrocities committed or, on an economic level, occur when there is a development of greater social equity; Finally, the legal dimension involves the reconstruction of the justice system (Brounéus, 2003; Huyse, 2003).

The process of reconciliation can also be analyzed in the light of different levels of actors and methods (Brounéus, 2003). At a higher level, political or religious leaders can play a key role in the social justice system, taking on the role of “peace leaders” by promoting a culture of peace through their acts and speeches. International and national courts are part of this higher level, since justice, punishment of certain crimes, restoration of social order and security are important in reconciliation. Religious groups or other institutions, professionals (doctors and psychologists) and the media influence attitudes and behaviors at an intermediate level. As for the media, Gardner (2001, cit. In Brounéus, 2003) distinguishes between peace media and hate media. Peace media favors the creation of an environment of tolerance and peace, by publishing carefully analyzed news stories. Peace commissions also play an important role at this level, in pursuit of the truth and organization / documentation of the past. At the grassroot level of the population, and based on the premise that “all societies have the capacity for peace” (Brounéus 2003: 37), the aim is to train local actors to promote peace, for example, through therapeutic intervention programs in trauma and crisis (Brounéus, 2003).

Regarding the top-level method described, in ad hoc international tribunals, such as Yugoslavia and Rwanda, Sierra Leone and Cambodia, the effectiveness of this method has been debated because of the danger of exacerbating hostility and further dividing victims and offenders, difficulties in getting evidence and post-conflict chaotic environments, legal corruption,
lack of judges capable of promoting fair courts (Main, 2005) and the fact that it is a costly and limited method in time and space (Brounéus, 2003). The temporal question is therefore a limitation; for example, in the case of Rwanda’s national court, it would take 200 years to try the 110,000 people accused of involvement in the genocide.

In order to compensate for these limitations, the commissions of truth and reconciliation emerged as an alternative at the intermediate intervention level. The Truth and Reconciliation Commissions are a non-judicial mechanism of transitional justice that operates with limited duration, aiming to address issues of the past related to human rights violations (Huyse, 2003). Although consensually accepted and documented, some researchers have criticized this method because in some cases there are no preconditions for effective intervention (eg, the political will of the country’s rulers to implement the recommendations, just as it was in Haiti, El Salvador and Guatemala). In general, there are controversial issues and debates related to the instruments to be adopted within the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions - truth, healing, forgiveness, damage, explanation or justice. The experience of the Truth and Reconciliation Commissions of South Africa has demonstrated their positive role in the reconciliation process, emphasizing the truth as a key component in this process. It is assumed that a collective memory of the past facilitates the overcoming of trauma and is an element of future conflict prevention. Through the mapping of events and interventions, the public validation of social, historical and political contexts that led to human rights violations, is obtained. Such a process of restoration of truth can be seen as a form of ‘historical justice’. The social justice and dignity of the victims, as well as the social and political transformation of society, are promoted through the implementation of reparative measures and non-re-creation (eg reparations to victims, memories, institutional reforms).

On the other hand, the role of truth in the reconciliation process depends on the extent to which this process of truth-telling (Huyse, 2003) has in
society in terms of inclusion and dissemination to the whole population and especially to the victims (Main 2005). This process invariably raises other issues such as (a) accepting (or not) the truthful version debated in commissions throughout society and (b) the existence of only one truth, or multiple truths. It is important to mention that reaching the truth is not something generically accepted, and society may not want to remember the past (Main, 2005).

Regarding the concept of forgiveness, there is also no agreement among authors (Brounéus, 2003). Theological conceptions postulate that reconciliation depends on a profound change based on God, in which forgiveness can be / is shared by all (idem). On the other hand, reconciliation can be understood as a process through which constructive future relationships are built, recognizing the past, not requiring a personal transformation of the victim (forgetfulness and forgiveness) (Brounéus, 2003). This view is framed by a human rights perspective which assumes that this process has no religious foundation but involves the transformation of relationships damaged by conflict. It seeks to establish a coexistence among all religious, ethnic or racial groups, in which discussion and resolution of problems are promoted based on the defense of the rights of each individual (Hamber & Kelly, 2009).

The concept of healing is associated with the need to deal with the impact of violence through individualized interventions (support, psychotherapy) or social / global (truth commissions, criminal courts) (Hamber, 2003). Justice is also often understood as essential in this process, assuming that in order to achieve democracy, truth and coexistence, “justice has to be done” (Huyse, 2003: 97). Other authors argue that this healing process, in the context of retributive justice, does not allow long-term intervention in peace and intervention in “emotional catharsis” (Hutchison and Bleiker, 2008, p. Emotions seem to play an important role in the task of coping with trauma and, consequently, in the reconstruction of identity and sense of postconflict community, in particular by promoting empathy, compas-
sion and admiration, as opposed to the focus on anger and on fear (Hutchison and Bleiker, 2008).

Other concepts such as damage, recognition and explanation are also generally associated with reconciliation (Santa-Barbara, 2010). The damage refers to the physical consequences (pain, wound or death), or emotional (loss of sense of self, of its social role and hope in the future, mourning) of a conflict. The damage can also be social, and the latter may include the destruction / loss of social and cultural infrastructure (idem). Recognition presupposes reference to the specific episodes of violence and the emotional significance related to the harm, in order to recognize the real suffering and to hold someone responsible for it, which admits and explains what it did to the victim or the victim’s relatives. In this way, reconciliation seems to emerge at the end of the conflict resolution process (Brounéus, 2003). Conflict resolution includes dialogue, the implementation of a peace plan and its consolidation in society; On the other hand, reconciliation refers to the way of dealing with past suffering and the transformation of violent behavior and attitudes when peace is already consolidated in society.
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About the importance of storytelling

Talk. Tell. Live.

Diego Fonseca97

“*We tell ourselves stories in order to live.*”
Joan Didion, The White Album

In the beginning it was the same: a group of women and men, perhaps in a semicircle, perhaps around a fire, listening to another woman or man tell of such a huge bear, of the river that grew and took away that village, of the Dark Death now dressed with the clothes of the plague, or, yes, of course, the birth of a new, beautiful baby girl who changed our lives forever and ever.

And today is the same: we continue to meet around that woman or that man who can move us with a story. Because, if we are made of something — if History, that more or less realistic tale, is made of something — that is stories.

Welcome, dear storytelling, then — although you have never left.

Some time ago I accidentally fell into a series of stories on the Internet. They all belonged to a project, The Empathy Museum, where producers collectively participate in creating art, they say, dedicated to help us look at ourselves in the world through the eyes of others. The Empathy Museum, of course, bases all its artistic projects on storytelling. Why? Because it is
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what we are made of. In the words of Clare Patey, its director: “Stories are the way we understand and make sense to the world we find ourselves in.”

Our best speakers are great storytellers. And the greatest film directors. And, of course, the best writers are storytellers. There is no good leader who has not been a great storyteller. And good teachers are. And soccer coaches. And the chroniclers, the artists, the crooners. Bob Dylan. Maya Angelou. Springsteen. I have no doubt that the best parents are also great storytellers.

Stories connect us with our inner self and with that of others. When someone tells his or her personal experience, the audience may feel that they are facing an authentic story with which they can connect: they identify themselves by projecting their own beliefs and affections in it.

The first time we told a story around the fire was personal. The connection was emotional: those who listened should be able to recognize themselves in the story of the narrator. It’s the same way today.

A personal story must go through common paths. That is, it must speak about universal elements recognizable to all. Desire, love, greed, envy, pleasure. Wrath. If history connects with our values, it will have the chance to remain with us.

For more than 25,000 years, we have told stories as a fundamental way to communicate and create empathy and build groups, clans, family. Society. The Word—the human word, not that of the gods—has kept us together because stories have always been a primary form of communication. They create an immaterial bridge, timeless and inexhaustible with the oldest traditions, with classic legends, our myths and archetypal constructions. They connect us beyond us with a wider world, that of humanity as a whole where we can recognize more or less universal truths.
Stories work because they are social glue. There is no history that does not seek to generate identification in some way, so it always contains a principle of collaboration—the listener must decide to open himself to the narrator, the narrator must decide to leave her or his private, personal silence—and connection—both narrator and listener must renew that initial opening minute by minute as the story unfolds.

The best stories are memorable. They transcend generations and commit us emotionally. There is no better way to connect with deeper truths than openness to tell passions, sorrows, pains and disputes, happiness. Each story is a channel to communicate meaning and purpose.

Sharing stories is the beginning of a conversation because it mobilizes. It is not a monologue: we open doors with a personal story. They allow us to understand each other and find the common mortar that makes us society, humanity. The philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer advocated the transforming power of conversation. “Where a conversation is successful,” he said, “something remains for us and something remains in us that has transformed us.” Gadamer believed that only in the conversation—“and in laughing with one another which is like a non-verbal mutual, exuberant mutual understanding”—the friends can meet and develop the community in which everyone remains “the same for the other because they find the other in themselves and find themselves in the other.”

If we tell each other stories in order to live, as the magnificent Joan Didion has said, it is because that is how we construct the meaning of existence. We have no other way of communicating more than language, in its most diverse forms. And that language, with its limitations, makes it easier for us to understand our place in the world, to confirm or create our identities and to define and transmit a moral conception of life.

The formative value of the stories is unique. Do you remember your grandparents telling you about their adventures in a time that always sound in-
credible? Have you read Emilio Salgari and Jules Verne? Harry Potter’s saga, JRR Tolkien’s? Have you had a good teacher who has surprised you often? With stories we learn to love, we learn about justice and its anvers, we learn from the evil that can creep into life at any time and we learn about the ways we know how to forgive and even forget. The uniqueness of a story makes it capable of remaining if it touches the most sensitive strings of our humanistic backpack.

The best stories operate as a reading and reflection of a given moment in a community or the world. And they act like that because stories provide order. We all look for certainty and structure, some solidity and familiarity. We want to know that life could be predictable, manageable in some way, and that it could provide us with comfort and, sometimes, closure. The narrative arch of stories provides that frame, the umbrella for the dark rain. It’s simple: every story presents individuals facing challenges and conflicts, and what comforts us is knowing that, whatever the outcome, the story of those people has resolution. Stories are a safety net.

A story usually works on three basic principles that constitute a narrative arc: an individual or a group of them has a plan; that plan and/or the person face a crisis that subjects the individual to go through difficult moments; Finally, there is a resolution: the person achieves his or her mission—or not. In any case, history leaves us with a moral useful for our own experience.

The rhythm—the *tempo*—, the vocabulary, the use of the grammar, the silences and pauses, the use of the nervous tension—of the audience itself—affect the success of a story. William Shakespeare, the bard, was a master of that structure: he built his works—from *Hamlet* to *Richard III*—in five acts to include the exposition of the case, the crescendo of action, the climax, the *descendo* of action, and the end, the dénouement.

Why did these stories work and work to the point that today we call them
classics? Because they encapsulate authentic human experiences. Richard III was a king, but what we see in the story is a man losing all his composure once deprived of that what has been his public armor. Have not you experienced the betrayal games of Othello, Iago, Desdemona and Casio? And who has not seen in Romeo and Juliet the definitive love story.

Those stories survive because they surpass the technology that produced them and the technology with which we consume today. They bring us the central experience of human life. They produce in us a deep psychological mark. They give us role models with their characters. They show us that an ordinary individual can achieve the extraordinary only by will and spirit and without the need to possess Thor’s genes or the molecular structure of Wonder Woman. The actions of ordinary individuals generate identification in others: if those ordinary people doing the ordinary can obtain results, why not me?

Viewed from a technical, basic perspective, stories are a simple answer to our demand for knowledge and security. Put in a few words, in its simplest form, a story is a logical cause-and-effect connection. Thus we have been educated to think. We try to order the world in a narrative form because our brain has been trained for thousands of years in such a sequence. When we say “I am going to buy vegetables at the supermarket” we have already built a narrative. We do it every day in the most sublime tasks—and specially in the most mundane ones. (Don’t forget to buy bread, honey.)

And maybe even our body demands that stories give us solutions to daily life. According to some neuroeconomists, the brain produces cortisone—the stress hormone—when we go through the hardest and most tense moments in a story. In tension, cortisone helps focus. When the tension dissipates then the brain releases oxytocin, the chemical that allows empathy to develop and connect with others. And if everything ends well, it is the turn of dopamine, when the limbic system rewards us with the feeling of optimism and hope.
And maybe that’s it. Maybe we are biologically conditioned to tell stories. To face bad drinks to, in the end, feel good with the result obtained, be it the best or the most sub-optimal. After all, we all look for tranquility, the sweet feeling that, whatever happens, in the end everything will be fine.

Storytelling makes easier for us to create these exemplary instances from the ordinary and common of human existence. From the past, they are a source of transmission of myths and transitional rites, of ethics and their aesthetics, of approveable behaviors—or not. It is our traditional way of passing legends and epics from generation to generation so that they act as a source of inspiration. From being a more or less united group, first as a tribe later as a society. There is no nation that does not build its own guiding fiction—that which is supposed to make us all Portuguese or Greek or Spanish or Argentine or Italian—on the basis of an ordered narration of myths and legends.

