

Towards a Coherent Unity of Perspectives on Peace: Burton, Lederach and the Philosophy of Ken Wilber

Henry Lebovic¹

Abstract: This master's degree dissertation uses the philosophical schema of Ken Wilber, known as the integral model, and the Spiral Dynamics[®] approach based on psychologist Clare Graves' work and promoted by Don Beck and Christopher Cowan, to explore the work of peace scholar-practitioners, John Burton and John Paul Lederach. It asks: Can the Integral model and Spiral Dynamics be utilised in analyses to explore the causes and sources of conflict, and the limitations of peace theory and practice? If so, can these schemas be used prescriptively to help design more effective approaches to peacebuilding? Such an analytical schema reveals that Burton's human needs theory makes claims to holism that ultimately fell short, primarily because of the reduction of culture to behaviour. In addition, his reliance on cognitive approaches and the aspect of assumed neutrality were found to be problematic. In contrast, Lederach's concern with subjective causes and solutions of conflict was closer to the "integral holism" Wilber advocates. Lederach's values, which were made more explicit than Burton's, were also found to be congruent with the second-tier value approach of Spiral Dynamics. Furthermore, research within the peace studies literature, as demonstrated here, lends support to the experimental analyses conducted in this dissertation. Finally, the small body of "integrally-aware" peace scholarship, which is also reviewed, illustrates how integral theory might emerge as an important tool for analysing and shaping future peacebuilding initiatives.

Keywords: Conflict resolution, conflict transformation, human needs theory, John W. Burton, John Paul Lederach, peacebuilding, Spiral Dynamics[®]

Introduction

My own intellectual journey has taken me from science and technology, via almost twenty years spent in the corporate I.T. world, to the study of peace and conflict. Along the way, I discovered the philosophical model of Ken Wilber, a contemporary American writer of the last 30 years and I came to three observations that grow in salience as my journey into the social sciences progresses. These observations form the motivation of this dissertation for my master's degree in peace and conflict studies.

First, theories that are powerful in a particular context seemed to provide only partial answers at best, or are of minimal value at worst, when applied outside the domain defined by their assumptions and core knowledge. This includes many of the "ideas" I encountered in the I.T.

¹ Henry Lebovic attained a Bachelor of Science in 1984, and worked for 16 years in Information Technology. He recently completed a Masters in Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Sydney, Australia, where he won the Gordon Rodley prize for 2011.

lebovic@bigpond.net.au

This work is dedicated to the memory of Regina Lebovic Nee Weitzenova, 1923-2011.



world concerning human behaviour, as well as much of what I learnt about modern economics such as the construct of “homo economicus” or “economic human.”² Second, I came to believe that interdisciplinary approaches may be an antidote to that partiality, because of the variety of perspectives these disciplines span and because the knowledge and understanding that emerges is greater than the sum of the parts that constitute it. I came to understand this concept as holism and discovered it was a purported characteristic of peace and conflict studies. Finally, I observed, both in everyday life and in academia, that ideas and theories were necessarily predicated on a particular worldview or set of values. However, frequently these were not made explicit and in many cases, seemed unconscious to those who espoused them. Those values, it appeared to me, shaped and limited the application of the theory, from how and what data is gathered, through to the way methodologies are constructed, research planned and results evaluated.

The study of conflict and peace and the practice of peacebuilding claims to be far more explicit with respect to its values and actively seeks to employ an interdisciplinary, more holistic approach to research and practice. However, is this really so? If it is, to what extent do those values shape theories? Is there a framework for bringing disciplines together in a coherent way? By utilising Wilber’s model, would it be possible to create a set of lenses through which theories could be tested, both for the limitations outlined above and for their durability and wider application to more complex human problems? To explore these questions, I examine the work of John Burton and John Paul Lederach, in particular. These two theorists have been selected in large part because they are well regarded and remain popular within contemporary peace and conflict studies, and are well documented and widely discussed within the literature. The work of others such as Norwegian peace scholar, Johan Galtung or American peace educator, Betty Reardon would also be a valuable addition to these two theorists for the same reasons I have outlined. However, time and space constraints prevent this here and a future examination along these lines would be an extension of this research.

In this research, then, I ask two questions:

1. Can Wilber’s “AQAL Model” and the related Spiral Dynamics^{®3} schema be used in an analytically descriptive manner to explore the causes and sources of conflict, and the utility and limitations of peace theory and practice?
2. Can those schemas be used prescriptively, to help design more effective approaches to peacebuilding? In other words, is the complexity of violent conflict and the challenge of sustainable peacebuilding best dealt with by Wilber’s “integral approach” and Beck and Cowan’s second-tier value systems (“vMemes”)?

Ken Wilber’s AQAL model is not a theory about peace and conflict. Its roots lie in sociology, psychology, the physical sciences, cultural studies, phenomenology, spirituality and religion, amongst others. While it is primarily regarded as a theory of philosophy, its breadth and eclectic roots are likely to remind readers of theories from these other disciplines, including some from peace and conflict studies. Wilber’s model can be described as a map providing a way to view

² This refers to the abstraction of a narrowly self-interested, rational human in pursuit of maximum wealth for minimum effort. The term was coined in reaction to the political economy of John Stuart Mill. See Persky, 1995, pp. 221-231.

³ “Spiral Dynamics” is a registered trademark. The ® symbol is indicated in only this first use of the trademarked name; hereafter, Spiral Dynamics is used.

and explore other theories and ideas. It is often called a meta-theory (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 1) in the sense that it is beyond a theory – it can be thought of as situated above the landscape of specialised theories, providing a view from which one can spot relationships, trajectories and even vacant territory regarding theoretical locations. The word “integral” is key to Wilber’s model. An “integral” approach, by Wilber’s definition, is one that tries to include as many perspectives, styles and methodologies as possible within a coherent view of a topic (as cited in Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 1). The integral map has five distinct components or elements: (Wilber, 2006, pp. 1-40)

1. Quadrants: encompassing the perspectives of intention, behaviour, culture and society.
2. Lines or streams of development (i.e. intelligences, capacities, e.g. cognitive, emotional, moral, values).
3. The stages through which those lines progress, revealing greater complexity.
4. States of consciousness.
5. Personality types (e.g. gender).

I will be considering only the first three of the above elements because they are the most directly relevant to the three observations stated at the beginning of this section. The term “AQAL,” which stands for All Quadrants, All Lines, is derived from the first two elements above. The term implies that an “integral” approach requires a consideration of all quadrants, all lines, all stages, all states and all types. The use of development lines and stages will focus primarily on the values lines which Wilber identifies and which is developed in more detail by the Spiral Dynamics theory of Graves (1974), Beck and Cowan (1996). The stages within this line of development are also known as “value Memes” or vMemes and they are colour-coded for ease of recollection (see below). The theory identifies particular patterns or types of values as they emerge and matches them to the types of challenges they are best suited to addressing.

This work draws upon academic literature in diverse and germane areas: the philosophical theories of Ken Wilber and what I consider to be subsidiary psychological theories by Clare Graves, Don Beck and Chris Cowan; the published works of John Burton and those of John Paul Lederach; academic articles reflecting on the work of Burton and Lederach and peace theory and practice relevant to the analyses conducted herein; and lastly a small body of work which represents the first steps in integrating Wilberian ideas with peace practice. In the case of the major academics I examine, I focus primarily on their significant and later works, in an attempt to accurately capture their most mature views. In the case of Lederach, the progression of his writings is also of some particular interest.

The first section outlines the three elements of Wilber’s model indicated above in sufficient detail to allow the reader to engage in the analysis that follows. This includes examples, but it does not make any explicit connections to peace and conflict theory. In the following two sections, Burton and Lederach’s work are summarized, drawing out those particular aspects that are to be the subject of the descriptive analysis of the second part of each of those sections. The analysis determines the extent to which they could be considered integral, by Wilber’s definition. This includes a four-quadrant analysis, an examination of various “development lines” and their prominence, and a consideration of the value Meme (vMemes) that are evident in the theories and practices.

The first part of the fourth section compares the observations derived from applying Wilber's model to Burton and Lederach's theories with peace and conflict literature. This analysis finds some striking similarities and starts to paint a picture of the prescriptive value of the AQAL model to peace and conflict theory. Practitioners and theorists in a number of disciplines have begun to develop more complete, holistic approaches to the challenges in their specific fields. The second part of this fourth section considers how this could begin to be undertaken in peacemaking, using Wilber's model as a schema and Burton and Lederach's models as components. A handful of examples are documented by way of illustration.

It is argued here that integral theory could become a valuable tool for the analysis and prescription of peace theory and peacebuilding practice. The analyses undertaken in this dissertation are not only illustrative of how to use integral theory as a set of lenses, but they also suggest how it may be possible to move towards a coherent unity of perspectives on peace. The suggestions for further research in the conclusion advances this goal by expanding both the frame of analysis and the scope of peace theory.

Section One: An Introduction to the Integral Model

Since his first book in 1977, Ken Wilber's ideas have been refined and expanded over a series of books. With a background in the sciences and yet, deeply interested in the spiritual traditions from across the world, Wilber's drive has been to create a synthesis of the wisdoms and insights already available to humanity in a coherent way that can provide a practical map for navigating our future. His sources include the insights of both East and West, from science and religion, and from the perspectives of pre-modern, modern and post-modern.

This section begins by examining the ideas of holism and integralism, as Wilber uses them. These ideas are underpinned by the notions of holons, holarchy, and the existence of non-reducible perspectives, corresponding to domains of knowledge. The domains, which form the four quadrants of the Integral model, are then explained in detail. An inherent aspect of these quadrants is the unfolding of greater depth and complexity, as manifested in the development lines and stages and this is examined here. Particular attention is paid to the development in the subjective quadrants as they relate to human experience. The values line is then explored in more depth, because of its relevance to the examination of Burton and Lederach that is undertaken in the subsequent sections.

From Holism to Integral

But what is really meant by holism? For Wilber, the key underlying concept is that of a holon. In 1995, Wilber formulated his twenty tenets concerning the patterns of existence or tendencies of evolution. In the first of those tenets he asserts that "reality as a whole is not composed of things or processes but of holons. Composed, that is, of wholes that are simultaneously parts of other wholes, with no upward or downward limit" (Wilber, 2000b, p. 43). Thus, he sees reality as a hierarchy of holons – or a holarchy, in which there are an infinity of holons, each of which is a part of a still greater holon.

Wilber warns about two particular dangers that are common in our modern world. The first stems from the assertion that a particular holon is in fact the ultimate “whole,” that is, it is not a part of anything greater or more complete. This leads to repression and domination of higher holons over lower ones, often through the use of force. This can be entrenched in what Eisler calls “domination hierarchies” (as cited in Wilber, 2000b, p. 30). The second danger is what Wilber calls gross reductionism, which is the practice of reducing all material systems to material atoms – often called atomism.

