IN FACTIS PAX
IN KNOWLEDGE {THERE IS} PEACE
journal of peace education and social justice
Volume 19 Number 1 (2025): 123-144
https://openjournals.utoledo.edu/index.php/infactispax
ISSN 2578-6857

Exploring Psycho-Educational Horizons in the Face of the Climate Crisis: Links Between Contemplative Pedagogy and the Eco-Relational Paradigm of Peace

Dr. Leonardo González Torres
Mtr. Inés Vázquez Rico

Círculo de estudios para la paz, València, España, mail: leonardo.gtorres@campus-estudiosparalapaz.org, ines.vrico@campus-estudiosparalapaz.org

Abstract

Starting from an analysis of the global ecological crisis and drawing on the concepts of interbeing, the practice of compassion, and the framework of eco-pedagogy, this article explores psycho-educational perspectives for a contemplative ecological pedagogy that integrates critical, experiential, and transformative practices. Through an examination of experiences from the *Círculo de Estudios para la Paz* in IIPE 2024, the epistemological, political, and affective challenges of the emerging eco-relational paradigm of peace are discussed. The article concludes by emphasizing the need to integrate ancestral knowledge, contemplative practices, and an emotional reconnection with the

Earth in order to consolidate an education committed to ecological justice and planetary regeneration.
Key words: climate crisis, interbeing, contemplative pedagogy, eco-relational paradigm

Introduction:
The current ecological crisis and the dominant civilizing model

Among the many threats facing humanity and the planet today, the climate crisis—derived from processes of devastation and the commercialization of land and resources—is the most threatening. According to the *Climate Change Synthesis Report 2023*, human activities, especially those related to greenhouse gas emissions, have caused current global warming of 1.1 °C above the 1850–1900 level in the period 2011–2020, jeopardizing future ecological balance. This temperature increase is due to the use of unsustainable energy, harmful land-use practices, decades of excessive resource consumption, a lifestyle with little respect for ecological needs, and excessive production.

The aforementioned has had an enormous impact on multiple areas of human and non-human life, felt in areas such as food production, lack of water, changes in agricultural practices, and risks to meat and fish production. In the human species, well-being and health are also being affected in relation to frequent infections, global warming and malnutrition, mental health, and displacement due to climate or resource crises. The impact on cities and infrastructure has been evident in flooding in urban and suburban areas, river overflows, and damage to coastal zones—thereby affecting key sectors of regional economies, which, in a relatively interconnected economy, has been felt globally. Finally, biodiversity has been significantly impacted by changes in the structures, seasonal patterns, and species of terrestrial, freshwater, and oceanic ecosystems. Added to this are climatic consequences—attributed to human influence—such as increased fires and severe rainfall.

For several decades, scientists have been warning governments about the consequences of the crisis and how to mitigate its effects. At this point, and in

light of the ecological problem, a second problem arises: the lack of political response to many of the warnings made by scientists to governments (Bleazby et al., 2023). This can be explained if we consider that "the spread of neoliberalism and the increase in distrust in governments, the media, and science only seem to have exacerbated the challenge of responding to climate change" (p. 1087). This highlights the current difficulty of research and evidence in shaping public policies related to land protection. One of the greatest obstacles to such an undertaking is that defending the land directly opposes the neoliberal, extractivist logic that underpins the current paradigm of unbridled growth—a capitalist economic system based on the relentless and unregulated exploitation of resources for personal and private gain.

However, the above must be understood as a continuation of *ecological imperialism* (Crosby, 1986), a form of colonialism that began in the European colonies and involved the transfer of plants, species, and cultivation and production processes to ecological spaces, substantially modifying agricultural processes and traditional models of relationship with the land. Today, such imperialism remains alive through excessive exploitation, the commercialization of resources, and the extractive model. This colonial logic is also anthropocentric, meaning that human beings can make use of other species, subordinating their lives to their own interests. In this sense, the practices of coercion and persecution of land defenders—especially in Latin America—cannot go unnoticed. As EarthRights International reported in 2020, these have increased and diversified, involving not only coercion, blackmail, and armed violence, but also methods such as criminalization and the misuse of legal and political systems to curb and prevent environmental activism, producing negative effects on the collective and community processes of land defense.

Along the same lines, and as analyzed in González and López (2016), the Indigenous peoples of southeastern Mexico, among others, have developed proposals for the defense of land and territory and have been critical of contemporary forms of neoliberalism. This has resulted in proposals and practices of nonviolent civil resistance, peace education in the context of Indigenous peoples, and the use of alternative communication networks,

among others. It is no coincidence that these peoples represent one of the most important poles of resistance to extractivism.

In addition, and in the face of an ethical response to the climate crisis, we believe it is important to raise awareness of the limitations of ethnocentric practices that are decontextualized from the environment and local culture—practices evident in what has been called *green colonialism* (Guha and Martínez-Alier, 2000). This environmental response, under the pretext of protecting the planet, reproduces colonial domination through actions that homogenize and transform the economy, business practices, and ways of relating to the land around the world based on the ethnocentric vision of the Global North, as opposed to the practices of the Global South. As a continuation of the expansionist enterprise initiated during the European colonial era, this type of colonialism has involved the expulsion of Indigenous peoples from ancestrally significant areas, the lack of participation and popular consultation in such processes, and the reproduction of submission and dependence.