But there is something else: although a story is effective if it maintains a more or less identifiable structure for its audience, it has in itself the great value of the literary act. That is, it does not recognize limits. Every time a story is recounted, it changes. There is no story equal to itself since the beginning of time. The absence of a structure that operates as a natural law as well as the lack of precise limitations mean that a story can be retold in an unlimited way, adjusted to the needs of each group. You have heard it: in every country the same joke is told just changing the regionalism that best suits “these guys are the worst of all”.

Because of their mutability stories offer variety. With that, the plot never stops—it’s adaptable to the times. The idea that any given society in any given moment has of an event of its past will be conditioned to a large extent by what that society wants to see from that past according to its current needs. The fluidity of cultural identity—there is no such a thing as purity—gives storytelling enormous power as a tool for the transmission of knowledge. The number of lessons that can be learned is infinite because
each narrator will have his own way of telling the same story today—and other new ways of narrating it will be found by others in ten, thirty or one hundred years.

In these times, storytelling has an additional value: the connection it generates allows building bridges between ideological differences. Gadamer said that we should value conversation. The dialogue that initiates a story is an effective tool to tear down sectarianism and tribalism.

I read Ramin Jahanbegloo, the Iranian philosopher, in Celebrating Diversity. Jahanbegloo takes Gandhi—“All humanity is one undivided and indivisible family, and each one of us is responsible for the misdeeds of all the others”—to proclaim the need for an intercultural imperative, a dialogue held between diverse. “It’s about the search for plurality,” Jahanbegloo writes, “not in spite of our differences and differences, but thanks to them.”

There is no homogeneous culture that works on an isolated horizon, says Jahanbegloo. Humanity is syncretic, a product of crossing experiences. The borders are artificial, an administrative determination. The only thing that needs two people who speak distinct languages, profess different beliefs and live in different cultures is time and disposition. Time to achieve a common language and willingness to talk.

So the future of our global civilization in this fragile and vulnerable planet depends on our capacity to live together—with our diversity—, if not in harmony, at least with capacity for dialogue, mutual understanding, and tolerance.

Stories serve that purpose. Above all, because, as Jahanbegloo and Gadamer would accept, they open up to dialogue and conversation.

We are attracted to stories because we are social animals and we need gregariousness. We are wired for them. It is impossible to live without them.
As Bill Buford said, an old fiction editor of The New Yorker and a great non-fiction writer, stories protect us from chaos. “Implicit in the extraordinary revival of storytelling is the possibility that we need stories—that they are a fundamental unit of knowledge, the foundation of memory, essential to the way we make sense of our lives,” he wrote. “The beginning, middle and end of our personal and collective trajectories.”
Building relational bridges in the Northern Ireland conflict

*Geoffrey Corry*98

John Hume MEP and Nobel Laureate tells the story about his first visit to Strasbourg in 1979 as a member of the European Parliament. It proved to be a defining moment for him. Taking time out, he went for a walk across the bridge from Strasbourg in France to Kehl in Germany and stopped in the middle of the bridge for a few minutes to think about what he was experiencing. Those two cities are physically very close but it was the political message that John was thinking about. After two horrific world wars in which 50 million human beings were slaughtered, the bridge he was standing on was a symbol of the Franco-German commitment to reconciliation through economic development and inter-governmental cooperation. That commitment endures to this day and is remembered by France and Germany every November Armistice when they stand together laying wreaths on their respective war graves.

Hume believed that the European Union is the best example of conflict resolution in the history of the world and the most successful peace pro-
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cess. For that reason, the principles at the heart of it should be sent to every area of conflict. He preached almost *ad nauseum* the three EU principles:

1. **Respect for difference.** All conflict is about difference - an accident of birth - whether it is a matter of race, religion or nationality.
2. **Create institutions that respect differences.** In divided societies, this will involve a proportional government to include all sections of society.
3. **Working together in your common interests is a healing process.** Through spilling your sweat and not your blood, economic development can erode the divisions of centuries. Yet it is a slow process.

In the twenty years following 1979, Hume put into practice these principles as an architect of the Northern Ireland peace process. He fundamentally believed that politics must win and not the use of political violence. The same inspiration motivated Jean Monnet and Altiero Spinelli who rose above the ashes of the Second World War to create a European community to break the vicious circle of one war following another. Their big discovery was that when those who are victorious in war – and become exhausted by victory – it only deepens the desire for revenge in others. Monnet’s ambition was to make another war between the nations of Europe not just unthinkable but materially impossible.

**The metaphor of the bridge**

In our discussions at the Ubuntu conference in Lisbon (17–18 July 2018), we came to grips with the reality that peace is not given on a golden platter. It has to be built slowly bit by bit and, while it is difficult to achieve, it is so rich when we achieve it. Much of the public spotlight has gone on the top-down approach to peacebuilding when ceasefires and settlements are often imposed on conflict situation (Bosnia, Syria,
Yemen) out of desperation. The experience of the Northern Ireland peace process is different because it was a combination of bottom-up and top-down approaches making it more sustainable. It is still an unfinished peace process and more social transformation has to take place. At the top level, the British and Irish governments increasingly learnt how to work together to build and support a negotiated outcome. Parallel to this significant diplomatic effort, civil society initiatives popped up at different levels both before and after the negotiations to engage the political parties - to meet each other, to rethink the nature of the conflict and to find workable solutions.

As we sat around the table in Lisbon, we recalled together Mandela's long journey to build a bridge to a peaceful South Africa. He used his prison experience to reflect on the downside of political violence and how the traditional African concept of Ubuntu could be mobilised to reclaim the humanity of all people in such a way that groups do not lose their dignity in the freedom struggle. By having a public viewing in the open air of the film “Invictus”, we celebrated that symbolic moment of reconciliation when Nelson Mandela reached out to the white Afrikaner community by putting on the number 6 springbok rugby jersey. It was not planned but rather it was a moment of imagination on the day. One of Mandela’s staff team had to race across Cape Town that morning to get a jersey made up that would fit him. It turned out to be a historic, magical and iconic moment of building a relational bridge to the other side that spoke from the heart with political substance.

How do you build a bridge between protagonists? What are the tasks of the bridge builder? What allows a person to make that first step of the journey to bridge the sectarian divide of hatred and enmity? Here are some of the insights from our conversations:

➤ To have the self-confidence to make the journey requires a moral imagination.
You need courage to move out of your own ethnic enclave, to reach out and recognise the other group, their values and dignity as human beings, while at the same time respecting one’s own tradition.

Discovering the nature of the relational bridge that has to be crossed by both sides.

When you cross over to the other side, you need people to meet you over there who are ready to engage with you.

Part of the journey with the other is to understand the context of the conflict and to be open to hearing the other’s pain and suffering, their fears and suspicions.

Another part of the journey is to discover the constraints operating on each side that may not allow each group to seize the super prize of peace in the short term.

**Peacebuilding versus Peacemaking**

In the lovely surroundings of the Archive meeting room in the Municipal City Council, I was thinking about another bridge that has to be built – a conceptual bridge between the academics and the practitioners. Conflict resolution and peace mediation is a young field that came to prominence in the 1990’s. The two concepts of **peacebuilding** and **peacemaking** have dominated the literature. They are widely used terms often interchangeably but not defined sufficiently on how they can be applied concretely to each strategy or phase of a peace process. An example of the confusion is how the term ‘peacebuilding’ has tended to be used to describe the post-violence or post-agreement phase of a peace process. Darby & McGinty (2008:255) point out that the term “presupposes that there is peace to build upon”. Yet if you change the order of the two bits that make up the word, then ‘building peace’ takes on a different meaning and can embrace the pre-negotiation phase, the negotiation phase and the post-conflict phase. The same applies to the word ‘peacemaking’ and can be made a more active word in ‘making peace’.
I was wondering where the practical on-the-ground building of peace bridges can be located within the academic terminology of Peacebuilding or Peacemaking. My sense is that it fits into both. But in what way? We need to make a specific distinction between two different types of interventions and the way in which one leads into the other:

A. **Building blocks of peace** are declarations of political principles that consolidate the values and mutual understandings that have emerged out of the dialogue or sets out further steps for confidence building in an agreed future political route. They also support clarity around issues of political substance that could form part of future negotiations.

B. **Building relational bridges** are inter-group interventions to provide safe space for listening, dialogue and rethinking the nature of the conflict. It contributes to making peaceful inter-communal relationships on an incremental basis where previously they have been torn apart by past animosities, thus removing emotional blockages and strengthening the growth of political will and engagement.

I have been trying to tease out how these two processes dovetailed in reality in the early phase of the NI peace process between 1982 and 1994 so as to move from theory to practice and back again into more refined theory. In previous writings (Corry & Hynes 2015), I have described this as the political engagement phase which was hidden from public view and where the seeds of a peace process are sown in a sort of organic way in the midst of ongoing low intensity violence. It came against a background where there was a readiness (Pruitt 2005) or a ripening moment (Zartman 2000) for politics to surface and the public were saying ‘enough is enough’ regarding the use of political violence.
A. Building blocks of peace

Diagram 1 shows different levels of a peacemaking pyramid (Lederach 1996) as applied to the Northern Ireland conflict and maps the chronology of the blocks of peace as they unfolded mainly on the nationalist side. The pyramid is split vertically in half between the Catholic nationalist community in green on the left and the Protestant unionist community in orange on the right. You cannot build blocks of peace without significant bridge building interventions to create the political conditions for new relational and substantive understandings to emerge. In some uncoordinated organic way – yet eventually connecting - they achieved the super-prize of stopping the violence through ceasefires, as represented by Block 7 at the top of the pyramid and Block 8 on the orange side.

Diagram 1: Eight Building Blocks of Peace that led to the 1994 Ceasefires

Most theories of peacebuilding are based on the assumption of external intervention but in the NI situation we have a model where 90% of the peace initiatives were home grown in unconnected initiatives and largely out of public view. So the public did not know about them until after the Good Friday Agreement when the stories came out [and are still being
revealed] about what was happening in the secret channels. Journalists like Ed Moloney (2007), and Peter Taylor (1997), who covered the developments during the 80’s, have done us a great service by providing us the basis for constructing eight building blocks of the conflict engagement strategy.

B. Building relational bridges for making incremental peace

A great strength of the early stage of the NI peace process was the number of community workers, clergy and ordinary citizens who came forward spontaneously and of their own initiative to act as peacemakers, bridge builders and home-grown mediators at all three levels in Diagram 1. Four examples are given below of peace interventions that brought together the warring parties that eventually led to the creation of those eight Building Blocks of the peace process.

PM1: A walk along the canal. The Chinese have a saying: “A journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step” That first step can be the most difficult to take and involves a risk to meet with the other side; but it usually comes from a realisation that you must build a respectful working relationship before a project can get off the ground.

An example of a first step in engagement comes from the higher diplomatic relationships between Britain and Ireland. David Goodall (right), a British Foreign Office diplomat was attending the first meeting of a coordinating committee in September 1983 in Dublin that was set up by
the two prime ministers. He tells us what happened: “So it was a complete surprise when...Michael Lillis [Irish diplomat, left] invited me to take a quiet walk with him along the Grand Canal and proceeded to sketch out the possibility of radically new arrangements for Northern Ireland. He made it clear that these were not yet the ideas of the Irish Government but indicated that they were the lines on which the Taoiseach was thinking.” This convivial informal one-to-one walk along the canal opened a door to significant diplomatic discussions that led all the way to the Anglo-Irish Agreement in 1985 [see building block 4 in Diagram 2]. Their sustained working relationship made it happen.

**PM2: Creating safe opportunities for political dialogue.** In the 1980’s, the idea of bringing together politicians from across the sectarian divide to another place in a residential setting with time to talk and think together was a novel initiative. To do it at a time when the everyday violence was continuing and in a pre-ceasefire situation involved a political risk. Dr Eberhard Spiecker played a significant but little recognised role in second track efforts to build understandings through hosting secret meetings in the Essen area of Germany. Dr Spiecker was a lawyer by profession with an interest in reconciliation. He was also a German Lutheran layman/Elder in his church and it was through his contacts with the Irish Presbyterian Church that he offered his mediation/facilitation skills (Farren 2010:222, 235). Writing a few months before his death, he said the republican hunger strikes in 1981 had left a huge “chasm”. His brave response was to build “rapprochement” to bridge political divisions. One of those efforts was to bring together a small group of unionists with nationalists in Duisberg in 1987 in the aftermath of the Anglo-Irish Agreement when unionist opposition to it was in full swing.
However, news of the Duisberg secret meeting got out into the public domain several weeks later showing how very difficult it is to keep things under wraps in a small society where everyone watches everyone else!