In a sense, Wilber’s Integral framework is his attempt to make holism operational in the totality of human affairs. He understands “integral” in the sense of “comprehensive, inclusive, non-marginalizing, embracing” (as cited in Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 1). Key to achieving that is the recognition of four fundamental perspectives, which can be summarised as: subjective or intentional, objective or behavioural, inter-subjective or cultural and inter-objective or social (Wilber, 2000a, p. 73).

The AQAL Model’s Four Quadrants

These perspectives are known as the four quadrants and are often shown diagrammatically (such as in Wilber, 2000b, on p. 127). The two axes that divide the whole into four are based on two distinctions: the interior versus the exterior and the individual versus the collective. Thus, the upper-left quadrant corresponds to the internal perspective of an individual. It is concerned with psychology, spirituality, meaning and intentionality. This is characterised in language as the “I” perspective. The upper-right quadrant is the external view of individuals and is concerned with behaviour and observable phenomenon. The pronoun related to it is “IT.” The lower-left is the cultural dimension, or the inside awareness of the group and its worldview, its shared values and meanings, shared feelings and so forth. Its perspective is encapsulated by the pronoun “WE.” Finally, the lower-right is the social dimension (or the exterior forms and behaviours of the group, which are studied by third-person sciences such as systems theory. Characterised by the pronoun “ITS,” it includes the social, institutional, legal and political domains.

One of Wilber’s most compelling insights is that for a view to be considered “integral,” all four quadrants need to be included or considered. Problems emerge when you try to deny, dismiss or reduce any quadrant or perspective to another one (Wilber, 2006, p. 28). In particular, he warns against the attempt to reduce interiors to their exterior correlates, that is, collapsing subjective and inter-subjective realities into their objective aspects. This is known by some as “scientism” and Wilber gives this frame of reference the name “flatland” (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p. 3). In other words, when all “I’s” and all “we’s” are reduced to systems of interwoven “its,” we are engaged in a form of subtle reductionism (Wilber, 2000a, p. 73).

This type of reductionism is widespread. It is practiced, for example, by those neuroscientists who reduce all mind states to brain functions, asserting that consciousness is an epiphenomenon of brain activity. Similarly, it is being practiced by those systems theorists who reduce all culture and collective meaning to systems of interacting, autonomous units. Wilber does not deny the validity claims of science and empiricism, acknowledging that they accurately and importantly report on the exteriors of various phenomena. However, he is critical of an aggressive

imperialism that some scientists engage in when they try to “corner the market on truth” (Wilber, 2001, p. 21).

Reductionism in the opposite direction is also a concern for Wilber. Denial of the objective quadrants is a feature of extreme cultural constructivism. While Wilber supports the validity claim that many ideas are constructed according to various interests (power, sexism, racism etc), he is critical of any who might argue that only the lower-left (cultural) quadrant is “real” and deny the existence of objective truth(s) (Wilber, 2001, p. 23). In analysing the popular constructivists, he in fact finds that they do admit some objective truth and system, including Bataille, Derrida and Foucault (Wilber, 2000b, pp. 45-47).

One way that the four quadrants can be applied to conflict is in the analysis of behaviour. Such an analysis might start with questions such as “how do we behave?” and “why do we behave in the particular way we do?.” The first question is observational and descriptive in nature, so, while important, it is not analytical. The process of answering the second question can lead towards particular quadrants, depending on the analytical perspectives employed. One answer might be “due to socio-political and structural factors,” which leads to the lower-right (social) quadrant. Another answer is “because of brain states and chemistry, genetic characteristics and defects,” which implicates the upper-right (behavioural/empirical) quadrant. Alternatively, we might conclude, “it is a part of our culture and therefore is meaningful to us,” leading directly to the lower-left (cultural) quadrant. Finally, we might conclude, “it is rooted in our intentions, emotions, personal desires and beliefs,” which lands us in the upper-right (intentional) quadrant. Each of these answers may be simultaneously correct, or partially correct. Wilber’s model does not predict or prescribe what the answers to such questions will be in any specific case, but it does encourage a consideration of each of the possible answers as part of the analysis. In this way, an integral (or relatively complete) understanding is possible and derived action is likely to be more robust.

Wilber’s quadrant model not only describes the basic dimensions of our own awareness, available to us at any time, but also a set of (at least) four perspectives with which to analyse and understand any situation in our world (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p.7). However, it is often not enough to just be aware of the quadrants— it is also necessary to work with the depth and complexity within each domain (Esbjörn-Hargens, 2009, p.10).

Depth and Complexity: Developmental Lines and Stages

Since the work of Howard Gardner, educators, parents and the general population have become aware of the idea of diverse human capacities, or “multiple intelligences” that each of us possess. Although inter-related, each one is relatively independent and each one shows different levels of maturity or development within a single person. Gardner’s work builds upon the insights of the developmental structuralists, such as James Mark Baldwin, Jean Piaget, Jean Gebser, Abraham Maslow and numerous others. As Wilber (2007) explains, together they have revealed the nature of stage-like development within human consciousness (p. 55).

Wilber’s own model asserts that such developmental lines or “streams” exist in each of the four quadrants. Within the upper-left quadrant, humans possess approximately a dozen

development lines including cognitive, moral, interpersonal, emotional, psychosexual, kinesthetic, self, values and needs (Wilber, 2007, p. 58). Each of these capacities unfolds in various stages that are usually enduring and stable. They are also referred to as levels, because each represents a level of organization or a level of complexity (Wilber, 2006, p. 7). Each level is also a holon, because a stable, healthy level transcends, yet includes the previous level, building on their predecessors in specific ways which imply that stages or levels cannot be skipped (Wilber, 2006, p. 13).

Examples of the stages of development as they occur in each of the four quadrants can be seen in Wilber (1996, p. 1). There are strong correlates between the subjective and inter-subjective, particularly in the later stages shown. The archaic, magic, mythic and rational cultural stages map quite well onto the stages of psychological development of modern humans, a point that will be explored in more detail below when discussing Spiral Dynamics. By its very nature, development in the objective quadrants is more readily apparent. For example, in the upper-right quadrant, there is an increase in complexity as we follow the stream of development from atoms to molecules to cells to various types of organisms. Significantly, the progressive unfolding of the physical and social spheres is strongly correlated to that in the subjective (left-hand) quadrants. Similarly, in the social quadrant, there is an increase in complexity from foraging tribes, through horticultural and agrarian communities, on to industrial nation states, the modern informational states and a potential, future planetary society. Each of these societal structures is characterised by particular types of cultural holons. Although the correlation has been observed for some time, the causal relationship is not clear. Wilber holds the view that these levels are indications of an expanding, increasing consciousness, becoming more inclusive as you move up the holarchy. He sometimes expresses this as a movement from sub-conscious to self-conscious to super-conscious (Wilber, 2003, time index: 12m 45s). Alternatively, the progression can be described as one from pre-conventional to conventional to post-conventional, with each higher level exhibiting more depth and complexity than its predecessor.

Graves and Beyond: Values and vMememes

But why is the multiplicity of development lines, particularly those related to our subjective experience, important? Wilber proposes that each development line is, in fact, found in the responses we discern to the various questions life poses. For example, the cognitive line, as studied by Jean Piaget, is the response to the question, “what am I aware of?” Similarly, “of the things that I am aware of, what do I need?” is the question at the heart of needs development, as studied by Abraham Maslow. In response to the question, “of the things that I am aware of, what is the right thing to do?” we find the stages of moral intelligence, explored by Lawrence Kohlberg. Finally, the question, “of the things that I am aware of, which do I value most?” is answered in different ways based on one’s value system, first studied by Clare Graves and now a part of the Spiral Dynamics framework (Wilber, 2007, pp. 59-60).

The psychologist, Clare W. Graves, conducted his own research into values and human development from the 1950s through to the 1970s. He concluded that humans moved through various “levels of existence,” each of which was characterised by specific behaviour and values. Each stage was a response to specific life conditions and thus a person’s psychology can change as the conditions of their existence changes. Graves (1974) argued “man is learning that values

and ways of living which were good for him at one period in his development are no longer good because of the changed condition of his existence" (p. 72). Graves saw adult human psychology as an "unfolding, emergent, oscillating, spiralling process" in which humans moved through six "subsistence" levels, whose overall goal was individual survival and dignity (Graves, 1974, p. 73).

Graves' work was expanded by Don E. Beck and Christopher Cowan and named Spiral Dynamics in their 1996 book. They reframed the levels in terms of "memes," a term originating with Richard Dawkins who used it to describe a unit of cultural information. Later, psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi conceived of them as information units in our collective consciousness – a sort of intellectual virus that reproduces itself, from person to person and generation to generation. Beck and Cowan (1996) coined the term "value meme" or vMeme to describe a meta-meme that binds the smaller memes that had concerned Dawkins and Csikszentmihalyi. In essence, Graves' "levels of existence" became these vMememes, colour-coded for convenience (Beck & Cowan, 1996; also see <http://www.spiraldynamics.net/> and <http://spiraldynamics.org/>).

1. Beige: Semi-Stone Age
2. Purple: Tribal
3. Red: Exploitative
4. Blue: Authoritarian
5. Orange: Entrepreneurial
6. Green: Communitarian
7. Yellow: Systemic
8. Turquoise: Holistic

Beck and Cowan explain vMememes as the basic package of thought, motives and instructions that determine how we make decisions and prioritise our lives. In other words, they are the structure of thoughts, rather than the specific contents of thinking. These vMememes form an ordered spectrum of value systems, divided into two distinct tiers. Beck and Cowan explain that the values we hold are dependent upon both the conditions and circumstances of our lives and the way we respond to those circumstances and conditions (pp. 52-56). Obviously enough, this is the process of how a person grows and changes. The important point is that neither life conditions nor adaptive capacity is fixed: growth and change regularly occur. And the schema outlines how these changes unfold in a more or less ordered sequence. Beck and Cowan assert that higher vMememes increasingly offer more explanatory power and greater freedom to act as life's conditions become more complex (pp. 40-43). Thus, each vMeme is appropriate to the conditions of time and place. Although they emerge in a particular order, their strength can vary, brightening and dimming as these life conditions change. However, it must be mentioned that while vMememes express both healthy and unhealthy qualities, vMememes themselves are neither good nor bad, neither healthy nor unhealthy, neither positive nor negative.

Within the first-tier that Graves observed, the first vMeme was designated Beige by Beck and Cowan. It is the basic survival level, valuing food, water, warmth and safety above all else. It is characteristic of early humans and newborn infants. The Purple vMeme is characterised by animistic thinking, magical beliefs and is common in tribal environments and the Hogwarts School of Harry Potter stories. Kinship is important and powerful spirits rule the physical world. Beyond Purple lies Red, whose thinking is egocentric. There is a belief in the world as a jungle

full of threats and predators. It is impulsive, valuing power and thus it employs exploitative processes often in the pursuit of imperial social structures (pp.44-45).