In today’s world of twitter and social media, it has become harder to maintain confidentiality about what gets discussed and preserve anonymity of who was present. Facilitators must build that contract with participants to protect their own interests. It was a big setback for future second track problem solving workshops in the 1990’s when academics like Chris Mitchell and Paul Arthur (1999) invited some of the same politicians to take part. If the same people continue to dialogue over a period of time like we did at the Glencree Centre (Corry 2012), then ethnocentric narratives of ‘them and us’ - taught informally through family, school and church - can be unpacked in the light of a new and more complex understanding of the relational nature of the conflict. Always the hope is that the exploration of new ideas can act as a catalyst for concrete proposals for policy change when the participants return home to their party.

**PM3: Opening up channels of communication.** Based in the Clonard Redemptorist monastery in West Belfast, Fr Alec Reid became the bridge connecting Gerry Adams, the Sinn Fein leader, to the other centres of nationalist power in Ireland over a period of eight years from 1986 to 1994. Because the Adams family and other republicans attended Mass at Clonard, Fr Alex got to know their families. Then as prison chaplain at Long Kesh prison nearby, Alec engaged in a pastoral role with IRA prisoners in the 1970’s and heard their story of political frustration, family suffering and communal alienation (McKeever 2017). He was a good listener and stayed within the three rules of engagement: Don’t criticise; Don’t con-
demn; Don’t inform others. In this way, he gained the trust of militant republicans but found it difficult at times to take on all that anxiety himself, endangering his own health. He had to take a break in 1980 from the prison work.

Fr Alec Reid struggled with ways to end the suffering of the ongoing Troubles. He believed passionately that the role of the church was to take the conflict off the streets and get the parties around the conference table; but before that would happen, he realised there had to be an IRA ceasefire. He felt the politicians and church leaders made a mistake in not speaking to the IRA earlier. “I believe now that if we had spoken to the republicans in 1969 or 1970, we would have avoided most of what happened afterwards.” In 1982, after the horrific IRA killing of Thomas Cochrane, a member of a local Protestant militia, he made it his job to get to know Gerry Adams. This coincided with an ‘internal ripening’ within the Belfast wing of Sinn Fein who saw the opportunity to shift into politics after the Hunger strikes (see Building Block 2). Reid believed there could be a non-violent alternative to the armed struggle if all the nationalist parties – SDLP and the Irish government – could work out a common position, followed by a peace conference.
Diagram 2: The four different secret bridges built by Alec Reid between 1982 and 1988

What happened then was an amazing piece of relational bridge building by Reid (Moloney 2007:275) as visually mapped in Diagram 2. To the right of the map, you can see how he needed to get Catholic Church backing for his peace ministry particularly by Cardinal Tomas O’Fiach, the all-Ireland Archbishop. He consolidated the new political thinking generated by Gerry Adams [channel 1] and the feedback obtained through the second channel with the British. He wrote it up in 1987 into a detailed discussion paper “A Concrete Proposal for a Political Strategy for Justice and Peace”, setting out the principles of self-determination and consent along with twelve stepping stones. It included circumstances in which the British government would depart from Ireland. This effectively became the blueprint for the emerging peace process. It heralded a huge piece of unofficial back channel work with the Irish prime minister, Charles Haughey [channel 3], and the SDLP leader John Hume [channel 4].

It was not possible for Gerry Adams to approach these people on his own because society had made him an outsider and so it fell to Alec as a third party interlocuter to convey the importance of this new thinking that could
lead to a ceasefire. Remarkably, doors were opened by Haughey and Hume, political oxygen was pumped into a peace process and intense inter-party dialogue began between SDLP and Sinn Fein in 1988 in five meetings at the Clonard monastery. Reid did not attend these meetings but subsequently carried in his pocket the documents between Hume in Derry and Adams in Belfast over the next few years of what was to become known as the Hume-Adams proposals (see Building Block 5 in Diagram 1). From 1992 he was the key intermediary between new Irish prime minister Albert Reynolds and Gerry Adams and was centrally involved right up to the August 1994 IRA ceasefire. After that he withdrew from the political discussions.

How do we define these relational and connecting skills? Fr Alec demonstrated in an exemplary way the role that insider third parties can play in first engaging each conflicting party and then connecting them through himself being the line of communication. His role kept developing and changing to a higher level as trust got built and political proposals gained credibility. He had a gift for framing issues and getting clarity on the nature of the substantive issues as he went back and forth between the parties in the third phase of his mediation work. Micro blocks of peace get built one step at a time until they materialise into text, public speeches and declaration.

**PM4. From ecumenical friendship to republican-unionist dialogue.** A warm ecumenical friendship formed between the Redemptorist Catholic priest, Fr Gerry Reynolds (left, colleague of Fr Alec), and the Presbyterian minister at Fitzroy, Rev Ken Newell (right), from different sides of the peace wall in Belfast. Their friendship extended over thirty years and continued right up to 2016 when Fr Gerry died. They succeeded in bringing members of their own congregations with them to meet in regular prayer groups by creating the Clonard-Fitzroy Fellowship. They took part in each other’s services and jointly built the bridge over which many of their parishioners crossed.
This was a remarkable grassroots achievement for neighbouring republican and unionist communities to go beyond suspicion and fear of each other to form deep bonds of friendship and trust. It is an example of the power of grassroots personal inner change where you begin with yourself and overcome the psychological and social barriers that keep people of different traditions apart. Each was willing to literally walk a mile through invisible sectarian barriers to encounter the other in their place of worship [not doing it in a neutral place] and to discover together the gospel of grace. “The emotional warmth of the meetings began melting the iceberg of traditional responses (Wells 2005: 128)” and where personal friendship allowed the healing of historic divisions in the name of Jesus. Each could have kept to themselves in splendid isolation within their own church congregation and settled into their own fundamentalist theology.

Ken’s advice is not to rush it and take it in little steps so as to bring your own people with you. It is both a journey to engage your people ‘within’ your congregation and a journey ‘without’ to go across the sectarian boundaries.

Amazingly, out of these local inter-church friendships came a platform for political dialogue with Sinn Fein and loyalist paramilitaries. The clergy facilitated a talks encounter which started in 1990 and continued for three years with three influential Sinn Fein leaders, one of whom was Gerry Adams (Newell 2016: 145-152; Wells 2005: 125-129). This was a dangerous personal decision for each of the Protestant clergy to make because of the official Unionist position that there could be no talks with Sinn Fein/IRA until at least a ceasefire. Add to this the fear they would be called ‘collaborators’ and become targeted by Loyalist paramilitaries. But Ken had to wrestle “with the clear and simple teaching of Jesus…to love your enemies
(Matthew 5:43-8)” and this must include talking with them. To lessen the risk, Ken asked Denis, an Elder in his local Fitzroy Church, to join him in the discussions.

In that secret safe space of Clonard, the Protestant clergy told the IRA how angry they were about the continued violence - it was their people who were being killed and it had to stop. They were British, Ulster and Irish – like a three-leafed shamrock – and they would not be going home to Scotland. In turn, Sinn Fein members explained the political grievances and issues that drove their campaign of violence. The Protestant clergy had never been subjected to Republican arguments before.

After a year, Ken Newell found it hard to stay in the dialogue because he felt the political argument was going around in circles of “we are right, you are wrong” and they were justifying the armed struggle. However, he later re-joined the group and found the dialogue went deeper, breaking through into mutual understandings and possible ways forward out of the conflict. Tom Hartley was one of the Sinn Fein participants. He said at a recent public meeting that those three years of dialogue enabled him to build personal relationships with Protestants and understandings of unionist thinking: “It shaped me, moulded me and is now a part of me…. It challenged me to rethink who I was, to unravel things and react to my prejudice. It brought me into my stomach.”
Changing hearts and minds to get out of protracted violent conflict

These examples show bridge builders at work doing different relationship tasks. Some are building a line of communication to the other side or opening up a humanising political relationship or creating a secret back channel. This makes the next step possible of facilitating a safe process where parties engage with each other in an authentic way, no longer seeing each other as the enemy. It is noticeable that Alec Reid did not take on the facilitator role.

What is it about such encounters that brings about change in the relationship and in the thinking of each party to the extent that it contributes to a building block for peace? One crucial factor is for a party to a conflict to feel fully heard and understood. When that happens, the relationship deepens and they are more likely to trust and engage with the other in political dialogue. I can remember talking to one Palestinian leader and hearing the sheer absence of connections on his side with the Israelis. “If only they would sit down in a room with me to listen to what we have to say. Will you arrange that for us?” He believed that if only the Israelis would hear their story of suffering, then they could find out what is politically important for them. The challenge for the facilitator is to hold the Israeli group in the room long enough to get to that point and have their story heard in return.

Secondly, we also know it is incremental. Marc Gopin (2009:73) has worked on how you measure successful conflict transformation and has come up with the notion of ‘increments of positive change’ [PIC]. Each increment becomes a step on a relational journey with a former enemy. A ‘mere’ contact with the other is not sufficient and the encounter must lead to an authentic level of empathy about the other’s situation. However, I would define it further as an “increment of positive emotional and relational change to the other”.

Thirdly, the journey does not follow a linear path but rather ups and downs built on hope of getting to some destination but not knowing precisely what the final destination of that journey is going to be.
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Ubuntu, building bridges for peace

Jacqui Scheepers

Historical perspective of Ubuntu

The origin of the Ubuntu philosophy can be traced centuries back to an ancient holy belief called the Netchar Maat which had seven cardinal virtues: Truth, Justice, Propriety, Harmony, Balance, Reciprocity and Order (Koka, 2002; Broodryk, 2007). Some belief that the seven virtues of Netchar Maat were written about 1500 years before the discovery of the Bible’s Ten Commandments and that these are part of the values featured in all other religions (Brooderyk, 2007). So what went wrong? How did many humans veer off this spiritual path despite being equipped with such a clear moral compass? The discussion which follows is a South African (SA) perspective of how the country has built on the values of Ubuntu in order to transcend the devastation caused by colonialism and Apartheid.

Ubuntu unpacked

Martin Luther Jr. once said:

“All life is interrelated. We are all caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied into a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. We are made to live together because of the interrelated structure of reality.” (King, 1991).

The imagery presented by the above statement encapsulates the concept of Ubuntu. It is virtually impossible to live without interacting with others in
our work, play, community and family. These connecting threads represent our experiences which are interwoven to form the rich tapestry of life. Ubuntu is another term for humanness which prevails within all humans and comprises of three main constituents of the wholeness of life as illustrated by Broodryk (2006) below:

Broodryk (2006) further espouses on the value of humanness which in his view differs to the concepts of humanity or humanism. To fully understand the Ubuntu philosophy, it would be remiss not to consider the differences between these concepts. Humanness, as a main ingredient of Ubuntu, gives respect to all religions and worldviews whereas humanism rejects religious beliefs in favour of promoting the welfare of human beings (Broodryk, 2006). The philosophy of ubuntu is often in conflict with Western ideas of individualism, materialism, capitalism, individual ownership versus collectivism, emphasis on private rather than public, dictatorship and colonialism. However, these ideologies may be the reasons why human beings have compromised their humanness.

An American educational activist, John Dewey promoted education for critical citizenship. In the same vein as “the ancient Greek philosopher [Plato], Dewey theorized that education and society were dynamically interactive and interdependent” (Benson & Harkavy, 2005). He proposed shifting our discourse from the “I” to the “we”, so that the individual self is inexplicably tied to the collective “we” which is our community (Saltmarsh, 1996). Although Dewey never alluded to the Ubuntu philosophy, his ideas on the link to democracy and education resonates well with building citizenship through engaging with communities. In community engagement collective ownership is the ideal rather than the westernised norm of striving for individually owned knowledge, artefacts and projects. Citizens who embrace and practice indigenous knowledge systems favour inclusivity rather than exclusivity. Ubuntu embraces the notion of sharing and promotes the interests of the collective as well as the individual within the collective.
During the struggle for freedom, many young SA’s sat at the feet of great leaders like Desmond Tutu whose explanation of Ubuntu is as follows:

“We belong together. We say in Africa ‘a person is a person through other persons’. We are bound together in a delicate network of interdependence. We believe in ubuntu – my humanity is caught up in your humanity. Ubuntu speaks of generosity, of compassion, of hospitality, of sharing: I am because you are. If I dehumanise you then whether I like it or not I am dehumanised”. (Habib, 2004).

The above statement resonates with many SA’s on a deeply personal, spiritual, political and cultural level, possibly because of similar values being embedded in the daily lives of many of its citizens. The majority of the population suffered under Apartheid on many levels, with the denial of economic opportunities and land ownership leaving many citizens impoverished. This remains still a big challenge in SA. In addition, many SA’s were displaced through forced removals and communities were left fragmented and dispersed as a result. However, there exists a spirit of resourcefulness, creativity and solidarity which sees communities rallying together in the face of often what appears to be insurmountable odds. The Ubuntu Pledge which was compiled by the National Religious Forum in SA propose that citizens:

Be good and do well;
Live honestly and positively
Be considerate and kind
Care for my sisters and brothers within the same human family
Respect other people’s rights to their beliefs and cultures
Care for and improve our environment
Promote peace, harmony and non-violence
Promote the welfare of South Africa as a patriotic citizen
(Broodryk, J. 2007: 49-51)
These elements are relevant across many religious faiths and have synergies with both the constitution and therefore to the new democratic SA.

Ubuntu is not unique to SA. There are many similar philosophies around the world. Professor Maria Nieves Tapia (2014), presents the “Babel tower of engagement languages” and explains various universal terms which have similar connotations as Ubuntu (I am because we are) such as: Harambee (Pulling together), Alli kausai (Good living), Solidaridad (Solidarity), Fraternité (brotherhood, fellowship, fraternity), and many more. Organisations like the International Red Cross Society and Doctors without Borders cross borders and oceans to provide aid and support in the aftermath of natural disasters and during war. The NGO, Gift of the Givers was established in 1992 and is the greatest disaster response organisation in Africa. Their motto: “Best Among People are those who Benefit Mankind” guides them to apply Ubuntu by spreading their energy and resources to all people “irrespective of race, religion, culture, colour, political affiliation or geographical location, unconditionally” (giftofthegivers.org/about). Civic organisations form an important function in society by ensuring that the rights of citizens and the environment are protected. They take on the role of “watchdogs” to ensure that gross human rights violations do not occur, often at great risk of harm. Many individuals in service professions like teachers, doctors, engineers, and other professionals dedicate additional time providing love, care and empathy to those who need it. Service is often given in a selfless way without a reward or expectation of any recognition.

The legacy of oppression

In the aftermath of an oppressive regime SA, as a country of great promise, stands as a beacon of peace and reconciliation in its transition towards a democratic government. SA’s will espouse at length about their
commitment to Ubuntu and their trademark of diversity, the “Rainbow Nation”. Citizens pride themselves on appreciating their rich diversity and many stress how integrated South African society is. The question often arises: How can SA have such high levels of violence, especially perpetuated against women and children? It must be acknowledged that the harm inflicted on SA society (individuals and cultural institutions) by the infamous Apartheid government has left a legacy of pain and anger that has not been fully realised. Many challenges experienced in SA society can be attributed to trauma caused by a violent and oppressive past. These wounds have not healed and manifests itself today in various forms and guises, on a continuum from verbal racist attacks to extreme and horrific acts of violence. Despite the obvious challenges, SA is a nation of hope and resilience and have displayed the potential to bind together when faced with major challenges.

On a global level many countries and continents grapple with genocide, wars, human trafficking, slavery, and many other gross human violations. The degradation of the environment by human hands motivated by corporate greed and personal enrichment has led to global warming, deforestation, pollution, poaching of endangered species and other destructive human activities.

South Africa as a new democracy

In SA, the evolving political landscape gave rise to “a decade of unprecedented reflexivity and change in the policy arena” (Patel 2004, 282). These policies affected universities and communities. A range of interrelated policies first introduced in 1994, was generally “aimed at addressing inequality” (Patel 2004, 282). The SA Constitution; National Development Plan; Strategic Objectives of respective provincial governments; Integrated Development Plans and Batho Pele principles all seek to address issues of
inequality, service delivery and redress. However, communities still experience amongst others; poor housing, lack of access to basic services and unemployment. The White Paper on Education of 1997 states that historically “there were no policy mandates or directives for community engagement in South African Higher Education” (CHE, 2004). The White Paper led to community service becoming an important consideration for SAHEI’s. As a result, universities and schools in South Africa practice Ubuntu through various projects under the banner of Service-Learning, Community Engagement, Civic Engagement, Volunteerism and Civic responsibility. Whatever term is used is irrelevant. Of importance is that there exists an ever-growing culture of Ubuntu in SA.

The gap from policy to implementation needs to be addressed otherwise policies lose their meaning for the very people that it was designed to serve. One strategy is to develop connections and build connections between the various layers of government and societal structures. Building bridges is therefore an effective metaphor for partnership building between the various sectors of society. In the words of (Hartley, Saltmarsh & Clayton, 2010):

“never has the imperative to strengthen participatory democracy for collective problem-solving – at the institutional, local, state and national levels – been greater. A democratic-centred civic engagement effort based on collaboratively addressing pressing social problems holds the promise of transforming not only the educational practice and the institutional identity of colleges and universities, but the larger public culture of democracy as well."

Collective and collaborative problem solving by SA citizens is key to moving the country forward. What is needed is a concerted effort on the part of all citizens to take policy through to implementation by pooling their skills and resources. In fact, Kharam (2004) proposes that there exists “A new governmentality: From transformation to implementation”.
The Apartheid government focussed on ruling by division; by creating and socially reinforcing the concept of separate races. SA is comprised of many diverse communities and therefore Ubuntu needs to work across these boundaries and not just within respective cultural groups or communities. There should be a shift towards the building of bridges across divergent groups rather than a focus on differences as was done in the past. These linkages can have a positive influence on the effectiveness of implementing Ubuntu projects between universities and society. HEI’s are well placed to bring together all stakeholders across diverse levels off government and have extensive resources, mainly students that can play an active role as citizens.

The Moral Regeneration Movement (MRM)

After the demise of apartheid, the SA government started the Moral Regeneration Movement (MRM) which stemmed from a June 1997 meeting between former President Nelson Mandela, Faith Based Organisations, former Deputy Minister of Education Father Smangaliso Mkhatshwa and the SA Broadcasting Corporation (SABC) to generate discussions on spiritual transformation. President Mandela emphasised “the role of religion in nation-building and social transformation, and the need for religious institutions to work with the state to overcome the ‘spiritual malaise’ underpinning the crime problem” (mrm.org.za/). The vision of MRM is to strive for: A just, tolerant and moral society for the common good; and their mission is: To initiate, facilitate and coordinate societal networks and programmes to regenerate and preserve our nation’s moral fibre (mrm.org.za/). MRM members further “seek to promote local action and commitment from within communities at various levels” and their objective is “to assist in the development of a caring society through the revival of the spirit of botho/ubuntu and the actualisation and realisation of the values and ideals enshrined in our constitution” (mrm.org.za/). The MRM charter of positive values consti-
tutes a framework of reference for all SA’s (mrm.org.za/images/ENGLISH_CHARTER_NW_ADD.pdf). A graphic illustration of the values of the MRM is shown below:

**Concluding remarks**

In order to transcend a traumatic past one has to recognise the humanity in “the other”, including in the perpetrator or the oppressor. The ability to recognise ourselves “the human” in others and form connections is not a new concept but lies at the basis of what it means to be human. When we cease to see each other as human, or part of our human family, it is then easy to “other” individuals and focus on differences instead of commonalities. Often there is a fear that by engaging with “the other” there is a risk to the preservation of one’s own culture and traditional belief systems. That is one of the main reasons why many people alienate themselves from others and even avoid interacting with others who are different. At a more extreme level the
fear can lead to hate and aggression towards those who are different.

Creating awareness amongst youth at schools and universities about Ubuntu will ensure the growth of a generation of responsible and ethical citizens. Investing in youth leadership programmes will contribute to future ethical leadership, good citizenship and sound governance. It is hoped that the Charter of Positive values will make a significant impact on the citizens, especially the youth, by acting as a foundation for the inculcation of values and ethics in the journey towards a new world where all people can share in the beauty and riches of their country.

An old Chinese proverb says:

> When a man is at peace with himself, he will be at peace with his family. When the families are at peace there will be peace in the villages. When the villages are at peace there will be peace in the country. When all the countries are at peace there will be peace in the world. Then man can be at peace.

Cape Town, South Africa
scheepersj@cput.ac.za
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IV Chapter
Ubuntu Leaders Academy in Portugal and Worldwide
Ubuntu Leaders Academy

*Tânia Neves*

1. What?

1.1. Leadership program and purpose

Academia de Líderes Ubuntu (Ubuntu Leaders Academy) is a non-formal education program, unconstrained and free, promoted by Instituto Padre António Vieira (IPAV). It integrates a flexible training program, constantly updated and focused on a lifelong learning experience. With a focus on servant leadership, Ubuntu Leaders Academy is directed to the training of young people who want to promote their leadership competences focused on the service of the promotion and restoration of human dignity, in contexts where it is diminished or menaced.

As an action model based on the promotion of service-focused leadership, the Ubuntu Leaders Academy underlines the urgency of inspiring bridge builders and the need to promote an ethics of care. These are the foundations guiding the Ubuntu Leaders Academy. This project takes the participants on an inner journey that challenges the way each one sees and relates to others, providing the tools to contribute to building a more faire and cohesive world.

---

*Padre António Vieira Institute (IPAV)*
The main goals of this project are:

i. to empower young people as agents of transformation at the service of communities, promoting the integrated development of skills with a focus on the skills of a servant leadership;

ii. to train educators who, by demonstrating their experience and aptitude as trainers, recognizing the transformation potential of the Ubuntu method, help disseminate it by promoting a culture of building bridges, where server leaders play an increasingly important role;

iii. to promote dialogue between and within communities for the promotion of peace and justice, contributing to the development of more inclusive and resilient communities;

iv. to develop an ethics of care, focused on empathy, attention and responsibility, considering three dimensions: I, I- the other, I- the world.

In addition, the Ubuntu Leaders Academy is also a space in which other skills such as teamwork, critical and self-reflexive thinking, communication, problem solving and promoting the full development of the participants are promoted.

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy has as main target audience young people between 14 and 35 years old, coming from socially vulnerable and challenging contexts. Insofar as this is an essentially experiential, reflexive and sharing program, it is important that the participants have a level of maturity that allows them to follow and enjoy the training plan.
2. How?

2.1. Ubuntu concept and method

"Ubuntu is a way of life. It is a word that condenses the true essence of what it is to be Human. My humanity is intrinsically linked to yours and, therefore, I am human because I belong, I participate, I share a sense of community. You and I are made for interdependence and complementarity."

Desmond Tutu

This program is inspired by the concept of Ubuntu, an African humanist philosophy, which means “I am because you are. I can only be a person through other people”. This ideology, deeply linked to humanity and the transversality of the individual and collective life, is impartial to nationalities, cultures, religious or political affiliations. The concept Ubuntu is therefore focused on the person and its uniqueness, while focusing on the relational process that each is called to do: being/becoming a person.

In this sense, the incompleteness of the construction process of the ‘I’, and therefore of the relationship with the ‘other’, is based on constructive interdependence. So, it is based on the primordial idea of relationship, because it is proposed that each person can discover himself/herself and the other by relating, preserving and enhancing individual singularity, by reinforcing the importance of the ‘other’.

From the study and deep analysis of the Ubuntu concept, we tried to understand and to base the praxeology of this humanistic philosophy. In addition to understanding it as a way of life and from which one understands nature and human relations, it was considered that Ubuntu is also a new look at the individual and the relation to the ‘other’ and the community, which can be worked on, empowered and inspired from a more structured praxiological and methodological lens of action.
2.2. Methodology and competences

The methodology used in the Ubuntu Leaders Academy aims to develop five core skills or Ubuntu pillars - self-knowledge, self-confidence, resilience, empathy and service. At a first level, competences are focused on the individual and deepening the knowledge of self, of their capacities and forces [Self-knowledge, Self-confidence and Resilience]. On a second level, we try to move towards the ‘other’, with social and relational skills being worked on [Empathy and Service]. This is a continuous and circular dynamic, because it is not assumed or exhausted in a process of linear development.

The journey from “I” to “We” teaches these skills in a way that promotes cooperation, participation, creativity, responsibility and communication, which are essential aspects to complete personal growth. The collective construction of learning, with the potential to produce social impact and to be disseminated, justifies the relevance of this program to be implemented in challenging contexts and of greater vulnerability.

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy, as a non-formal education program, it has developed a pedagogical model focused on the participants, through a participatory and experiential approach. The methodology is deeply relational in its conceptual essence, in tune with the principles of the Ubuntu philosophy: a person is only a person through other people. Therefore, this project aims to create opportunities for co-construction of knowledge, developing socio-emotional competencies that have a transversal impact on the participants’ lives. The creation of a “safe space”, where each one feels respected and valued, puts a humanizing stamp on the whole training process.
As a non-hierarchical project, it gives responsibility and autonomy to the young participants in the construction of their own formative path, being, for this reason, unique in the way it is constructed and appropriated by each person who participates in it.

The proposed activities are structured in terms of pedagogical goals and intentionality of the learning processes. This process happens through four cycles of experiential learning:

1) Experience - What happened? Living a certain experience;
2) Reflection - How did I feel? To think through and share how the experience was lived (feelings, thoughts, behaviour, etc.);
3) Generalization - Why did it happen? Discern and learn from experience;
4) Application - What am I going to do about it? Understanding the practical implications of the identified conclusions and its applicability to life.