With the emergence of the Blue vMeme, the thinking becomes absolutistic. Processes are authoritarian in nature. Highest value is placed on order, righteousness and stability. Although fundamentalist religions thrive under this vMeme, it was also responsible for legal and moral systems with an emphasis on retribution (pp. 44, 46). The Orange vMeme became dominant during the Western enlightenment. It values success, rationality and science. It is multiplistic in its thinking and in contrast to its predecessor, more delegative than rigidly authoritarian. Competition, strategic risk-taking and the efficient utilisation of resources are also highly valued. The final vMeme within the first-tier, designated Green, is described as communitarian, egalitarian and pluralistic. The thinking is relativistic and the favoured type of process is consensual. Sensitivity is valued over rationality, diversity over dogma, kindness over kinship, plurality over power (pp. 44, 46).

Significantly, Graves discovered vMememes beyond the first, “subsistence” tier. The “momentous leap” he referred to in the title of his 1974 paper is one in which humans cross “a chasm of unbelievable depth of meaning” (p. 75). Within this second (“being”) tier, Beck and Cowan have documented two levels so far, Yellow and Turquoise, which together they feel are representative of no more than 1% of the human population. Wilber (2000a) describes Yellow as “integrative,” able to grasp natural holarchies. Knowledge and competence is valued over rank, power, status, or group and egalitarianism is complemented with natural degrees of excellence where appropriate (p. 52). Turquoise thinking is global, viewing the world as a single, dynamic entity, sensitive to the deep inter-connectedness of all things, as well as collective mind and intuitive thinking. Beck and Cowan point to both James Lovelock’s Gaia hypothesis and Gandhi’s ideas of pluralistic harmony as examples (p. 47).

vMememes emerge in individual and collective thinking in response to life conditions. More complex problems and challenges initiate the process through which the higher, more complex vMememes emerge. However, each vMeme has its purpose and its time. Orange thinking can solve Orange problems, just as Green thinking can solve Green problems. A naughty toddler is a Blue problem requiring a healthy Blue approach (boundary setting and discipline) rather than an unhealthy Blue approach (violence) or, say, an Orange approach (bribery) or a Green approach (let junior explore his/her feelings of anger). More complex value systems (like Green) are capable of solving more complex problems, but don’t do so well with less complex ones.

A key insight of Spiral Dynamics theory, as Wilber explains it, is the observation that humans whose values and thinking are rooted within the first-tier are often convinced their own values are the “correct ones” for everyone. Whereas second-tier thinking can step back and grasp the big picture, appreciating the necessary role that all of the various vMememes play, first-tier thinking (of any colour) often reacts negatively if challenged and lashes out when threatened using its own tools and strengths (Wilber, 2000a, p. 51). A clue to why this is so may be found in Graves’ own words. He describes the gap between the first and second-tier as that “between deficiency or deficit motivation and growth or abundance motivation.” (Graves, 1974, p. 75)

Although Spiral Dynamics is concerned with only value systems (vMememes), the psychosocial implications are significant, particularly in the peace and conflict domain. It is, however, a

subordinate theory to Wilber's, because it does not address the perspectives represented by the four quadrants, nor does it theorise about other human capacities. Together, though, the integral model and Spiral Dynamics provide a framework for analysing all types of theory and practice. The next two sections demonstrate how this can be done within peace theory and peacebuilding. Far from being mere esoteric, philosophical schemas, these forthcoming sections show how these ideas can be made operational and relevant.

Section Two: John Burton and Human Needs Theory

Section one introduced the key elements of Wilber's integral model that I consider of most relevance to an exploration of peace and conflict theory. This section examines an application of Wilber to the ideas of John W. Burton, exploring both theoretical underpinnings and practical applications. First, the extent to which Wilber's four quadrants are being honoured in Burton's work is explored. This includes a search for any possible reductionism of one quadrant to another. Second, the degree to which Burton preferences one development line over another is determined and the implications of this discussed in terms of how it weakens the problem-solving approach. Finally, an examination of the values evident in Burton's framing of human needs theory and in the problem-solving workshop he advocates is undertaken. Are these values made explicit? What vMeme best characterises his work?

Burton's Key Theoretical Ideas: What Motivates Behaviour

During Burton's many years in international diplomacy, he observed that most efforts to create peace were limited to conflict settlement based on coercion, control and power politics. He concluded that such efforts ultimately fail because of the existence of frustrations and concerns under the surface that were not negotiable and could not be repressed (Burton, 1990, p. 13). Thus, he advocated a process of conflict resolution, which is concerned with root causes, uses a clearly articulated analytical approach and has at its core, human needs theory (Burton, 1990, p. 187).

Human needs theory asserts that it is the frustration of ontological, mostly non-material, human needs that is the major cause of deep-rooted violent conflict. Burton and Sandole (1986) accept those needs as articulated by Paul Sites: response, security, recognition, distributive justice, meaning, rationality and control (p. 338). To Sites' list, Burton (1979) added role defence – the defence of positional goods (pp. 140-156). Unlike material needs, the means for satisfying non-material needs (except role defence) are not necessarily in short supply. While these needs are not subject to negotiation and bargaining, their satisfaction amongst one party can in fact promote their satisfaction in others (Burton, 1990, p. 242). The key lies in finding appropriate satisfiers that achieve this win-win scenario. Sites argues that human needs are grounded in human emotions. He points to Kemper's research concerning the four primary human emotions - fear, anger, depression and satisfaction. Sites (1990) explains how humans strive to avoid suffering caused by negative emotions and move towards enhancing the possibility of satisfaction. All of which is also necessary for healthy survival (p. 16).

Human needs theory challenges the traditional, power political view articulated by authors such as Hans Morgenthau (as cited in Burton, 1997, p. 18). This view assumes that the roots of conflict lie in humans' natural aggression, their use of this aggression to protect material needs

and holds the individual responsible for being evil or unsocialised (Burton, 1990, p. 31). Moreover, it concludes that authoritative power at all levels is the foundation for peace, domestically and internationally (Burton, 1990, p. 31). In order to achieve these goals, it sanctions the use of punishment for any failure to comply in an attempt to ensure future conformity (Burton, 1997, p. 23). This is underpinned by an assumption that behaviour is to a large degree, malleable and therefore humans are wholly capable of being socialised in the manner that authorities deem to be necessary (Burton, 1997, p. 20). This traditional view is responsible for structural systems such as slavery, feudalism, tribal elite rule, majority tribe rule and modifications of these as industrialization developed (Burton and Sandole, 1986, p. 336).

Burton (1997) rejects all of these assumptions. He explains how such approaches are simply ineffective in the modern era and are likely to lead only to more frustration, alienation, anger and social unrest at all levels (p. 11). Burton (1990) believes that the traditional view leads authorities to wrongly conclude that extreme aggressive behaviour must be controlled through power and coercion in order to protect their social systems (p. 241). He argues that ultimately the fault lies with social norms and institutions, which he insists must be adapted to human aspirations and not the other way around (Burton, 1997, p. 26). He concludes that deep-rooted conflict is a problem, not necessarily of the type of socio-political system (e.g. communism, capitalism, fascism etc.) but of the processes within those systems. Specifically, this includes decision-making, goal setting and how decisions are pursued (Burton, 1990, p. 265). The adversarial political process and the protection of elite interests loom large in his critique. For Burton (1990), coercion fails because of the existence of those behaviours that cannot be altered by socialization processes (p. 4).

Burton (1997) advocates holism as part of his philosophy. His critique of the social sciences includes a concern that the whole person has not previously been the subject of study (pp. 20-21). Attributing this in large part to the separation of knowledge into distinct disciplines over one hundred years ago, he uses the analogy of medical specialists and their inability to treat the whole person effectively. Conflict Resolution, according to Burton and Sandole (1986), should be an interdisciplinary study that cuts across all disciplines: a synthesis, a holistic approach to a problem area (p. 333). Burton (1997) defines holism as a philosophy that “recognizes that the whole is greater than, and therefore different from, the sum of its parts” (pp. 127). He further explains that holism requires that we challenge assumptions, address root causes of social problems, use deductive techniques based on theories (particularly those of human behaviour) and find ways to cut across culture and ideology.

The major practical application of Burton’s theories lies in his problem-solving workshop. This analytical, facilitated process has the aim that participants will agree to change their tactics by selecting from many options those satisfiers that are not a threat to others. The assumption is that these options will emerge once relationships have been analysed, perspectives of the other understood and costing of alternatives conducted (Burton, 1990, p. 205). Facilitators need to be experts in human behaviour. They assist participants to learn more about both their conflictual relationships and the cause-and-effect relationship between behaviour and perception. It is clear that their key skills involve analytical and strategic thinking. There is no indication that the process would involve any sort of affective sharing, discussion of meaning and intent, or any direct understanding of culture.

Burton's writings are striking in that they contain very few references to culture. Although he does define culture on more than one occasion, those definitions lack any acknowledgement of collective meaning, as will be discussed in section four.⁴ Furthermore, his attempt to make a distinction between "culture" and "cultural values" leaves the reader confused. This is of concern because cultural values are held up as of some importance in the problem-solving process. Burton (1990) concludes that culture is "not an important consideration in a facilitated analytical problem-solving conflict resolution process" (p. 215). He reasons that because many deep-rooted conflicts have a cultural dimension, the problem-solving process must be capable of cutting across all cultures and so it must ultimately be culturally neutral. Having reminded us that many cultural norms with respect to dealing with conflict are often themselves dysfunctional (p. 214), he observes what he considers a tendency to give culture a special status in either analysis or process in ways that are "not relevant and probably dysfunctional" (p. 211).

Burton makes a distinction between human needs, cultural values and culture itself, outlining a hierarchy, from most to least important. However, his distinction between the last two of these is hard to pin down. In Burton (1990), he refers to culture as the concepts, habits, skills and manners of a given people at a given period of development (p. 212). Values are described as the ideas, habits, customs and beliefs that are a characteristic of particular social communities (Burton, 1990, p. 37). Yet in Burton (1996), he simply refers to culture as the total range of activities and ideas of a people including their means of dealing with disputes and conflicts (p. 22). Values (cultural or otherwise) are not explicitly mentioned. In Burton's last book, where his reasons for the primacy of human needs are most explicit, he reiterates that human needs represent goals or objectives that are universal and unchanging, whereas culture is to be grouped together with other sorts of "preconceptions" thus representing only a difference in method and means to those needs (Burton, 1997, p. 130). He describes culture and its associated values as "tactics," ways of satisfying specific goals. Burton (1990) says, for example, that the pursuit of culture is a satisfier of the need for identity and recognition (p. 211) and defence of cultural values is a means of satisfying the human need for personal security and identity (p. 37).