Taking into account that the intention is to promote the integral and holistic development of each participant, several tools are used to facilitate these processes. Thus, the ludic-pedagogical resources are configured as learning vehicles, namely, action-reflection dynamics, films, documentaries, short stories, songs, texts and experiences/activities related to the training topics.

In addition, the Ubuntu session proposals, in their different formats (cfr. Trainers Manual), can also include other experiences. Examples include:

- residential trainings, carried out in inspiring places, with a strong investment in the building of ties and relation between the participants (team building) and where central themes of the Ubuntu method are worked through;
Building Bridges

- invited thematic guests, with relevant testimonies of bridge building, overcoming obstacles and service in the community they are in, with questions and answers sessions by the participants;

- thematic sessions that normally start from a given theme, illustrated through a support of films, documentaries, books, songs, short stories or presentations, followed by a debate. Some of the sessions include group work and/or presentations of work developed by the participants, experiments carried out outside the training space, in an atypical context, aiming to achieve the training goals in a creative way, with a perspective of practical learning;

- individual presentations by the participants, about their life story, from key moments experienced and consequent outputs;

- Volunteering during a weekend, in a challenging context, with a strong investment in the bonding and interpersonal relations between the participants and the community and where they work some of the central themes of the Ubuntu Method, being the group work its main component;

- special challenges throughout the year that result in specific initiatives aimed at strengthening the pursuit of the objectives of the Academy, both in terms of training in events’ planning and the communication of the Academy’s mission;

- public conferences.
Particular importance is given also to learning by reference models (role-models), which takes shape in three axes:

1. through the study of world-renowned leaders who have exemplified the applicability of the Ubuntu philosophy and the principles of servant leadership (as Nelson Mandela, Desmond Tutu, Martin Luther King);
2. through the regular presence at the training sessions of community leaders and local personalities who, by giving their testimony, demonstrate that it is possible to be a vehicle for change;
3. through sharing the life testimony of the participants who become a source of inspiration and learning for others.

2.2.1. Collaboration model

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy methodology is of free access and replication to those who participate and contribute. For this, a cooperation model was developed for its application in different contexts, namely focused on 7-day training formats (two days of Training of Trainers and two days of Ubuntu Leaders Academy):

- **Expression of interest:** The collaboration model begins with the manifestation of interest to IPAV by an entity (organization, institution, project, university, etc.) that wishes to organize and implement this training and it is in tune with the mission, goals and principles of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy.

- **Contact:** It is essential that contact be established between IPAV and the organization concerned helps to clarify all the practical issues of the training, clear understanding of the goals and the relevance of the project to the context in question. A training proposal will also be
presented and the target audience of this initiative identified. After the contact, IPAV will send a ‘Kickoff Script’, where the procedures and resources necessary for the collaborative implementation of this project will be systematized, including information about the participants, trainers, materials, spaces and technical conditions.

The following steps in the collaboration model, such as protocol decision and signature, the design of the training proposal, the role of the IPAV team of animators and the follow-up and follow-up are available in the Trainers Manual and the Ubuntu Leaders Academy website (academialideresubuntu.org).

The development of different formats of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy should be shared certification - IPAV and host sponsoring institution - and it is desirable that there be regular monitoring by the IPAV team.

3. Why?

3.1. Evidence and context of operationalization

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy project was initially aimed at young migrants and descendants of migrant communities. However, the focus of intervention was quickly extended to young people with interest and/or work experience in more challenging social contexts, and the contexts of experimentation of this methodology were increasingly diverse. Through the training work developed, an international experience of the methodology was initiated in some countries of origin of young graduates - Guinea-Bissau (with an annual training experience), Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe and Mozambique. More recently, due to its historical and cultural proximity to Guinea Bissau, the Ubuntu Leadership Academy also reached the territory of Casamansa in Senegal.
The Ubuntu Leaders Academy has arrived also to Spain and Latin America (Colombia, Venezuela and Peru), to the Philippines and Cambodia. These different contexts of training have enriched formative and methodological experience and have been successful in all contexts where it was replicated.

By promoting and allowing an effective equality of opportunities and positive role models and example of reference leaders, personal and relational development (with others and with the world) is promoted. Therefore, collaboration, which is also the instrument of work and fundamental competence in this program, should be privileged.

This commitment to collaboration as the basis of the program has been receiving national and international recognition. The Ubuntu Leaders Academy was recognized by the European Commission being one of the 12 most relevant best practices projects in Europe (“Taking the future into their own hands: EU publications). It was recognized by the largest network of social entrepreneurs in the world - ASHOKA - as a reference project of social entrepreneurship. In February 2019 the Ubuntu Leaders Academy was also invited to a conference in the European Parliament called “Ubuntu Leaders Academy: A leadership focused on building bridges”. 
4. Where to?

4.1. Lessons and learning for the future

The growth and ever-increasing reach of this program are notorious and with increasingly visible results in the places where it is now present. The Ubuntu Leaders Academy project intends to become more international and reach more young people with high leadership potential. Therefore, in addition to the countries where it has already had the opportunity to present and develop its methodology, and where it wants to continue working, it is hoped that the project will reach more and more countries and contexts of intervention, knowing and working with economic, social and cultural differences and, with that, integrating new learning and conceptual and methodological contributions.

In this internationalization path that the Ubuntu Leaders Academy has taken, it has been possible to validate and consolidate the relevance, meaning and urgency of Ubuntu, not only from a conceptual point of view, but also methodological and strategic.

In addition, as a non-formal educational approach, this program has looked and gained space within a new educational universe, more focused on the individual and communities. It is, however, curious to note that the interest in Ubuntu has been manifested mostly by schools and universities, showing that its relevance is strategically assumed as an educational asset for the development of young people. It can be challenging to understand that this concept and method does not compete with the importance of school and the formal educational path.
Also in order to respond to this challenge, in the framework of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy, an effort was made to systematize, consolidate (the concepts and methodology as well as the cooperation model) and evaluate all the products of this program in which the Erasmus + Program played a crucial role.

In this process of project growth and development, there is a tendency to consolidate, more and more, the awareness of youth training needs, social and ethical values such as social justice, dialogue, respect and collaboration. At the same time, it is intended to foster ever more profound learning of the individual and the other and the world, as an increasingly conscious premise of interdependence.

This project invites an inner journey that challenges what each one is and how it relates to others, recognizing and connecting with the ‘other’, becoming able to be active, responsible and committed agent for the change that want to see in the world.
Personal Storytelling: a path of self-knowledge and resilience

Sofia Mexia Alves

“No one is irrecoverable”
Mário Ottoboni

Personal Storytelling: Methodology

Stories bring meaning to our lives, convey values and emotions, help to reaffirm and validate our lives and experiences and have the ability to connect us with our innerselves, with others and with society (Atkinson, 2002).

Personal Storytelling is a methodology for building and sharing stories, experiences and personal perspectives; each subject is active - author and actor - in deeply reflecting on his/her path, meaning and identity, as well as in sharing this introspection with others.

According to narrative theory, storytelling has the social value of enabling individuals to reconstruct the meaning of past experiences (Horta, 2017). In addition to telling his own story, the author describes how the story or event entered his life and how it brought meaning to his life, directly or indirectly (Maguire, 1998).

100 Trainer at the Post Graduate Course “Ubuntu for Educators” in 2016/2017 at the Paula Frassinetti Higher School of Education.
Personal Storytelling within the Ubuntu Bridges program

According to Horta (2017), in the [Ubuntu Academy] context, storytelling is the central methodology through which participants gain an understanding of their identity, the values that guide their relationship with others, and how they contribute to the self-realization and well-being of others, within the values of Ubuntu.

The Ubuntu context-storytelling methodology is facilitated in two ways: on the one hand, by listening, contacting with and reflecting on the stories of reference leaders (through books, films and experiences, participants are immersed in the stories and testimonies of leaders, in order to understand their distinct contexts, their different missions and the choices they made) and of invited guest speakers (reference and inspiring people who share their life histories or remarkable episodes of different world realities and perspective); and, on the other hand, sharing the narratives of the Ubuntu trainees, since everyone is encouraged to listen and to share their own life stories. In all of the Ubuntu modules, to a greater or lesser extent, all participants are encouraged to reflect on their life story and identity and construct their personal narratives.

At first and throughout several sessions and moments, the participants are encouraged to reflect and to deepen their understanding of their own life story - What happened to me that was relevant, that was significant, that gave texture to my life, that transformed me? Who were the people and contexts that influenced me (positively or negatively)? In what ways did each of these aspects influence my way of being, of thinking, of feeling, of my choices and my view of the world, now?
From this exercise, the need for critical questioning and search for meaning arises - *What values, what skills, what strengths, what potentials have I developed or am able to develop with what happens (or happened) to me? What are my frailties, my fears, my limits and difficulties? How can I overcome, circumvent, transform, diminish and even accept them? What do I need to forgive? To reconcile myself with? What skills and talents am I wasting or not profiting from? What do I have to do in order to become the best version of myself?*

In a second phase of reflection and self-knowledge, participants are encouraged to construct their Personal Narrative, to be the authors of their own story, through practical exercises (e.g. Life Line, “What if my life were a Book? Or the traditional Storyboard). In these exercises, it is important for the participant to identify and select the most relevant events, the most significant people and contexts as well as the role each experience played in the construction of their identity, and vision of themselves, of the others and of the world; and also to determine a structured and organized line of thought - so that the narrative is not a heap of memories and references but a singular, intelligible and intentional narrative.

In addition to the process of constructing their life story, in the Ubuntu Leaders Academy, participants have the opportunity to share their narrative in two distinct and complementary moments: the Human Library and the Ubuntu Lives Conference. The Human Library is a methodology allowing for the sharing of life stories in small groups or even in pairs (one-on-one), where all people are considered to have unique stories and visions, which must be listened to, welcomed and celebrated. At the Human Library, a person shares his / her life story with one or more people who should listen carefully, and at the end of the sharing may ask questions and give feedback. Participants who are on the path of self-knowledge and are willing and able to share their life story publicly, may do so at the Ubuntu Lives Conference. At this stage, the participant should reflect on different issues: What do I want to share? How will I share? Why do I share, what moves me? What impact does my life story sharing have on others who are listening to me?
The Ubuntu Lives Conference has been the setting of unique life stories, diverse and rich in truth and meaning. The Ubuntu Leaders Academy has been giving voice to people, causes, groups or communities who are often excluded, vulnerable, discriminated against – it is, therefore, a platform for service and inspiration as well as for the promotion of empathy, through building a culture of celebration of overcoming, difference and diversity.

There are a few fundamental principles that must be fulfilled in order for Personal Storytelling to achieve its intended results:

**Freedom** - reflection and sharing of one’s life story must always be a free and conscious choice, no one should ever be forced to walk this demanding and individual path;

**Dignity and Respect** - for yourself, for the reader or listener, for the cause or group that you represent and for other people who may be involved in the life story (they must also be able to choose whether or not to share, and how); the personal narrative is always a subjective and singular vision;

**Truth** - although the stories are subjective and personal, they have to be obedient to the basic principle of honesty and truthfulness of the facts.

Despite the powerful, transformative and positive impact that Personal Storytelling has on the subjects that integrate this self-knowledge process, there are associated risks that may result from poor methodology or non-appropriation of the principles on the part of the participants, namely: i) danger of hate speech, when the person sharing the story is not at peace and serenity with his narrative, events or people involved - this risk does not mean that it should be tampered with or the trainee forced to alter his
personal narrative. It means, however, that the person and the team should reflect critically and discuss the impact the narrative can have, if sharing it is appropriate and timely; ii) danger of negative feedback or inadequate feedback from the listener (when done in small groups) - as a way to prevent this risk, the Ubuntu Leaders Academy has created a “reader card” so that all participants understand and respect the associated principles; (iii) danger of contact / appropriation of disruptive behaviour and its consequent danger (eg sharing stories associated with drug addiction among adolescents or children, may lead to desensitization towards drug use and lead to experimentation by stimulating curiosity about drugs); iv) if sharing of life stories is done in small groups, it is necessary for the person to be aware that, in sharing with others, the principle of confidentiality may not be fulfilled. As a way to prevent some of these risks we advise the participants’ mentoring, which is carried out by Ubuntu mentors with experience, profile and specific training for the development of self-knowledge; and prior sharing of personal narrative before sharing it in public.

**Personal Storytelling — the impact in context of diversity and vulnerability**

First of all, there is the central belief that “no one is irrecoverable” (Mário Ottoboni), that all people regardless of the condition and state in which they find themselves in, regardless of their path, context, opportunities, choices, perception that they have of themselves ... all people can become the best version of themselves. Recognizing that, for this to happen, there are realities, constraints and external factors that have to be changed or overcome; there is also an internal path of self-knowledge, of resilience, of self-efficacy that has to be done by each subject. A path that each has to go through - no one can do it on behalf of others- but can be supported and guided.
Personal Storytelling has been used in various education and intervention programs in contexts of vulnerability and exclusion in personal and group development methodology, empowerment and emancipation. This methodology has an impact on personal development - stirring self-knowledge, self-esteem and resilience in each participant - and the building of a more cohesive and stronger group and community through the power of empathy.