Yet for Burton, values have a greater significance than culture. While still holding that they are a set of acquired behaviours that are subject to change and not held universally, he describes them as only partially negotiable (Burton, 1990, p. 244). In almost all cases, he places them together with needs/goals as the set of things that problem-solving ought to try and satisfy. Of particular concern is Burton's indictment of culture as justification for behaviour or habits seeking to hide behind ethnicity or sub-group membership. He writes, for example, about UN diplomats being late to meetings and the Middle-Eastern penchant for sleeping after lunch and questions the existence (or validity) of sub-cultures (Burton, 1990, p. 212).

Burton under Wilber's Microscope: Culture Serving Human Needs and the Orange vMeme

Burton's advocacy of holism echoes to some extent Wilber's larger critique of modernity. As Wilber (2000a) explains it, modernity's great gift is its necessary differentiation of what Max Weber and Jurgen Habermas called the "value spheres" represented by arts, morals and science

⁴ See, for example, Clark, 1990, pp. 34-59, and Staub, 1989.

(pp. 60). This is evident in the way science and art were disentangled from religion during the enlightenment, allowing both to pursue their own truths, make profound discoveries and flourish without offending prevailing dogma and suffering censorship, and without their exponents fearing imprisonment or death. However, Wilber's critique of modernity is that these "value spheres" did not just peacefully separate; they often flew apart, leading to dissociation, fragmentation and alienation (Wilber, 2000a, pp. 61). A similar fragmentation and alienation is of concern to Burton, particularly as it applies to academia and the various disciplines, which he feels, ought to be brought together in order to create a holistic approach to the problem of violent conflict. However, although Burton envisions conflict resolution as cutting across and transcending disciplines, it is important to note that the type of holism he suggests does not include the subjective domains, such as culture. This, then, is a limited holism because as Wilber (2000a) reiterates, holism must be based on the principle of "transcend and include" (p. 51 and pp. 150-151 at note 3). Burton seeks to transcend disciplines, but not include those that honour the distinct truths of culture.

I would also argue that Burton's writings on culture, limited as they are, demonstrate the reduction of the lower-left (cultural) quadrant to the upper-right (behavioural) quadrant. Alternatively, it could be argued that Burton's view of culture acting as a satisfier of human needs reduces culture instead to the upper-left (intentional) quadrant, based on Sites' argument that the roots of human needs are largely found there. In both cases, this is what Wilber calls subtle reductionism. Wilber (2000b) explicitly warns about subtle reductionism, one form of which occurs when the whole validity of a cultural set of values is converted into a question of whether they promote social cohesion, functional fitness and the integration of the social action system (p. 152). Most significantly, there is no mention in Burton of the concept of culture as collective meaning. The word "meaning" makes no appearance in a slim, six-page section dedicated to the topic, other than as a synonym for "definition" (Burton, 1990, pp. 211-216). Let us remember that Wilber characterises the left-hand quadrants as being concerned with the question "what does it mean?" as opposed to the right-hand, concerned with the question "what does it do?" It is ironic, therefore, that one of the non-material human needs that Burton subscribes to is the need for meaning.

Nevertheless, Burton's explanation of deep-rooted conflict represents a significant shift in thinking away from the traditional, power-political model. This shift engages the discipline of psychology in a more sophisticated way and thus brings the upper-right (behavioural) quadrant into the foreground of thinking on conflict. At the same time, it provides a deeper analysis of the social domain (lower-right quadrant) by rooting a major cause of conflict in structural violence, as defined by Johan Galtung (1969, pp. 167-91), the origins of which, according to Burton (, 1997), lie in the policy and administrative decisions that are made by some and which adversely affect others (p. 32). I also conclude that the upper-left (intentional) quadrant is being considered in Burton's explanation of conflict, albeit indirectly. As Sites explained, intentionality underpins human needs through the existence of universal emotions and drives. Nevertheless, Burton's problem-solving workshop aims only at objective change. The problem-solving approach itself is firmly situated in the right-hand quadrants of the AQAL model. This raises the specific concern that emotion, attitude, direct personal experience, values and meaning may be more causally significant, and have a greater role to play in the set of potential solutions to conflict, than Burton envisions.

In section one, we recall that the AQAL model proposes that human development in the left-hand quadrants is characterised by a set of distinct but inter-dependant capacities. These capacities exhibit a general progression, albeit not always in a linear or predictable way, over the lifetimes of individuals and cultures. The cognitive line in the upper-left quadrant is crucial. Wilber (2007) suggests cognitive development is “necessary but not sufficient” for growth in many other lines (p. 65). Burton’s problem-solving approach relies heavily on these cognitive skills. This is evident, for example, in the way that participants in that process are obligated to be analytical and to cost out the consequences of policies and options (Burton, 1990, p. 271).

Of course, there is no reason to doubt Burton (1990) when he asserts that skills of analysis and thought are common to the human species and cut across cultures and levels of education (p. 214). However, an integral analysis raises the concern about the preferred way of thinking and evaluating costs (and therefore value). Individuals, as a result of either their personal experience or the influence of their culture, may have vastly different world-views or value systems. This leads to a wide variation in the value they place and level of comfort they have in the rational costing demanded by Burton’s workshops. For example, using Beck and Cowans vMeme language, we learn that Blue (Authoritarian) vMeme thinking values a rational, analytical approach only insofar as it does not threaten accepted “truths.” Costing from a Blue perspective places a high value on preservation of traditional ways. In contrast, the Red (Exploitative) vMeme costs the loss of power quite differently to someone whose thinking is centred on the Green (Communitarian) vMeme. Efficiency is of utmost value to Orange (Entrepreneurial) vMeme thinking. Individuals with Purple (Tribal) vMeme thinking will struggle to be understood by those centred on the Orange vMeme and more likely to be viewed as superstitious and pre-modern. Differences such as these raise a number of issues. Burton maintains that ontological human needs “cut across” culture and trump values. Perhaps not. If culture, values and associated world-views are the lenses through which people understand their world, make judgements and define meaning, how is this to be filtered out when diverse people sit down to find their common goals? And how are institutions and governments to formulate policy and processes in light of this diversity of value amongst their populations?

Burton’s problem-solving approach has emerged in a global context that is strongly in the embrace of the Orange (Entrepreneurial) vMeme. It is entirely natural, therefore, that such values are reflected in the approach and particularly in the way it places pre-eminent value on rationality, analysis and outcomes. This also explains why Burton’s ideas are particularly comfortable to Western readers, academics and peace-workers, given that Orange values are stronger in this readership at this time. At the same time, I think it is clear that Burton emphatically rejects Blue (Authoritarian) vMeme approaches that support power politics and coercion as a means of controlling conflict, going to great lengths to explain the failure of this approach throughout his writings. I would argue that his critique of Blue is Orange in its thinking. This is particularly evident in the way he holds that the alternative, conflict resolution approach must find its own justification in terms of efficiency and acceptability to authorities (Burton, 1990, p. 172).

Nevertheless, an ever-increasing proportion of the human population are embracing the Green (Communitarian) vMeme, arguably since the 1960s and particularly so in the developed world (Beck and Cowan, 1996, pp. 303-320). It is not clear to what extent Burton reflects these emerging Green values. Certainly, his writings are peppered with mention of social exclusion and

the omni-presence of inequality in social systems (e.g., “In industrial relations employees still demand to be treated as people” Burton, 1997, p. 24). However, there are few appeals to human rights and appeals to justice are avoided, even pushed aside, in favour of practical concerns for unfavourable social consequences (Burton, 1997, p. 23).

The Burtonian approach aspires to the objectivity of values neutrality. Facilitators engaged in problem-solving are seen as neutral, required to avoid making judgements or to impose their own values or wills and must, in Burton’s (1990) view avoid relating alternate perspectives that do not relate to the participants’ values and experiences (p. 207). In reality, this must be difficult to achieve as facilitators, according to the analysis above, are likely to bring their own Orange values to their work. In stark contrast, the analysis of Lederach’s ideas using Wilber’s model in the next section finds a very different attitude towards the role of subjectivity and the awareness of values in peace work, shaped in large part by social constructionism. Furthermore, the prominent role of culture in Lederach’s writings indicates a very different balance between Wilber’s four quadrants. It also allows us to consider what a second-tier value approach to peace studies might look like, as opposed to Burton’s first-tier values approach.

Section Three: John Paul Lederach and Conflict Transformation

In the previous section, I examined the theories and practical applications of Burton’s work and then used the AQAL model to explore aspects of that work. The degree of holism evident was found to be limited, according to the AQAL model, because, although Burton incorporates behavioural factors (Wilber’s upper-right quadrant), the subjective quadrants, particularly the cultural (lower-left) quadrant was reduced to objective behavioural factors. Wilber’s Integral map highlights the need to consider the full spectrum of human capacities (“development lines”). It was found that Burton’s problem-solving process limits its engagement of these capacities primarily to the cognitive, rational and analytical. Finally, the value system (“vMeme”) employed by Burton was, under Beck and Cowan’s Spiral Dynamics schema, predominately Orange – entrepreneurial, achievement-oriented, rationalistic. Supposed value-neutrality in the problem-solving process was called into question. This section will conduct an analysis of the work of Lederach. In particular, I explore his ideas related to conflict training, his integrated framework and his understanding of the emerging conflict transformation approach to peacebuilding.

Lederach’s Key Theoretical Ideas: Eliciting Culture, Constructionism and Embracing Complexity

John Paul Lederach’s writings reveal three factors that strongly shape his philosophy to peace and conflict. First, his upbringing as an American Mennonite. As he explains:

This perspective understands peace as embedded in justice. It emphasizes the importance of building right relationships and social structures through a radical respect for human rights and life. It advocates nonviolence as a way of life and work. (Lederach, 2003, p. 4)

Second, his writings reveal a willingness to include the spiritual domain within the set of components that constitute his “integrated approach” to peacebuilding. Third, Lederach (1997) explains that he is an advocate of the social constructionist school when it comes to

understanding conflict. For him the construction of social meaning, as an intersubjective process, lies at the heart of how human conflict is created. This view suggests that people act on the basis of the meaning attributed to actions and events and that social conflict emerges on the basis of these meanings (pp. 8-10).

Like Burton, he criticizes the traditional model of diplomacy that focuses on what are called substantive interests only. Lederach (1997) highlights the psychosocial aspects of conflict and like Burton, explains that when threatened, people seek security in narrower, more localized identity groups (pp. 17-18). While confirming the importance of unmet human needs he also recognizes the structural, economic and socio-political causes of conflict, which of course can also be framed in terms of human needs (Lederach, 2003, p. 25). However, he differentiates himself from Burton when he asserts that the emotive, perceptual, social-psychological and spiritual dimensions are core, not peripheral, concerns (Lederach, 1997, p.29).

Lederach argues for conflict transformation as a movement amongst peace theorists and practitioners. In contrast to conflict resolution, which Lederach (2003) sees as being too narrow, conflict transformation recognises conflict as a natural part of human affairs that can be used as a catalyst for growth in human relationships, rather than simply a problem to be solved (p. 15). This perspective owes a lot to the long-term view of conflict, as outlined by Adam Curle in 1971 (as cited in Lederach, 1997, pp. 64-66). As Lederach explains, Curle suggested that conflicts progress through some typical stages. Often beginning as latent, where power is imbalanced, transformation occurs through education, which raises awareness of this imbalance. Later, advocacy is required to assist those demanding change in the name of justice and this usually leads to confrontation. At this point, when power is more balanced and an awareness of interdependence often emerges, negotiation and mediation can occur. Of course, things are rarely this neat and, much like the progression of vMememes, conflicts can cycle back and forth and be stalled by blockages of various sorts. This perspective helps us understand not only that conflict is a dynamic, transforming process, but also that peace is itself a “process-structure.” By this, Lederach (2003) means it is a structure that is embedded in a dynamic, adaptive process that continuously evolves and develops the quality of relationships in it (p. 20). Thus, the conflict transformation process is envisioned in two directions. We can describe how conflict transforms relationships and structures and we can prescribe how our actions could impact conflict so as to produce a desired transformation. Lederach (2003) explains that these impacts occur in four domains - personally, relationally, structurally and culturally (p. 23).

Lederach (2003) contends that rather than choosing between the need to address episodes of conflict and the need to build long-term structures for sustainable peace, we need to see how those episodes can be used as an opportunity to address the epicentre of conflict (p. 33). This leads to an appreciation of multiple activities in peacebuilding, conducted over multiple time-frames and involving multiple roles. Lederach’s interdependence model (Lederach, 2005, p. 79) further explains that each side in a conflict has a “vertical capacity,” that is, three levels of leadership - high-level or official leadership, community or mid-level, and grass-roots). A common problem is that these levels are often not well connected, undertake activities that are not coordinated, or simply not in the habit of talking to each other. This “interdependence gap” is less well recognised than the need for dialogue and understanding horizontally across the dividing lines of conflict (Lederach, 1999, pp. 29-30).

Lederach feels the focus of peace-building activity should be on the middle-level leaders and actors. In formulating his “integrated approach” to conflict, Lederach (1997) explains that these actors have the greatest potential because they are the most likely to be able to build relationships, both vertically and horizontally (p. 81). The major peacebuilding activities that focus on this level are: problem-solving workshops, conflict resolution training and peace commissions (Lederach, 1997, pp. 45-47). Lederach explains further that in creating the “integrated approach” he became aware of the need to design social change in units of decades, linking crisis management and the long-term. This, in turn, requires us to understand that issues have systemic roots and so we must develop approaches that anchor issues in relationships and sub-systems (Lederach, 1997, p. 81).

In *Preparing for Peace (1995)*, Lederach explains that he was for many years an advocate of what he calls the “prescriptive” approach to training people, particularly in places outside North America. This involved the transfer of techniques considered universal and culturally neutral (pp. 65-66). Cultural differences were an aspect of advanced training, in which practitioners learned how to adjust those techniques to employ the necessary level of sensitivity such differences demanded (pp. 5-6). In time, Lederach became aware that a participant’s own culture, rather than being irrelevant or a challenge to overcome, was a powerful resource. He saw how this knowledge, which included an understanding of what things mean, could be used to help identify needs in context (pp. 56-58). Appropriate training models could then be derived to generate more sustainable peace processes. The key was that by eliciting the insights of this local cultural knowledge, including myths, relationships and language, a more adaptive, long-term platform for generating solutions could be built. Nevertheless, he stopped short of just rejecting the prescriptive approach; instead he developed the conviction “that a convergence of universal and particular with prescriptive and elicitive [processes] was both possible and necessary” (p. 92).

He continued his critique of the prescriptive approach to training in *Building Peace (1997)*. Echoing some of the findings in Section Two of this dissertation, Lederach observed that prescriptive approaches were focussed primarily on the cognitive skills of analysing conflict and the communicative skills of negotiation, with very little recognition of either the “cultural baggage” of these approaches nor the value of local knowledge as a resource (p. 107). As explained above, Lederach does not totally reject the conflict resolution approaches with its problem-solving workshop, as advocated by Burton. He accepts that it does provide a degree of empowerment to those being trained, by presenting concrete ideas which may contain new ways of thinking and specific skills (Lederach, 1995, p. 51). More generally, the conflict transformation approach has a distinct advantage, according to Lederach, due to its capacity to consider multiple avenues of response. At its heart, it incorporates the conflict resolution response; but a narrowly defined conflict resolution approach, according to Lederach, can’t raise the questions that conflict transformation can and therefore does not contain the potential for broader change (Lederach, 2003, p. 68). He does admit, however, that conflict transformation is of limited value when there is no ongoing relationship between the conflicting parties (p. 69).

All of this reflects Lederach’s general rejection of simple either/or solutions and his insistence that peacebuilders must develop the practice of embracing complexity and dilemma. Abiding complexity, he says, requires that we develop the capacity to identify the key energies in a situation and hold them up together as interdependent goals (Lederach, 2003, p. 52). In a section dedicated to the topic of complexity and simplicity in his book, *The Moral Imagination (2005)*,

Lederach explains the role of a paradoxical curiosity in enabling one to rise above dualistic polarities (pp. 31-40). Such a curiosity allows one to suspend immediate judgement, accepting things both at face value and at what he calls “heart value” (the way things are perceived and interpreted; the “home of meaning”). Ultimately this allows us to find a greater whole, a greater truth than could otherwise be perceived (pp. 36-37). This greater truth may indeed represent a type of simplicity, a simplicity beyond conventional understanding, not prior to it. Lederach quotes Oliver Wendell Holmes at the start of this section:

I would not give a fig for the simplicity this side of complexity,
But I would give my life for the simplicity on the other side of complexity.
(Oliver Wendell Holmes, quoted in Lederach, 2005, p. 31)

Lederach under Wilber’s Microscope: Subjective Meaning and the Yellow vMeme

As we recall from Section One, Wilber’s AQAL model calls attention to the existence of four separate but interdependent domains, each encompassing particular ways of knowing and understanding that cannot be reduced to another. In the analysis below, I begin by outlining the extent to which Lederach acknowledges and incorporates the truth claims of each of these quadrants. Are there signs of reductionism? Does one or more of the quadrants dominate his theories and practice? I then examine the values evident in Lederach’s work, identifying the nature of any shifts in his value system, as they would be understood by Beck and Cowan’s Spiral Dynamics schema. The implications of such shifts are also examined.

Lederach’s active spirituality and his espousal of social constructionism set him apart from Burton and other peace scholars. These two factors together indicate an inclination towards Wilber’s left-hand (subjective and meaning) quadrants. This is certainly reflected in Lederach’s comments about the central role of emotive, perceptual, social-psychological and spiritual dimensions in the process of reconciliation. Furthermore, conflict resolution as Lederach (1997) points out, has traditionally seen such factors as irrelevant or outside the competency of international diplomats (p. 29). While the socio-psychological dimensions Lederach alludes to are many of the same that concern Burton, straddling both the upper-right (behavioural) and upper-left (intentional) quadrants of the AQAL model, the spiritual and emotive issues Lederach points to are directly concerned with personal subjectivity. This shows a more direct consideration of the upper-left quadrant than Burton’s writings.

But what of this social constructionism? We recall that Wilber is equally critical of both extreme materialists and extreme social constructivists, as discussed in Section One. However, Lederach avoids such critiques because his advocacy of social constructionism (which is closely related to constructivism) does not deny objectivity and its truth claims. I find no evidence of either subtle or gross reductionism in any of his books. Recall also the four domains Lederach (1997) articulated - personal, relational, structural and cultural (p. 82). These domains correspond very closely to Wilber’s four quadrants. The personal domain maps to the upper (individual) quadrants; the relational one maps to the lower quadrants, in large part to the inter-subjective (lower-left); the structural is the lower-right (social) quadrant and its socio-political structures; and the cultural one is precisely the lower-left quadrant.

Lederach's later books, such as *The Moral Imagination* (2005) suggest a similar understanding to that of Wilber's major critiques of modernity. This critique, mentioned in Section Two, concerns the fragmentation of the three spheres of values symbolically found in the arts, morals and science. These spheres are in fact a reframing of the Four Quadrants: arts represent the "I" or subjective (upper-left), morals represents the inter-subjective or "WE" (lower-left) and science corresponds to both the objective quadrants – upper-right and lower-right (Wilber, 2001, p. 18). Although Burton identified the fragmentation of specialisation in modern science and academia, Lederach goes further and takes active steps to incorporate morals (cultural meaning) and art (personal meaning) into peacebuilding practice. Lederach (2005) introduces the novel idea of the aesthetics of social change. He expresses concern that by shifting perspective towards the technical and away from the artistic, peacebuilding processes have become too rigid and fragile. He posits that only by rediscovering the artist's intuition can we get to the "art and soul of the matter" (p.73).

Although Lederach avoids reductionism, can we conclude that his approach is "all quadrant"? Probably, but with some caution. Unlike Burton, who advocates for the bulk of action in the quadrants of objective change, it could be argued that Lederach's strong engagement with the subjective and inter-subjective may over-emphasize skills concerned with relationships, empathy and intuitive breakthroughs. It is possible that Burton's socio-political concerns could be pushed to the background too much in Lederach's schema. Lederach's particular balance may be more appropriate to specific sorts of conflict situations – recall that he himself admits the limited value of conflict transformation when ongoing relationships are not involved. As explained in Section One, Wilber's schema doesn't prescribe absolute equality, only that an appropriate awareness of the dimensions each of the quadrants represents. The degree of complexity and nature if the conflict should determine the balance.

Unlike Burton, who freely acknowledged that cognitive ability was the essential skill required by problem-solving conflict resolution, Lederach's later works question whether this ability is ever sufficient to the greater goal of sustainable peacebuilding. As discussed in Section One, Wilber considers the cognitive line to be just one of a set of separate and inter-dependent human capacities, each with its own growth potential. Lederach (2005) concludes that while current skills training is oriented towards understanding cognitive and behavioural responses in human interaction, there is a strong need to tap other parts of human "being" and "knowing" (p. 175). To this end, he encourages the disciplines of a wide range of the arts, such as journaling, storytelling, poetry, drawing, painting and music. Having incorporated such practices in his own workshops, he is convinced that their value to designing peacebuilding platforms lies not in the products produced, but in the way they unlock creativity and "the moral imagination." Ultimately, he says, they help penetrate complexity with breakthrough insights and nurture attentiveness to intuition (Lederach. 2005, p. 174).