“We see, hear, and read. We cannot ignore it.”
Sophia de Mello Breyner Andersen

As we listen to and read the life story of Nelson Mandela, his strengths and qualities, as well as weaknesses and defects, as we journey from childhood to seclusion, liberation and struggle for human rights and equality for all South Africans, when we recognize humanity and feel their steps, their conquests, their pain ... then we all become 466/64. We wear the sweater because we feel, because we share, because we become a person through the Other. We become responsible for his history, his cause, his legacy. When we allow ourselves to feel the narrative, when we allow ourselves to be immersed in it, our vision of the world is transformed, as is our meaning and role in it. As with Mandela, it happens when we hear stories of others who have felt or feel wronged, discriminated, alone, disrespected and lost. The person next to us. And then we become listeners, accomplices, responsible.

“(...) I now recognize your step as a magical turning point in our relationship. Not only did he make Harriet more human, but humanized me. I received a gift from her, enlivened with a glimpse of her life. She has given me the privilege of becoming an out-of-the-ordinary listener, a witness to her humanity, a keeper of secrets. “
(Maguire, 1998)
Personal Storytelling is empowering.

Liberation power, through meeting and dialogue, without fear of criticism or judgment, by other people who have lived similar episodes to ours or feel like us. Power resulting from the acceptance and forgiveness of oneself, but also from the processes of reconciliation with others.

Which it so often awakens. Power for hope, for the opportunity to look at ourselves in a new way, for a renewed identity. Power for choices: I choose what gives me shape and worth, I determine the weight and meaning of each event in my story and path, I define my look. Power of vulnerability. Vulnerability is essential in the whole process of self-knowledge: the ability to allow myself to feel, to be honest with myself and others, to be genuine, to have the courage to observe my nakedness, to face my demons and virtues – and to recognize ourselves in this renewed humility - to overcome me.

Personal Storytelling allows everyone to find their voice.
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Ubuntu: a glance from Guiné Bissau

Osiris Ferreira

When the Instituto Padre António Vieira invited me to write some lines about the World and Ubuntu, I confess I didn’t know where to start. I thank the Institute for this initiative and in the following lines I will attempt to narrate the reach of the Ubuntu philosophy, its concept, characteristics, definition and social impact in the society in which I live.

I wanted to start by defining compassion, respect, solidarity, self-esteem, servant leadership, life experiences. The first contact I had with IPAV’s Team upon their arrival in Guinea- Bissau to launch this new type of leadership training for community service in the Guinean society and youth; I’d also like to mention the first contact I had in Bissau with Filipe Pinto and Mónica Caldeira to discuss an innovative project benefiting young people as a way to change social paradigms and inspire the youth to have greater intervention in the process of social change in Guinea Bissau.

In the midst of all doubt, certainty prevailed in regards to the aims of a school of life and leadership, of service, of building bridges, of truth and of reconciliation. Also, and after all, to refer to a spirit that exists in each one of us which must be awakened with a click for the good of humanity, service, sharing, compassion, social transformation, tolerance, self-esteem and dreaming of dignity and humanity for all.

101 Judge in the Supreme Court of Justice – Guiné Bissau
If, in the past, the founders' perspective was to challenge a community and its surrounding area in the training young people with high leadership potential based on the Ubuntu philosophy, its methodology and mechanisms, its innovator impact, entrepreneurship and servant leadership, it has now become a globalized project - universal and unavoidable, without frontiers. It has its direct and indirect beneficiaries, peoples or nations rekindling spirits and training young social entrepreneurs, competent community leaders with knowledge and tools to transform the environment and the community in which they live, with values and ethical and trustworthy principles of the communities to which they belong to, giving them more humanity and dignity.

Ubuntu challenges us to realize a dream, a dream to be experienced in our daily lives, in this world (my country) full of conflict, social vulnerability, violence, intolerance and lack of institutional dialogue between political agents and social activists.

It was in this context that this innovative leadership project, was launched and implemented. According to the Anglican archbishop Desmond Tutu, author of an Ubuntu theology — “my humanity is inseparably linked to your humanity.” This notion of fraternity implies compassion and is opposed to individualism. Nelson Mandela had this to say:

“Respect. Courtesy. Sharing. Community. Generosity. Confidence. Detachment. A word can have many meanings. All contain the spirit of Ubuntu. Ubuntu does not mean that people should not take care of themselves. The point is, are you going to do it in a way to develop your community, allowing it to improve?”

So the Ubuntu philosophy - “I am because you are” - encourages us to interact with and understand the humanity of the other, of the community around us, of the society in which we live, and if, our actions and behaviour are in accordance to the interests and benefits of the community.
Contrary to current individualistic perspectives and visions, the Ubuntu philosophy makes our traditions, contexts, community and social way of life a reality for the well-being and the humanization process of human society and people.

The world has always been inspired by the Ubuntu philosophy and as an element of the African tradition, Ubuntu has been reinterpreted throughout the political and cultural history by Africans and their diasporas. Between the years 1910-1960, it appears in terms of pan-Africanism and black movements. It is these two philosophical movements that helped Africa fight against colonialism and gain its independence. After independence, he will be present in the philosophical praxis of Julius Nyerere’s Ujama, in Tanzania, in the philosophy of *bisoity* (Tathiamalenga Ntumba, from the Lingala language, meaning “we”), in political practices that point to the national reconciliation in the 1990s in South Africa and other African countries in the process of democratization (filoafricanaemubuntu.blogspot.com2014inconversa-com-o-profesor basilele.html)

So the Ubuntu philosophy - “I am because you are” leads us to interact with our inner selves to understand the humanity of the other, the community that surrounds us, the society in which we live, and to gage whether our actions and behaviour are in accordance to the interests and benefits of the community.

Moreover, contemporary history has given us life examples of great thinkers and men who, throughout their life marked inspiring historical moments for the well-being, the struggle against all forms of discrimination and the affirmation of freedom, reconciliation and human dignity, such as Martin Luther King, Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, Amilcar Lopes Cabral, Mother Teresa of Calcutta, Aung San Sun Kyi, Aristides de Sousa Mendes and others that remained anonymous.
These world renowned inspirational personalities charged with natural desires that lived from their traditions and cultures converge in their purposes and ends which consists in improving the dignity of the other and the community in general, as they contain in themselves a state and an action that complement each other in a mode of interdependence contrary to the logic of individualism.

These personalities and inspirational sources charged with natural desires based on their traditions and cultures converge in their purpose to improve the dignity of the other and the community in general, as they contain in themselves a state and an action that complement each other in a mode of interdependence contrary to the logic of individualism.

Thus, the social and ethical values of the Ubuntu philosophy taken globally translate into a set of personal experiences that can influence transformative social behavior in a healthy coexistence of mutual affection, empathy, shared, collaborative and community solidarity for improvement and transformation of the level of human coexistence concentrated in individualism.

**Ubuntu – Social transformation**

Social vulnerability and the successive political and institutional crises in my country have negatively influenced the process of galvanizing young people in the process of appropriation and adherence to local and community development initiatives in the last few years. With the implementation of the Ubuntu Guiné-Bissau Academy and its philosophy, its training process in favour of young people through its own methodologies and techniques in some pilot communities, namely in some critical neighbourhoods of the city of Bissau, there has been radical transformation in the young and in the communities that were once considered high risk, due to lack of hygiene and basic sanitation, citizen participation and community leadership.
Today, these inspiring values, based on the skills process provided during the training, were relevant to the paradigm shift and the way of thinking and acting of those communities in accepting the new, inclusive, entrepreneurial, integrated and community processes leading to human dignity, in securing opportunities for collaboration, service, examples of citizen participation and young leaders in favour of the community.

In this way, the school of life and leadership through the Ubuntu process is current and fundamental to the process of appropriation and empowerment of youth in their role as transformative leaders of the community in synergy with all social actors leaving the world a better place and with more dignity.

**In Ubuntu it is possible to reconcile**

Nelson Mandela, the leader in the struggle against Apartheid in South Africa, was inspired by the Ubuntu Philosophy to promote the policy of reconciliation in that nation.

For in the South African tradition, reconciliation is expressed through Ubuntu or humanism, which includes values such as compassion and communion - values that have guided the Truth and Reconciliation Commission and served as a basis for the formulation of national reconstruction and reconciliation goals. J.Y. Mokgoro, a South African Constitutional Court judge, has shown that this fundamental philosophical principle has decisively influenced the country’s constitutional law since the provisional constitution of 1993 and is contained in the Basic Law No. 34 of 1995 on the Promotion of Unity National and Reconciliation - L'idée de réconciliation dans les sociétés multiculturelles du Commonwealth: une question d’actualité? “(In French). Cairn.info. June 2, 2004
South Africa, after the liberation of Mandela and the end of apartheid, became the historical example of the translation of Ubuntu into a multicultural political project.

This country, through its political, religious and social leaders, was able to use the ethical principles of this philosophy through the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It was the recreation of a space of dialogue of the community of inspiration in the “African Palabres”. Palabre is a French word, which refers to the spaces of mediation of conflicts of the community, that count on the ability of the use of the word by the old or wise. It was not a condemnation space for torturers or racist but rather a meeting of the South African people with themselves, with their problems of the past, with their present and future waiting to be built. An encounter with their memory of pain, suffering and hope. After this process, this country defines itself today as a New South Africa, which recognizes itself as a multicultural country where whites and blacks can live together. In this way the zamani [past] of suffering became a sasa-lobi [present-future] of hope.

In Africa today, in the democratic process and post-conflict countries, it is possible to build on the methods and principles of the Ubuntu philosophy as a way of reflecting and doing politics. In this context, governing implies listening to the different opinions of political parties, civil society organizations, guaranteeing fundamental freedoms and rights, reducing the level of violence in communities and promoting actions to develop a sustainable and lasting collective national project and a pact of political and social stability for the well-being and dignity of citizens.

In this perspective, the legitimacy and responsibilities of the leaders are based on the practice of loyalty, honesty, fighting impunity, on the dignity of the community and not concentrating on individualism.
By inspiration of the process and principles of national reconciliation through the truth and reconciliation commission of South Africa is brought to the reflection in the flowchart and script of the Organizing Committee for the National Conference in Guinea-Bissau as one of the models to be proposed to the National Conference and some civil society organizations, notably the Ubuntu Guinea- Bissau Academy where they praised and reinforced the need for a participatory and inclusive process of national reconciliation among Guineans.

In a post-conflict society such as Guinea-Bissau where there is still the risk of violence, fragility of the state, institutional conflicts and permanent instability requiring the adoption of humanist methods that protect human dignity to avoid the resurgence of new sources of violence and the breakdown of cohesion; national reconciliation through inspiring reconciling mechanisms based on the ancestral socio-cultural values and experiences of other peoples.

It is in this perspective that Ubuntu presents humanity with a set of solutions through the philosophy of life, a way of living in the world and a social ethic whose system includes a set of values of human dignity, such as participatory democracy, respect, compassion, forgiveness, truth, dialogue, reconciliation, recognition of guilt, the dignity of the victim for the well-being of human and world society.

And this conviction is reinforced by Mahatma Gandhi, in affirming that “there is no way to Peace, for Peace is the way”. And if there was another way to Peace, it would certainly be Ubuntu.

To conclude, I congratulate IPAV for taking the lead role in expanding the values of the Ubuntu philosophy for communities and humanity on the continent of Europe, Africa, America and Asia.
This process is becoming more and more current and unavoidable in its fight against social vulnerability, inequality, the fight against all forms of discrimination, integration and social inclusion for the promotion of leadership, integrated governance, of peace and reconciliation processes in Guinea-Bissau and in Latin American countries.

The inspiring influence of Ubuntu will transform the world into a space for universal and permanent dialogue, of collaboration between the different political and social actors for the well-being, human dignity and peace and social justice of peoples and nations based on the spirit of Ubuntu.
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Ubuntu Leaders Academy in Venezuela: a window of hope

Norma Perez102

General Context

Venezuela is plunged into an unprecedented crisis. One of the signs is the constant violation of human rights in all orders (social, economic, political, etc.) and targeted repression for the defense of these rights. The weakening of the institutions that serve the citizens, the opacity of information and the deterioration of the citizen’s culture are verified, all of which threaten democratic values.

During the year 2017 we had 4 months (April, May, June and July) of continuous protests against the deprivation of basic goods of health, food, security and the high cost of living. The balance of these protests was, many wounded, deaths and prisoners product of the violent repression of the government.

According to the monitoring of the Venezuelan Observatory of Social Conflict, the cycle of protests that began on April 1, 2017 consisted of: 6729 protests, 5431 detainees, 132 deaths and 428 looting. While in 2018, only in the first three months, there were more than 1,600 protests nationwide.
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The 2017 protests differ from those registered in 2018 in two ways: the motivations for the 2017 protests were basically political; those of 2018, are based on socio-economic claims linked to the dizzying rise in prices, insecurity, unemployment and the collapse of public services.