So what does all this suggest about Lederach's values, at least insofar as they are disclosed in his writings? This is where the Spiral Dynamics of Beck and Cowan, as explained in Section One, are helpful. It seems that Lederach has himself progressed through various vMememes. While Blue (Authoritarian) values, such as right authority, sacrifice, rule of law, are not a feature of even his early writing, in his early career he practiced a strongly prescriptive approach to training and this indicates some degree of the Orange (Entrepreneurial) vMeme in its espousal of the universality of rationality. This approach employs a transfer mentality to education (Lederach,

1995, p. 28) – the teacher is the expert, the student is passive - and is driven by the goal of transferring universal knowledge and skills to other settings. Lederach's discovery of theorists like Paulo Freire and his concept of conscientization (i.e., awareness of self in context) resonates strongly with his inclination towards social constructionism (Lederach, 1995, p. 19). These ideas find their zenith within a more complex and contextualised Green (Communitarian) way of thinking. Although how and when these ideas first infused Lederach's thinking is unclear, it is likely that his socially engaged Mennonite upbringing would have given him the capacity for activating a Green value system.

Significantly, Lederach may have begun, if not completed, the journey to a second-tier vMeme approach. Lederach (2003) suggested the practice of developing the capacity to pose the energies of conflict as dilemmas or paradoxes (pp. 51-52). He also asserts that we must "make complexity a friend, not a foe" (p. 53) because it provides multiple options. The key, he says, is to trust that options will be generated, pursue the most promising but not lock rigidly to one idea (p. 54). These are characteristically "second-tier" vMeme attitudes. The end of Lederach's 2005 book contains four mottos that encapsulate much of his writing to that point:

Reach out to those you fear.
Touch the heart of complexity.
Imagine beyond what is seen.
Risk vulnerability one step at a time. (Lederach, 2005, p. 177)

Psychologist Dr. Clare Graves, whose seminal work underpins Beck and Cowan's *Spiral Dynamics*, characterised the second-tier of vMememes as crossing a threshold beyond which fear dropped away -- fear of death, fear of God, fear of technology and fear of fellow humans (Graves, 1974). Beck and Cowan (1996) echo this and add that this helps develop an ability to take a contemplative attitude, with the result that the quantity and quality of good ideas increases dramatically (p. 278). In the transition to second-tier vMememes, ideas become multidimensional. Yellow (Systemic) thinkers, for example, tolerate and even enjoy, paradoxes and uncertainties and are neither intimidated nor cavalier in the face of complexity (Beck and Cowan, 1996, pp. 276-278). An ability to resolve such paradoxes is mentioned as one of the two key competencies of the Yellow problem-solver. The other is related to their comfort, even enthusiasm, for seeking out that complexity. Not only are they drawn to hot spots where evolving crises demand new insights, they have an ability to smooth out blockages between people with different vMeme thinking (Beck and Cowan, 1996, p. 283).

Based on vMeme theory, I suggest there are at least three implications if Lederach is developing a second-tier vMeme capacity. First, his proposals could signal the leading edge of a transformation in peacebuilding. The shape of this is explored in more detail in Section Four. Secondly, Lederach's work may challenge and risk alienating some readers and participants for whom its eclectic synthesis of diverse ideas are either incomprehensible or seem to lack a well-defined core idea. Beck and Cowan suggest this is often the case when those centred on first-tier vMeme thinking encounter the second-tier. For example, to those at Blue (Authoritarian), those at Yellow (Systemic) appear inconsistent, disrespectful and out-of-focus. To Orange (Entrepreneurial), Yellow seem unwilling to commit themselves fully to achieving objectives. From the Green (Communitarian) standpoint, they seem cool and reserved, intellectualising

emotions without joining wholeheartedly into the group experience (Beck and Cowan, 1996, p. 282).

Third, Yellow vMeme approaches are rare, both in academic disciplines and the general community, even 40 years after Clare Graves identified their existence. Second-tier vMeme approaches require second-tier actors to emerge and shepherd them into existence. The estimate of persons at second-tier is only 1% of the population (Beck & Cowan, 1996). Given this, I suggest that the transformational social change which they might be able to bring about will require these actors to be distributed strategically throughout society, in a manner constituting the “critical yeast” that Lederach (2005) does indeed propose (pp. 87-100). This concept suggests that the quality of connections of strategic individuals and the social spaces they inhabit may be of more importance than the quantity of such individuals, an idea also found in Malcolm Gladwell’s notion of “connectors” in his popular book, *The Tipping Point* (2000) (as cited in John Paul Lederach, 2005, p. 90).

Lederach’s concern with subjective causes and solutions of conflict is closer to the “all quadrant” approach Wilber advocates. In contrast to Burton’s primarily Orange (Entrepreneurial) vMeme orientation, Lederach’s probable transition to a second-tier, Yellow (Systemic) value system raises exciting possibilities about this theoretical contribution to peace and conflict study and practice. In the next section, I explore how the peace and conflict studies literature support the integral analysis of Burton and Lederach conducted herein, before sketching out some of the integrally informed scholarship now emerging in the peace and conflict studies domain.

Section Four: Towards Integral Peacebuilding

In sections two and three, Wilber’s AQAL model and Beck and Cowan’s vMeme schema was used to examine the work of the scholar-practitioners, Burton and Lederach. This section begins by outlining some of the peace and conflict literature that reflects the analysis conducted in the previous two sections of this dissertation. These reflections support the argument that Wilber’s AQAL model is a useful analytical tool, both for analysing the cause of conflict and the degree of holism of specific conflict theories. The section ends with a brief exploration of recent attempts to apply integral theory to peacebuilding and addresses the question of whether Wilber et al have provided a valuable prescriptive framework in the context of peacebuilding.

Reflections on Burton and Lederach

Avruch (1998) examines the role of culture in Burton’s problem-solving approach and observes that Burton holds culture to be relatively unimportant and so it assumes no greater role than as a “satisfier” of human needs. While for Avruch, cultural analysis is an irreducible part of the problem-solving process (p. 74), he notes that in their purest form, problem-solving panels aim to help participants “excavate right past culture” down to those human needs (p. 90). Avruch (1998) demonstrates Burton’s acute minimisation of the importance of culture by pointing out that within the highly prescriptive set of 56 rules Burton provides, culture appears on only one occasion (as cited at p. 90).

Further, Avruch questions Burton's assumptions that people everywhere reason the same way and that everyone shares the same cost-benefit calculus. Even in these areas, culture is significant. Avruch (1998) goes on to quote Lederach, whose experience in Central America highlighted the difference between analytical thinking (breaking down stories into components) and holistic thinking (keeping the parts of stories together) (p. 92). Further, Avruch cites research by James F. Hamill, who found that while syllogistic logic ("All Cretians are liars; I am a Cretian; therefore I am a liar") looks the same from culture to culture, propositional reasoning does not, because the semantic elements of the arguments mean different things in different settings. (What is a liar? If you're not a "liar," then are you always "honest"?) He adds, meaning not only structures validity but also defines truth (as cited in Avruch, 1998, p. 93). As explained in Section Two, while Burton never frames culture in terms of meaning, Wilber, in contrast, feels that meaning is the key quality of the subjective quadrants. Scholars such as Ervin Staub (1989), agree, preferring a definition of culture as the shared meanings within a group, specifically the values, rules, norms, customs and life-styles (p. 13). Similarly, Clark (1990), who argues that social bondedness is a crucial human need, suggests that this deep bondedness is based on shared values and worldviews and the sense of a people reciprocally sharing a common fate. She calls this "sacred meaning" (p. 47).

Väyrynen (1998) highlights the medical metaphors that infuse Burton's problem-solving approach. Not only are facilitators, like doctors, expert practitioners who diagnose disease and implement cures but also therapists, who, according to Burton, help participants to "filter out" false assumptions and misconceptions and therefore to perceive reality accurately (as cited Väyrynen, 1998, Purification Through Professional Cure, para, 8). Interestingly, she makes the link between his strong belief and reliance on instrumental rationality and the Enlightenment idea of the universal man who is determined to control both social and natural environments (Social Engineering and Instrumental Rationality section, para. 3). I believe there is no better description of the core values and worldview of the Orange (Entrepreneurial) vMeme than this. Väyrynen (1998) locates Burton's approach within the neobehavioural school, which she describes as based on an uncritical trust in the existence of objective scientific facts and in their value in solving practical problems. This rejection of culture and inter-subjectivity (the lower-left quadrant) is challenged by social constructionism, which asserts that cultural patterns function as unquestioned schemes of reference and condition how the world is represented to a person. As the phenomenological sociologist Alfred Schütz explains, through processes of interaction with people in the social world, we come to see things as types, which he calls "intersubjective "typifications" (as cited in Väyrynen, 1998, Creating a New Reality section). These shared typifications then define common realities. The social constructionist view is that a shared reality, rather than biological human needs, is a pre-requisite for cooperation (Creating a New Reality section, para. 3). Similarly, the Spiral Dynamics' vMememes circumscribe particular ways of thinking that shape our perception of what Burton would describe as purely objective reality.

Nudler (1990), in exploring the nature of conflicts between "worlds" or "frames," comes to a similar conclusion. He notes that William James' notion of "worlds" (selective attention that makes a set of things real) (as cited on p. 177) is similar to Erving Goffman's notion of "frames," which Nudler explains as a set of assumptions or principles which enable us to structure situations and make them real for us. Both ideas are undergirded by a non-reflective, uncritical acceptance of their basic assumptions and as Michael Polanyi says, when we accept these assumptions as our interpretive framework "we may be said to dwell in them as we do our body"

(as cited on pp. 178-79). This brings to mind Wilber's description of stages of development (such as vMememes). Describing the process as one of disidentification with the old and identification with the new, he adds that at each stage, the self "sees a different world: it faces new fears, has different goals, suffers new problems. It has a new set of needs, a new class of morals, a new sense of self" (Wilber, 2000a, p. 38).

Nudler (1990) proposes that the need for meaning is perhaps the most fundamental of all. He defines this "as the need which every human being has for building — and living in — a world (in the subjective sense introduced above)." (p. 187) Nudler contends that conflict resolution through problem-solving techniques has such a strong reliance on analytical skills that it is insufficient to resolve conflicts between worlds or frames. It must be complemented by other procedures, appealing to quite different abilities. The ability to discover and enter dialogue concerning what he calls the "root metaphors" underpinning a particular world or frame is suggested as one of these procedures (Nudler, 1990, pp. 188-196).