On the other hand, the protests have become widespread in the national territory; they do not concentrate in Caracas and state capital cities, but there have been protests in large and small cities. Equally, the discomfort does not make distinctions between social strata. Testimonials from popular sectors show that the cause of the discomfort, expressed by law (protests) or illegally (looting) originate in shortages, unemployment, insecurity and rising prices.

Why did people take to the streets?

82% of Venezuelan households live in poverty. The shortage of food and basic products decimates the population. Venezuela has become the poorest country in Latin America according to the Survey on Living Conditions in Venezuela (Encovi). The country is the second with the most lethal violence in the world.

The public services of education, health, communications, transport, electricity, among others have collapsed and have claimed thousands of lives. The collapse of the electricity supply service began in 2003, but every day it deteriorates at an accelerated pace, leaving every sector of the country in the dark every day.

In economic matters, the production of expropriated and nationalized companies has fallen to the ground. Venezuela only produces and exports - increasingly less - oil of increasingly dubious quality. In 2017, PDVSA’s production fell to 81 thousand barrels per day, as reported by the Organi-
zation of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC). In addition to this, the estimates of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), for 2018, annual inflation will be 1,000,000% compared to post-war Germany and Zimbabwe in 2000.

In the political-institutional, the Executive controls all the powers (legislative, judicial, citizen and electoral). At the end of 2015, the National Assembly was elected with a qualified majority composed of opposition parties, which allowed it to stop international loans and call public officials to declare their public management, among other powers.

Nine months later, the Executive still ignored it and, in mid-2018, decides to create a National Constituent Assembly, which acts as an institution parallel to the one elected in 2015. The ANC was presented to the nation as a mechanism to seek solutions to the social crisis, scarcity, insecurity, etc. But, in a survey conducted by Datanalisis, it is noted, before the ANC consultation, that 85% of the population did not agree with its constitution because it was evaluated as useless.

**Migration as a reaction**

The strong repression and the crisis created a great feeling of despair. One of the responses to those feelings, was to migrate. It is estimated that more than one and a half million Venezuelans have emigrated through legal means, but other figures handled by NGOs, affirm that migration is between 10 and 15% of the total population. Border countries have taken action against what is already considered a migratory and humanitarian crisis.

One of the groups that has experienced a mass exodus has been young Venezuelans, regardless of their socioeconomic origin. They see their pos-
sibilities for the future diminished, since they can not access the goods and / or services that guarantee quality of life. Access to quality education and health services have been seriously compromised. On the other hand, the restrictions to make their voices heard in the political sphere, as well as the limited capacity of the institutions to process their demands and generate policy responses in accordance with them, generates despair and political apathy.

Given all this complex situation, there are still young people committed to continue in Venezuela, as well as human rights, political and social organizations that act to contribute to the restoration of democracy. In the case of young people, we can see that many of them are involved in organizations of the third sector, promoting social benefits and taking them through projects to poor communities. For example, there are young people who serve as volunteers in organizations of the private sector, religious groups and more commonly initiatives of universities and civil society in poor communities (especially in Caracas).

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy in Venezuela: implementation amid the wave of protests

An initiative co-created by Ashoka Venezuela and IPAV

In the middle of a wave of protests in 2018, the Director of Ashoka Región Andina (Venezuela), made a working trip in Colombia, where she met Rui Marques, founder of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy, who was replicating his methodology in Bogotá, inviting her to replicate it in Venezuela.

It is important to mention that Ashoka is an international organization, with more than 30 years of experience that promotes a world in which we can all be Agents of Change, a world that responds quickly and effectively to
social challenges, where each individual has the freedom, trust and social support to address social problems and drive change.

Ashoka strives to shape a global, enterprising and competitive citizen sector, which allows social entrepreneurs to thrive and, in turn, citizens to think and act as Agents of Change. In the last three decades, the global citizen sector, led by social entrepreneurs, has grown exponentially.

Social entrepreneurs are creating innovative solutions, showing extraordinary results and improving the lives of millions of people, without the need to involve the State or the business. Currently, there are approximately 3,400 social entrepreneurs and the organization is present in 90 countries.

Currently, Ashoka’s scope has expanded significantly, since it leads initiatives in co-creation with the network of social entrepreneurs and local and international partners of each of the countries where it is present.

This is how the initiative of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy comes to Venezuela in a co-created way with its organization and other partners that joined the initiative, such as: the Ágora Civil Association, the Voluntary Dividend for the Community and the Social Network Uriji Jami.

**Young Resilient Change Agents**

In order to select the Young Change Agents, to participate in the training process, the Snowball Mapping methodology was used, which is a method to gather information and which allows mapping the ecosystem (in this case youth) fast and with a low budget.

Using this methodology, 30 young leaders of organizations in the civil society sector were selected, who met the following criteria:
Diversity: We give priority to young creators of changes with backgrounds from different socioeconomic strata.

Engaged in public affairs: Young people had strong emotional roots with the problems they are solving from their organizations.

Collaborative Leaders: We identified young people whose leadership is collaborative, where the leader inspires, mobilizes, involves and empowers other young agents of change in the process.

Long term commitment: with the execution of the idea and with the country.

Innovation: It must have a creative, innovative, disruptive, intelligent and effective approach to the problem it intends to solve.

Once the young people were selected, they were asked appoint 1 to 2 young beneficiaries of their projects or members of their team with whom they work. In total, 55 young people aged 20 to 35 were selected.

The type of training program that was offered to the selected young people was a program of Ubuntu Week, which consists of an intensive workshop of 65 consecutive days. In it, five (5) personal skills are reinforced: service leadership, empathy, self-knowledge, self-confidence and resilience. Likewise, they were trained in storytelling tools, to communicate their personal history in order to motivate others.

After the face-to-face training was carried out, follow-up meetings with the participants were coordinated to promote a Young Ubuntu network and thus carry out co-creations with Ashoka. The first co-creation was
to launch a storytelling campaign, product of the training, called **Ubuntu Lives**, where each young person told their story.

**Impact of the Academy in Venezuela: everlasting Hope**

The failures accumulated by the opposition political leadership to reach power and achieve change during 2018, generated a context of hopelessness that resulted in young people demobilizing.

It is in the spirit and in the attitude of the young people that we can see the main impact of the training process of the Ubuntu Venezuela Leaders Academy. The 55 young people trained, leaders of 30 organizations, went through an intense process of profoundly reflective personal transformation, accompanied by dynamic activities and innovative methodologies.

In the process they became aware of their power as Agents of Change and their transforming power of the environment to assume their responsibility to be protagonists of their present and future. In the words of some of them:

“(...) The Ubuntu Leaders Academy reconnected us with hope, with the conviction of having the certainty that it is possible to change our reality ... and that we can influence to achieve freedom in Venezuela”.
The work teams composed of young graduates set themselves the following objectives:

1. **Ubuntu Lives Book**: Write a book of experiences, called “Writers of Hopes”, where the participants are reconstructing their stories. For this, they coordinated the realization of a workshop that provided storytelling tools.

2. **Ubuntu Lives Videos**: Six (6) videos were made that give an account of the experience, in order to inspire other young people, with the support of a network of young people trained by the leaders during Ubuntu Week.

3. **Ubuntu co-creation**: The graduates have carried out joint actions, alliances between their organizations on issues such as: strengthening democracy, training programs where service leadership has been incorporated, film forums, street actions of peaceful protest, radio broadcasting, joint activities in Places and presence in public spaces.

4. **Internacional Representation**: Ricardo Racinni, a graduate of the UBUNTU Leaders academy, traveled to Brussels representing Venezuela in the European Parliament on February 11, 2019 to present the humanitarian emergency in Venezuela.

5. **International training and multidisciplinary teams**: Vanesa Vargas, another graduate of the Ubuntu Week program, traveled to Peru on behalf of Venezuela to facilitate training in two more cities: Lima and Chiclayo. With the replication of the experience, Ubuntu seeks to strengthen knowledge and regional leadership as well as creating an international and multidisciplinary training network that contributes to enrich the perspectives and scope of the Ubuntu training.
Given the success of the program on the Young trainees, the Ashoka regional coordinator, Norma Perez, proposed bringing to the country the annual program of the Ubuntu Academy, which is exploring financial partners to the implementation of it.

As a first step towards this goal, the regional coordinator traveled in November 2018 to the Ubuntu headquarters in Lisbon, Portugal. There, she received the induction to the program accompanied by the materials to be able to advance in the replication of the 10 modules that make up the annual training.

The expectations about the next application are great. The young people who were trained expressly expressed their interest in being part of the first cohort of the Ubuntu Annual Academy.

If Ubuntu Week, in just 6 days, has empowered young people in servant leadership, self-perception, confidence in their abilities to generate change, the 12 month training would be a great contributor of the strengthening of a generation of young people who will drive the changes that the country so badly needs, but also help them to visualize their vocation and draw, in the midst of chaos, a plan for their life.

The Ubuntu Leaders Academy is, a light of hope in the midst of the storm.

“All nature is a longing for service; the cloud, serves the air, serves the furrow. Where there is a tree to plant, plant it yourself; where there is an error to amend, amend it yourself; where there is an effort that everyone dodges, accept it.

Be the one who sets aside the stubborn stone of the road, be the one who separates the hatred between the hearts and the difficulties of the problem (...) “. Excerpt from the poem “The Pleasure to serve”. Gabriela Mistral, Nobel Prize for Literature
Bayanihan\textsuperscript{103}: the Filipino Ubuntu Spirit Bayanihan

\textit{Mx. Anthony D. Lopez}\textsuperscript{104}

I grew up in a not-so-well-off community. Most of the houses were made of light materials – plywood, bamboo, nipa (native roofing material), sometimes corrugated metal sheets and most of the time, second-hand materials salvaged from other people’s houses. It is a place where a small house of only 20 sqm could be a home for 1-3 families. Houses would be built inches away from each. True enough, you could even hear your next-door neighbors talk to one another. It’s not an unusual scene where I come from.

Although, depressing as it may seem, as Miss Universe 2019 Catriona Gray would put it, there is a constant silver lining surrounding any situation. I have always felt a sense of camaraderie and support coming from the members of the community. There is an unspoken feeling of connectedness that links each and every person in the area that results in beautiful relationships.

At any given day, you would see one neighbor giving a plate of food to another who may not have enough food to last for a day. In times of great need, especially after disasters, people from around the community would gather around the homes of those greatly affected and help them restore what was damaged. In times when families experience great loss by the death of a loved one, the women of the community would readily offer to
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lead the 9-day novena prayer for the deceased. All of these done without expecting anything in return. All of these are done because of “Bayanihan”.

“Bayanihan” is an innate, traditional Filipino custom of mutual assistance ingrained in the country’s culture and everyday life. In the course of history, there have been some varying definitions cited by different sources. Although, the most popular definition of the word is contextualized when a group of people from the community helps move a house, usually made of very light materials, by affixing long and sturdy bamboo poles along the side of the building and carrying the whole thing on their shoulders solely powered by human strength. This is, again, without any expectation of any monetary or material compensation. (But, often times, the homeowner serves up a small feast for the people who helped!) A feat that can scarcely be seen in other cultures and nations.

Some experts say that the word Bayanihan comes from “Bayani” which means hero or someone who does something without expecting anything in return and -han, a suffix forming nouns denoting reciprocal or mutual action. According to themixedculture.com, it comes from “Bayan” which means country, nation, town or community. So, literally, it means “being in a bayan”, which refers to the spirit of communal unity, work and cooperation.

In the recent success of superhero movies, one could ask, how are heroes made? What makes them so different from other people?

It’s definitely about power! Well, not the ones that come from mystical hammers, technologically advanced iron armors nor alien stones that could wipe out half of the universe’s population. I am talking about the power to help other people in a way that could pull them out of their current situations including the potential of changing their lives for the better. So, if one uses this power for good, it becomes a source of positivity. One becomes a hero.
Bayanihan is the expression of the community’s unity and cooperation in the belief that the people around them will be the same people who can help in times of need. No matter the task, the overall sense of connectedness and belongingness in the community finds a way to overcome the hurdles.

Filipinos are considered to be one of the most resilient people in the world. With the constant streak of natural and man-made calamities – typhoons, earthquakes, flashfloods, and landslides – the Filipino people has shown the world that they are able to stand up and pick ourselves from the rubble; that they are able to hold another person’s hand and rebuild what was destroyed; and that they are able to move on and move forward to a better future for everyone.

Like Ubuntu, Bayanihan exemplifies the overarching mantra of humanity – “I am because you are”. Providing guidance to the everyday dealings of the regular Filipino and reaffirms the connection of each and every person to one communal goal. The spirit of Bayanihan may be of Filipino origin, but the implications and the applications contribute greatly to the work geared towards peace, understanding and unity.

Ubuntu inspires, encourages, empowers and revitalizes the human person. Add the spirit of Bayanihan, the idealism and philosophy of Ubuntu is given a dimension where it is applied and practiced in everyday life. And the more it is taught and applied, the more it becomes a lifestyle which could be passed down from generation to generation. This helps realize the creation of “Intergenerational Ubuntu Individuals and Families”. Generations of individuals and families that embody the Ubuntu spirit.


Be the hero for humanity. Be Ubuntu.
Care for life and social change initiatives: Ubuntu leadership experience in Latin America

*Luz Angela Beltran*105

In this article I express a multiplicity of emotions, questions, challenges and achievements that I lived and experienced during the Ubuntu training “I am because you are”, in Colombia and Latin America, taking up the analogy of my mentors in this process: Rui Marques, Kattia Hernández and Inés. Going through each of the moments and pillars of the training can be compared to being in a mountain, where there are ups and downs, which are reflected in the deep confrontations allowed by the Ubuntu Leaders Academy.

That is why I have built this reflective journey in Ubuntu, in three moments:

The first one is related to the incidence of leadership training, service in my life experience and in the other participants in Colombia, and in the second I describe my role as a trainer of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy at the Universidad del Pacífico in Peru. These two sections will center on the impact of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy in Latin America.

To start I’d like to share what has been part of the Academy, from my experience as a Latina woman, teacher and Volunteer Leader of the Minuto

---
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de Dios University Corporation - UNIMINUTO, a Higher Education Institution in Bogotá Colombia, which was contacted at 2018, for the first time, regarding this philosophy of life, All of us students, volunteers, teachers and leaders of social organizations went through participatory reflections and methodologies, which unleashed personal questions and life affirmation processes and particular ways of reading life experiences.

At the beginning, questions emerged such as: “what is it that I am looking for here?”, “what do I intend to contribute and learn in the training?” These personal interpellations allowed a display of self-awareness and co-responsibility with others; I experienced, in period of my life full of hopelessness and lack of confidence in others, overshadowed my optimism, also in the stories of young people, men and women who expressed their daily struggles, their feelings, dreams, desires, pains and longings, which are woven into the passing of our daily life and that are conditioning certain ways of reading reality, of locating ourselves in it and of establishing our relational framework.

From my training process, I remember many testimonies from students and teachers, in two of the workshops “Overcoming obstacles and Ubuntu Lives”, where they calmly expressed the anger and pain of being mistreated, as well as the fears with which they live in a world where violence, patriarchy and injustice are legitimized that is, Ubuntu not only allowed us to recognize ourselves from the pains and desires, but also let us be in all its extension. In the words of Norma Moreno, UNIMINUTO teacher: ... “Being part of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy is the opportunity to strengthen me, many times the people themselves do not know that we have dignity, that is, we do not consider ourselves subjects-autonomous individuals, with useful knowledge, with the capacity to build society, with rights, but simply individuals who comply with rules or break them. In Ubuntu Leaders Academy, we need to look ourselves in the eye, exchange points of view ... and then reflect in depth on these points of view, from leaders, from trainers, from the voices of distant people, from other times
and places ... and that places us all before the wonderful opportunity of simply Being”.

On the other hand, I highlight the training received in Colombia, the relevance that Ubuntu gives to the relational-emotional dimension, decentering reason as the sole axis of decision in human action, recognizing emotionality as one of the fundamental columns, in which the subjectivities of people are held and configured.

This relational-emotional pillar was of great impact on those of us who participated in the training, because we consider it fundamental in a context like the Colombian one that has been marked by fractured relationships, due to the long history of violence in the country, more than 60 (sixty) years, in which multiple inequalities, injustices and exclusions have been perpetuated, which are manifestations of structural political, economic and social problems.

In a context as complex as the Colombian one it is crucial to locate the Ubuntu training, as a bet that seeks to weave bridges mainly with what confronts human existence. In this way, it is essential to expand the work of Ubuntu in Colombia, since it could unleash processes of profound change, which will allow us to go beyond the complacent or resigned observation of reality, which is often overwhelming. That is why I believe that Ubuntu contributes to social change, because it challenges and problematizes the “normal course of things,” particularly that of the violence that has permeated the territories and communities and that has generated so much pain and indignation in Colombian society.

Now I want to emphasize my second moment in Ubuntu, not as a participant in the training, but as a multiplier and trainer at the Universidad del Pacífico in Peru, a fantastic experience that made possible the encounter, the real encounter, starting with myself, and in my relation through others, who have cultural, formative and age distinct from mine. But when we
coincide in the same space, accompanied by a reflective methodology, we put ourselves in the same starting point: I am, because you are.

The highlight of this experience in Peru, the reflections from the training with respect to the questioning of the logics of competitiveness in our current times, where there is a dehumanizing demand for success related to having, that lead us to see the people who surround us as our opponents. In this context, the Ubuntu Leaders Academy helps us to remember that we are beings connected by a purpose: To be and to help people be; people with conflicts, but with the ability to manage them, in dialogue, in the recognition of that other in front of me, that confronts me and that builds me.

I also highlight from the training how the ties of affection were woven through empathic, affective, emotional and symbolic exchanges that generated reciprocal relationships of giving, receiving and giving back. In the words of Luan, one of the participants of the training in Peru:

“Ubuntu represented an opportunity to approach my own tragedies and give them a more positive sense. In my life, I have had many traumas which I never shared because they would have generated a lot of pain and sadness.

At the beginning I was very afraid to tell my life experience but feeling the empathy of others gave me the security I needed to continue. UBUNTU allowed me to reflect and transform what I thought were lacks in strengths and feel that they served as an example of improvement for others who also faced difficulties. I thank the training for giving me that safe space for building self-confidence.”
To conclude, I call on attendees to continue expanding and strengthening the action of the Ubuntu Leaders Academy in Latin America, because it is an expression of citizen participation through concrete action, where men and women demonstrate their great commitment to advance in the construction of a fairer society, in a region that has gone through unequal conditions, according to the latest ECLAC and OXFAM reports, the most unequal region in the world. Also, different types of violence and exclusion occur within relationships, racism, classism, and individualism.

To conclude I want to thank Ubuntu for promoting an ethics of care, transcends the field of semantics towards significance, because the new social struggles are for life, for water, for culture, for the most basic conditions of human existence, which are not taken into account by the global world and its colonial elite pattern “.

I also thank Ubuntu for cracking and disrupting those mechanisms that have naturalized and legitimized violence and social injustice, breaking with the “normalization” of the structures of injustice and social inequality; in the words of Svampa, 2013 “making seen” what is shown as invisible and “making felt” that, from feeling so much, makes them insensible to bodies.

Thank you very much, other worlds are possible!!
The Ubuntu experience in Peru

Jorge Ueyonahara

Since I was a child I have always liked to learn new things, and as a university teacher this is an indispensable requirement to update and improve my teaching techniques. I am always on the lookout for new training opportunities in order to be able to provide the best learning experience to my students. Therefore, when I was invited to participate in the Ubuntu Leaders Academy, I did not hesitate and I said yes.

Having participated in the Ubuntu Leaders Academy has been a very enriching experience, not only at a personal level but also at a professional level.

Peru is going through a difficult stage at a social, political, economic and environmental level, where problems such as violence, corruption are delaying other aspects of development such as health and education. Education in Peru is full of challenges, where private education is in many cases better than public education, since only those who have the economic resources to do so can access education. This situation leaves many people at a disadvantage. Given that there are many people who do not receive adequate education, problems such as violence, corruption tend to persist because these people consider it the “right” way to do business, thus creating a vicious circle, which could only be changed, through education.
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Ubuntu arrived in Peru in the last week of November 2018: the Training of Trainers took place followed by the Ubuntu Week in the first week of December. Although only two months ago my training ended, I allow myself to make this reflection.

The Training of Trainers gave the opportunity to 10 people to learn about the Ubuntu methodology from Rui Marques and during the Ubuntu Week we had the opportunity to train 22 people. As I speak to you now, in Peru the second edition of the Ubuntu Week (in less than two months) is taking place, since there was a lot of interest after the first edition, and we wanted to take advantage of the summer vacation (as opposed to the winter season in Europe) to carry out this training. At the moment 17 trainers and 29 participants are being trained. In Chiclayo, north of Peru, 45 people were trained, a total of 123 people all together.

Now I want to tell you how Ubuntu as a European project can impact on the training of future leaders specifically in Peru. I am a part-time professor at Universidad del Pacífico, whose focus is training in relation to economic and business sciences.

The union of Ubuntu with Universidad del Pacífico, occurred naturally, since both focus on the training of leaders. On the one hand, Ubuntu focuses on servant leadership targeting the common good and the Universidad del Pacífico focuses on responsible leaders around the world. For me, both approaches are the same expressed in different ways in which global prosperity is sought responsibly.

The subjects taught at university can change according to market demands or new world trends, the most valuable of all this is that students not only learn and master the subject content but obtain the skills such as teamwork, critical thinking, responsible citizenship, leadership, among others, that each academic course seeks to achieve, so that somehow the content of the course does not become the center of education, but the means by
which the students can always adapt to the new situations that professional and personal life may demand of them.

It is true that many of the topics that I teach today can be forgotten in a few months and years, but I know from my own experience that the different activities that are done in class to reinforce the theoretical part will be hard to forget and may be remembered for a long time or even forever. The foregoing is reinforced by a proverb from Confucius “what I hear, I forget; what I see, I remember; what I do, I learn”, so” doing “(practicing) has a powerful effect and immediate impact on the student and on the development of the class session. I must add that during the Ubuntu sessions many dynamics are carried out, and in some cases the use of personal experiences is required, so it is ensured that the acquired knowledge is put into practice immediately.

The word Ubuntu has an African origin that means “I am because you are” and that we are who we are through our relationship with others. The Ubuntu method seeks the promotion of Servant Leadership through the development of 5 pillars: The first 3 pillars are self-knowledge, self-confidence, resilience that focuses on the person through reflection sessions creating an opportunity for personal discovery and growth, and then the last 2 pillars are empathy and service focusing on interpersonal relationships developed through group dynamics to put into practice teamwork and leadership.

The skills promoted by the Ubuntu method, through non-formal education, complement the academic training of students in order to train ethical, responsible and supportive professionals. This is where the knowledge and skills of non-formal education and formal education can achieve synergies that enhance each other.
What I learned during the Ubuntu Leaders Academy helped me to explore and reflect on my positive qualities in order to strengthen them and also those aspects that require improvement. The Ubuntu Leaders Academy has been logically planned where each activity and each day has a specific objective within this experience. All this will allow me to put in practice a greater number of tools and in this way to get the students to reinforce and develop their personal skills and at the same time reach the expected competences of the course.

The courses I teach are related to sustainable development, specifically the Corporate Social Responsibility and the Circular Economy, for which it is required that students not only master the theory or know the good management practices that in essence seek to improve the conditions and expectations of the different economic actors in front of social and environmental problems derived from the activities of an organization.

I understand that many countries of the European Community are working or have implemented roadmaps under the Circular Economy scheme at the city or country level to make their communities more sustainable. The requirement to work under this scheme will sooner or later reach the suppliers of products for Europe having to meet these demands, as at some point the Corporate Social Responsibility, so I am excited to know that through my teaching I am able in some way to influence Peruvian companies that provide quality products both in Peru and within the European Community. The portuguese initiative of Ubuntu in Peru, can return to Portugal and Europe in the form of better products and services that not only meet the demands of customers, but with production standards framed within SDG 12 (Production and Responsible Consumption).

Now with the incorporation of the Ubuntu method I hope that students and future professionals can incorporate and practice leadership with a service focus, which has a purpose that seeks to achieve not only economic objectives but also social and environmental objectives for the common
good. Then the “I am because you are” will be reflected in the fact that a healthy person, company, organization or community can only thrive in an equally healthy environment.

Fortunately, the Ubuntu Leaders in Peru Academy count not only on people related to the Universidad del Pacífico, but also on social entrepreneurs, consultants and academics from other universities, with which it is expected that Servant Leadership can be replicated in other areas of the Peruvian society. The participants have been given tools that have allowed them to discover their strengths and express their deepest dreams, while creating relationships, bridges and hope for a better society.

It is evident that we alone cannot change the educational situation of a country, but at least we can impact from our daily tasks, that the actions we take not only make sense for us, but for all.

Finally, I want to conclude my participation with a phrase that Mandela said “Education is the most powerful weapon you can use to change the world” and I firmly believe that the Ubuntu philosophy in Peru is a powerful tool that can help promote the development that we all want and need as a society, if we want to live in harmony and prosperity.

Thank you.
For a Servant Leadership
“We would like to believe that the African Ubuntu concept will make a genuine contribution to such a new global ethic. Given its profound relational dimensions, Ubuntu crosses all kinds of borders, be they political, economic, cultural or from the civil society. Consequently, Ubuntu has the potential to influence all spheres of public policy, of citizenship, of people development and of governance. We can look at Ubuntu as a moral philosophy or, in postmodern language, as a meta-narrative”.

John Volmink