In Tom Woodhouse's article entitled 'Conflict resolution and peacekeeping: Critiques and responses' (2000), he responds to three specific critiques of conflict resolution, of which Christopher Clapham's arguments are of most interest here (as cited on pp. 9-11). Clapham's examination of the genocide in Rwanda led him to question two assumptions underlying the prevailing conflict resolution model. First, the failure to recognise the deep-seated differences that caused the conflict reveals, in his view, a "Western" assumption that parties to the process share a common value framework. Second, the assumption that mediation is inherently a good thing, being a neutral action and intended to fulfil humanitarian concerns. To this second point, the Woodhouse response is to explain the approaches of scholar-practitioners like Adam Curle and Lederach. Both acknowledge the limitations of "outsider-neutral" intervention. Curle was eventually convinced of the need to develop local peacemakers' inner resources of wisdom, courage and compassionate non-violence (as cited on p. 20). This is strongly echoed in Lederach's elicitive approach, explained in Section Three, and his discovery of the need for "insider partial" facilitators in Central America, which he wrote about as early as 1991 (as cited in Woodhouse, 2000, p. 22). As the previous sections demonstrate, neither Burton nor Lederach are values-neutral. Like all of us, their worldviews are shaped by value systems (vMememes). In Burton's case, this is not acknowledged, whereas Lederach now seeks to make his own values more explicit in his work.

The issue of worldviews or frames and as proposed here by inference value systems inherent in peace work was the subject of Rachel Goldberg's field research, described in her 2009 article, *How our worldviews shape our practice*. Using narrative and metaphor as analytical techniques, she interviewed 43 conflict resolution professionals, whom she described as pioneers and leaders in either environmental conflict or intercultural conflict. She found that most respondents showed strong, reiterated worldview patterns and from these she derived seven mini-profiles that represented the dominant focus of a particular narrative (Goldberg, 2009, p. 421 and p. 417). Having found that each respondent drew from one or more of these mini-profiles in describing their work, Goldberg was able to place these profiles on a continuum, one end labelled, *realistic*, the other *constructive*. The realistic end was connected with the idea of one, objective truth, individual interests, a belief in the universality of cultural frames; it favoured logic and empirical testing and prioritised task over relationship. The constructive end, representing the inverse, held to the relativity of "truth," focused on relationship over task, and was concerned with

subjectivity. The realistic end she describes bears a strong resemblance both to the right-hand quadrants of the AQAL model and Burton's writings, while the constructive end is located in the left-hand quadrants, being closely related to social constructionism and brings to mind many of the issues prominent in Lederach's writings. Although I would place Burton very close to the far end of the realists ("The Sheriff" or "The Alchemist"), Lederach would, I suggest, be best placed somewhere between midpoint and half way towards the extreme constructive end of this continuum (mixing "The Pastor," "The Radical," and "The Family; see diagram in Goldberg, 2009, p. 419).

Goldberg (2009) frames her work by expressing concern about the hidden worldview of practitioners from mainstream cultures (i.e., middle-class North Americans) (p. 406), and in her conclusion, strongly asserts that neutrality in practice does not exist and therefore the best that we can do, and ought to do, is become self-aware of our worldviews or frames. Noting that the better practitioners, in her view, were able to move back and forth between profiles along the continuum, she points to her future work on the way our worldviews shift and how we might grow to encompass new worldviews (pp. 426-429). Such shifts, I suggest, are precisely what Beck and Cowan describe at length in their Spiral Dynamics schema, as it applies to value systems. The shift to second-tier (Yellow and beyond) vMememes is, I believe, descriptive of the more holistic peacebuilding practices. As explained in Section One, such value systems transcend *and* include the others, unleashing the type of diverse potentials Goldberg describes.

The issue of value differences amongst parties in conflict is taken up by Heidi and Guy Burgess (2006), in which they recapitulate their earlier work on the causes of intractable conflicts (pp. 179-180). Although such conflicts are based on either high-stake distribution issues (e.g. of scarce material goods) and what they call "domination conflicts" - conflicts over power, status and one's position in the social and political hierarchy - there is a third type based on fundamentally conflicting values. This research indicates that what lies at their core are issues of self-worth and moral differences. This is, arguably, a more complex issue than the issue of "outsider neutral" vs. "insider partial" facilitators and incorporates, but is not limited to, issues of cultural difference that Lederach attempts to address. It reflects the concerns in the preceding two sections about the way people cost options, decide value and worth and what they believe about their world. It is an issue better understood by social constructionists like Lederach rather than realists like Burton.

Towards an Integral Approach: How is the AQAL Map Being used Today?

There is a small body of emerging literature outlining practical applications of integral theory for those who are writing and working on peace theory and practice. One such example is provided by the Generative Change Community (GCC), an initiative connected to a private change consultancy called D3 Associates. Launched in 2005, the group is concerned with multi-stakeholder change processes in numerous areas, including conflict. Echoing many of the concerns in the introduction to this dissertation, the group aimed to increase the ability of practitioners to make wise distinctions about which tools and skills to use and when to use them within change processes (D3 Associates, 2008, p. 3). To this end, they have developed a platform for collective learning amongst practitioners. The practice, they explain is based both on Lederach's four domains of conflict transformation, described in Section Three - personally,

relationally, structurally and culturally - and Wilber's four quadrants. The technique, applied in numerous workshops, asks participants to reflect on their work within these four quadrants, which are physically drawn on the floor (see [D3 article, p. 5 online here for elaboration](#)). This is a concrete way to promote reflectivity on peacebuilding practice.

Richard McGuigan and Sylvia McMechan, at the time serving as principals of a private college called the Institute of Conflict Analysis and Management in Canada, utilise Wilber's Four Quadrants in their Diamond Approach, which they describe as a tool of Integral quadrant analysis for organisational conflicts (McGuigan and McMechan, 2005). Motivated in large part by their concern that the frame or worldview that any consultant uses shapes their analysis, they explain, "[the] conflict exists with equivalent legitimacy in all quadrants. If solutions are derived from an integrated analysis, they are more likely to succeed because they take multiple factors into account" (p. 351). The analysis is conducted within teams experiencing conflict and asks participants to explore the factors from each of the four quadrants by asking questions as the following. "What values does the leader embrace?" "What do people need in the workplace?" "What does our organization value?" "How does our team behave?". For example, in the upper-right quadrant – "My Behaviour" – the Diamond Approach employs Burton's needs theory as its major analytical tool. In the upper-left quadrant – "My Leadership" – the approach focuses on self-awareness, especially as it relates to ethics and values and encourages various reflective practices as well as training in emotional intelligence and conflict resolution techniques (pp. 360-361).

Nancy Popp joins Richard McGuigan in a 2007 article in which they turn their attention to the development lines. Extolling the work of Folger and Bush, who espouse the transformational potential of the mediation process, McGuigan and Popp explore practical ways in which the constructive-developmental theory of the developmental psychologist, Robert Kegan, can be used as part of the mediation process. Kegan's theory, as its name suggests, integrates social constructionism and development theory, both of which have featured throughout this dissertation. Challenging the assumptions that parties in mediation have equal capacity to take the other's perspective, they provide examples of how the three adult mindsets that Kegan proposes understand and respond to conflict in very different ways (Table 1).

Table 1. Three Mindsets toward Conflict

Content	Instrumental Mindset	Affiliative Mindset	Self-Authoring Mindset
Experience of conflict	"You're wrong, I'm right, and I can't get what I want."	"You have betrayed me."	"Your world view is very different from mine."
Preferred resolution of conflict	"Everybody just follow the rules and do what they're supposed to do and obey the law"	"Let's forget our differences, concentrate on our similarities and where we agree, and join together in the same loyalty to the same side/idea/group."	"Let's come to an understanding of each other's perspective and agree to work together to the best of our ability for the benefit of all."

Note: Excerpted from McGuigan and Popp (2007), p. 234.

While those with the “instrumental” mindset are concrete thinkers with little ability to take another’s perspective, those with the “affiliative” mindset have such capacities but also have a strong group identity and strive to think and feel the same as those they have relationships with (McGuigan and Popp, 2007, pp. 225-229). These are qualitatively different ways of making meaning and require mediators to take different approaches, some of which McGuigan and Popp explore. The most complex adult mindset they discuss, the “self-authoring,” can not only take other’s perspectives, but can integrate more than one into their own, which is motivated by self-integrity, an embrace of complexity and a willingness to engage in conflict constructively (pp. 229-231). They may, however, incorrectly assume that others can and will operate as they do.

Lynn Holaday (2002) takes a very similar approach to McGuigan and Popp. Acknowledging that mediators already adapt their approach based on the parties they encounter, utilising different tools as they see fit, she believes that this unconscious approach can be made more explicit and effective by using a suitable theoretical framework for performing such an analysis. Her five stage developmental model (as shown in Holaday, 2002, p. 194) for use in mediation is adapted from various sources, including Kegan, Jean Piaget and Wilber. Holaday provides examples of tools and approaches mediators can use for clients at each of these stages, emphasizing both the behaviour to expect and the thinking and emotions underpinning the perspective. Holaday feels her approach provides mediators with a meta-perspective - a way of understanding other perspectives - as well as providing a concrete way to promote stage growth (a widening of perspective) in clients, albeit in a limited way. Mediation, she reflects, is itself a product of the higher stages, both the rationalistic (fourth) and integrative (fifth). And this gives her great hope that it can be utilised in an “all-stage” manner, to borrow from Wilber’s “AQAL” idea.

The four approaches outlined in this section provide some illustrative examples of scholars and practitioners beginning to create what Wilber (2000a) calls “integral holism” (p. 72) within the peace and conflict discipline. The need for this movement is made apparent by the critiques outlined in the first section above, which in turn provided support for the analysis of Burton and Lederach conducted in the previous two sections. The analysis in this dissertation used only integral theory and Spiral Dynamics, yet it permitted an exploration of these issues that matched the depth and breadth of those conducted by the peace scholars cited in this section.

Conclusion

This dissertation argues that Ken Wilber’s integral theory and the related Spiral Dynamics schema can be used as an analytical tool to understand the power and pitfalls of peace and conflict theory and peacebuilding practice. In sections two and three, the theories of Burton and Lederach were located within a philosophical landscape of quadrants, development lines and stages of unfolding complexity. In the process, specific critiques emerged concerning the work of these scholar-practitioners, which were then cross-referenced against the critiques of other peace theorists in the final fourth section. The congruence was significant and included:

- The minimisation of the cultural dimensions of conflict
- The limitations of purely cognitive approaches
- The questioning of the universality of rationality

- The importance of uncovering the value systems inherent in peace interventions, both those of practitioners and the parties engaged in conflict.

This not only indicates that integral theory is very useful in analytically describing the qualities of various peace theories and peacebuilding practices. I believe it also provides evidence that the more convincing theories are multi-quadrant, encompassing more than just one development line, are values-explicit and understand vMeme differences, and therefore are inherently a product of second-tier vMememes.

In order to understand why this is so, it is necessary to examine the nature of Integral theory. Recall that the AQAL model presents four, irreducible perspectives that are an inherent part of nature and consciousness. Being ever-present and ontological, they therefore infuse all human activity. Integral theory also highlights the existence of diverse human capacities in the upper-left (intentional) quadrant. These are an example of the developmental lines within each of the four quadrants and include cognition, emotions, morals, worldviews and values. The last of these is explored in particular detail by the Spiral Dynamics schema as the unfolding, stage-like progression of vMememes and is of particular interest to the values debate within peace and conflict studies. Nevertheless, I must point out that Wilber's AQAL model is itself not values neutral. Rather, it is created from a second-tier value perspective. While it does strive to use multi-quadrant lenses, its origins in developmental structuralism provide it with a sharper focus within the upper-left quadrant, because it seeks to explain both the enduring structures of human thought (structuralism) while honouring and valuing the qualitative experience of being human (phenomenology).

Why is integral theory of prescriptive value? This question has three components. First, why is it necessary to be "all-quadrant"? Put simply, because conflict, both constructive and destructive, exists in each of the quadrants. Moreover, sustainable peace with justice is, I believe, only possible when all four quadrants are appropriately engaged. In the collective-objective quadrant (lower-right), conflict exists in the structures, institutions and power relations of society. This includes Inter-group violence and Galtung's structural violence. At best, it is an engine for reform; at worst, it manifests as war. Peace, too, exists here. It is the peace of strong, adaptive institutions that serve human needs (as per Burton) and it is the "justpeace" (as per Lederach) of mature economies that provide prosperity and quality of life for all. In the individual-objective (upper-right) quadrant, conflict exists due to personal disempowerment, poverty, poor mental and physical health and disability. This can result in violent behaviour, which impacts on relationships. Peace in this quadrant is therefore the peace of autonomous, empowered, highly functional people able to fulfil their potential. In the collective-subjective (lower-left) quadrant, conflict exists in contested meaning, the clash of values (rather than civilisations) and Galtung's cultural violence. At worst, it fragments society and ignites some of the worst forms of violence. At best, conflict can be the engine for diversity and growth. Peace here is either that of a pluralist, harmonious society, or else that of an autonomous, stable, monoculture. In the upper-left, the personal-subjective quadrant, conflict is existential, related to identity, ego, self-worth, emotions and worldviews. At best, conflict drives personal growth and transformation, bringing contentment and fulfilment and occasionally spawns peacemakers. At worst, personal destruction results and it occasionally spawns warmongers.

The integrally informed approaches mentioned in the last part of Section Four recognise the all-quadrant dimensions of peace and conflict (see GCC and McGuigan & McMechan articles). However, they also acknowledge the need for “all-line” and “all-stage” approaches. This is the second component of the prescriptive value of integral theory. Why is this important? Cognition, it was found, is necessary but not sufficient. Logic, Hamill explained, is not universal because what things mean depends on cultural context and can therefore become a contentious issue. Being “all-line” requires one to understand that emotions, ethics, worldviews and values complete the picture of human intentionality and therefore expand the frame that can holistically comprehend the causes of conflict. And what about “all-stage”? Being second-tier (as per Beck and Cowan) implies an ability to “transcend and include” other, first-tier values in both thinking and practice. I believe this is what McGuigan and Popp are trying to encourage within the mediation community, by pointing out the way Kegan’s mindsets explain the challenges mediators face on a day-to-day basis. Lynn Holaday’s five-stage model is very similar and her diagram of concentric circles reminds us that stage development is a process, as Wilber constantly reiterates, that both transcends *and* includes less complex stages, widening one’s circle of care and making objective what one previously held as part of one’s subjectivity.

The third and final component of the prescriptive value of integral theory lies in its framework for holism. Section one began by explaining that for Wilber, holism centres on the idea of a holon that transcends and includes less complex holons, yet is always a part of larger, more complex ones. Holarchies (hierarchies of holons) exist in all four quadrants. However, Wilber (2001) is advocating more than “exterior” holism, a holism of the Right-hand quadrants only, i.e., behavioural and social. Nor is it just “interior” holism, a holism of the Left-hand quadrants. It must include all four quadrants, thus leading to what he calls “integral holism,” one of the central aims of the integral approach (p. 16).

According to Burton, “conflict resolution deals with the total human being, encompassing personality and cultural differences, and deals with this person in the total society, encompassing system differences” (Burton, 1993, p. 29). But this is an exterior holism only (if by “encompass” he means, “transcend”). Burton’s holism does not “include” the subjectivity of culture, but instead reduces it to objective factors. In contrast, Lederach’s own “integrated approach” is as close to an integral holism this writer has yet found from a major peace and conflict theorist. However, Lederach’s holism is not merely an unstructured, “kitchen-sink” approach that includes everything within a framework in a mish-mash of perspectives. A coherent unity of perspectives requires the wise and appropriate choice of tools, interventions, mindsets and frames. If we accept there are at least three major types or causes of violent conflict, then some perspectives will be more valuable than others, depending on the mix of those three causal factors in any particular conflict. Conflicts about power, involving Red or Blue vMememes, require interventions that understand Red and Blue vMeme thinking. Conflicts about material resources require Right-hand quadrant interventions, but nevertheless benefit from an attention to any value-based issues that lurk under the surface. And when vMeme differences are the major explanation, second-tier awareness, with its comfort in complexity and embrace of integral holism, is required.

There is a tremendous opportunity for continued research. The brief summary of Wilber’s AQAL model presented in section one of this work is inadequate to convey the full depth and potential of that body of work. It only presented three of the five core components: quadrants, lines and stages, the other two – states and types – are beyond the scope of this dissertation. An

opportunity for further research in this area could be to include those other two aspects of the AQAL model. In particular, personality types, which would enable an integral analysis of gender issues to be conducted. This would tap into the work of scholars with developmental roots, such as Carol Gilligan and others working towards an “integral feminism,” such as Joyce Nielsen and Elizabeth Debold. Another opportunity for further research could be to conduct an integral theory analysis of other peace and conflict theorists. Johan Galtung and Betty Reardon were mentioned in the introduction. Galtung is, of course, a pioneer in peace and conflict studies and is responsible for a huge and influential body of work. Betty Reardon would provide the peace theory perspective of gender, enabling an exploration of whether and how integral feminism may be incorporated into peace and conflict studies. Finally, a more in-depth exploration of peacebuilding approaches that claim to be holistic could be conducted, whether or not they are aware of integral theory.

Although it strived to be relatively objective, the research conducted in this dissertation is necessarily shaped by the writer’s subjective experience, which in turn is interpreted through a set of values. These values hold violent conflict as abhorrent, while rejecting the structural violence of oppression and marginalisation. I believe that a truly coherent unity of perspectives on peace is imminent. While I accept that this view is based more on intuition than reasoning, I contend that a “critical yeast” of self-aware, integrally informed peacebuilders will be its parents.

References

- Avruch, K. (1998). *Culture and conflict resolution*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Beck, D. E., & Cowan, C. C. (1996). *Spiral Dynamics: Mastering values, leadership and change*. Malden, MA etc.: Blackwell.
- Burgess, H., & Burgess, G. (2006). Intractability and the frontier of the field. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 24(2), 177–186.
- Burton, J. W. (1979). *Deviance, terrorism and war*. New York, NY: St. Martin's Press.
- Burton, J. W. (1990). *Conflict: Resolution and prevention*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Burton, J. W. (1993). *Conflict resolution as a political system*. Retrieved from http://icar.gmu.edu/wp_1_burton.pdf
- Burton, J. W. (1996). *Conflict resolution, its language and process*. Lanham and London: The Scarecrow Press.
- Burton, J. W. (1997). *Violence explained*. Manchester and New York, NY: Manchester University Press.
- Burton, J. W., & Sandole, D. J. (1986). Generic theory: The basis of conflict resolution. *Negotiation Journal*, 2(4), 333–344.
- Clark, M. E. (1990). Meaningful social bonding as a universal human need. In J. W. Burton (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory* (pp. 34-59). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- D3 Associates (2008, July). Exploring, nurturing, and promoting generative dialogic change processes for an equitable and sustainable world [PDF Document]. Retrieved from <http://d3associates.net/gcc/GCCOverviewJuly2008.pdf>
- Esbjörn-Hargens, S. (2009, March). An Overview Of integral theory: An All-Inclusive Framework for the 21st Century [PDF Document]. Retrieved from http://www.integralresearchcenter.org/sites/default/files/integraltheory_3-2-2009.pdf

- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research, *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Goldberg, R. M. (2009). How our worldviews shape our practice, *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 26(4), 405-431.
- Graves, C. W. (1974). Human nature prepares for a momentous leap. *The Futurist*, April 1974, 72-87.
- Holaday, L. C. (2002). Stage development theory: A natural framework for understanding the mediation process'. *Negotiation Journal*, 18(3), 191-210. Retrieved from <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1571-9979.2002.tb00740>.
- Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Lederach, J. P. (1999). Justpeace. In *People building peace: 35 inspiring stories from around the world* (pp. 27-36). Utrecht, The Netherlands: European Centre for Conflict Prevention.
- Lederach, J. P. (2003). *The little book of conflict transformation*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
- Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. Oxford & New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McGuigan, R. J., & McMechan, S. (2005). Integral conflict analysis: A comprehensive quadrant analysis of an organizational conflict'. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 22(3), 349-362.
- McGuigan, R. J., & Popp, N. (2007). The self in conflict: The evolution of mediation. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 25(2), 221-238.
- Nudler, O. (1990). On conflicts and metaphors: Toward an extended rationality. In J. W. Burton (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory* (pp. 177-201). Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Persky, J. (1995). Retrospectives: The ethology of homo economicus. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 9(2), 221-231.
- Sites, P. (1990). Needs as analogues of emotions. In J. W. Burton (Ed.), *Conflict: Human needs theory* (pp. 7-33). Basingstoke: Macmillan,.
- Staub, E. (1989). *The Roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence*. Cambridge, England & New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Väyrynen, T. (1998). Medical metaphors In peace research: John Burton's conflict resolution theory and a social constructionist alternative. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 3(2). Reproduced at http://www.gmu.edu/programs/icar/ijps/vol3_2/Vayrynen.htm
- Wilber, K. (1996). *A brief history of everything*. Melbourne: Hill of Content.
- Wilber, K. (2000a). *Integral psychology: Consciousness, spirit, psychology, therapy*. Boston, MA: Shambala.
- Wilber, K. (2000b). *Sex, ecology, spirituality: The spirit of evolution* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA & London: Shambala.
- Wilber, K. (2001). *The eye of spirit: An integral vision for a world gone slightly mad*. Boston, MA & London: Shambala.
- Wilber, K. (2003), Lines of development. On *Kosmic consciousness: CD 1* [CD]. Boulder, CO: Sounds True.
- Wilber, K. (2006). Introduction to integral theory and practice: IOS basic and the AQAL map. *Journal of Integral Theory and Practice*, 1(1), 1-40.
- Wilber, K. (2007). *Integral spirituality: A startling new role for religion in the modern and post modern world*. Boston, MA & London: Integral Books.

Woodhouse, T. (2000). Conflict resolution and peacekeeping: Critiques and responses. *International Peacekeeping*, 7(1), 8-26.