So far, we have discussed the role of colonialism and neoliberalism in the climate crisis. We would now like to focus on anthropocentrism as a third element that is an inseparable part of the foundations of civilization and, in our view, has contributed enormously to the devastation of the planet. We understand it, with Plumwood (2002), as a worldview that places human beings separate from and above nature, and that, consequently, has been the cultural basis upon which human needs have been prioritized over those of the planet. This is the result of a dominant paradigm that views the Earth as a means for subsistence and human activity, rather than as an independent organism. This vision has been criticized by ecofeminism (Shiva et al., 2003) and pointed out as one of the pillars upon which the exploitation not only of the Earth but also of women is structured. As a consequence of such a vision, the land ceases to be a living space and is understood instead as a resource that can be controlled, exploited, and sold.

Based on the above, we believe that the response to the climate crisis requires the discussion of new paradigms that allow us to question dominant visions and make structural violence visible. However, to be effective, these paradigms cannot remain embedded in the anthropocentric-capitalist bias of

current interpretive frameworks. Therefore, it is essential that such definitions be developed around the capacity to promote a greater level of peace and, at the same time, move away from anthropocentric notions of peace to place the Earth at the center of concern. This implies, of course, both a cultural challenge—in the sense that it entails changing the narratives and practices through which the planet is defined in Western culture—and an epistemic reconfiguration that positions the Earth as an essential element in the definition and configuration of peace.

Frameworks for rethinking the climate crisis from a perspective of peace: Gaia peace and imperfect peace

Anthropocentrism has been the axis around which practices and relationships with the Earth have been socially structured, and it has also shaped the way in which human beings have considered the possibility and concept of peace. Whether understood as the absence of war—in first-generation peace—or as the presence of social justice, equity, and conditions of peace—in the second generation—definitions of peace remain, from this perspective, confined to the human sphere and, as a consequence, reproduce the separation from the planet and the practices of domination toward it.

In this context, the concept of Gaia Peace - or Earth Peace - (Jiménez , 2017) emerges as a framework for considering new forms of peace that transcend the individual-society relationship and include the society-nature relationship . From this perspective [1], the Earth is understood as a living entity, an organic, dynamic whole in constant self -organization . The definition takes ecology as a paradigm and proposes peace as a process between humans and between humans and the Earth and the planet [2]. In this sense, peacebuilding

[1] The concept of Gaia peace is based on the Gaia Hypothesis (Lovelock, 2000) which understands the biosphere, the oceans , the earth and everything we find on the planet as part of a living ecosystem that seeks balance.

[2] In this sense, Gaia Peace becomes a bridge toward an eco-relational paradigm of peace that recognizes the interdependence between the human and the non-human. We delve deeper into this topic in point 5 of the text.

must involve a transformation of the links , narratives, and practices in relation to and on the planet, an aspect that must impact education , culture, and spirituality.

In this complex climate scenario, the concept of *imperfect peace* (Muñoz, 2001) gains relevance. It assumes that peace is not an absolute, complete, or finished state, but rather a process of constant construction that exists within a framework of tensions, contradictions, and naturally human conflict. In this context, thinking about peace in an imperfect way allows us to recognize small achievements, spaces of resistance, local and global initiatives, cultural proposals, and emerging forms of relationship with nature that are being raised, from various scenarios, as parts of a larger whole.

From the above, there is a need to explore ethical frameworks that can engage with the proposed conceptions of peace and connect with the described climate problems. Locating ourselves in the present, but reviewing current ethical-religious traditions, we believe that Mahayana Buddhism can offer a framework of principles, traditions, and practices of individual or collective transformation that can shed light on a new relationship with the planet. In the following section, we explore the contributions of Buddhist ethics to climate change in order to shed light on a way in which spiritual traditions may—or may not—engage with the contemporary climate crisis, reshape practices and narratives linked to the Earth, and provide a practical-contemplative context for transforming our relationship with it.

A Buddhist view of devastation : searching for the seeds of climate ethics

Attempts to articulate a "Buddhist response to current environmental problems" have been called eco-Buddhism (Harris, 1995). However, a look at Buddhist philosophy shows that eco-Buddhist readings emerge from disparate backgrounds and that the Buddhist canon does not necessarily possess an environmental ethic (Keown, 2007; Ling, 2019). This is partly because "Buddhism does not seem to consider the conservation of nature as anything other than a matter of prudence" (Keown, 2007:97) and partly because it has no general or specific responses in relation to the Western green agenda.

This does not mean, however, that there are no elements that, based on the previous principles, can be structured as a contemporary Buddhist ecology. These exist and attempt to address problems that—although not classical in the founding texts of Buddhism—are relevant to the future development of Buddhism and humanity. Below, we analyze some relevant attempts linked to the establishment of a Buddhist ethic.

Within this virtue ethics, Keown identifies a series of qualities that can become vectors of social and ecological transformation. Humility, compassion, kindness, and equanimity are dispositions that imply an openness toward all beings, without exception. These virtues allow us to rethink the relationship between human beings and the environment, not from a position of superiority or domination, but from an attitude of respect, care, and recognition of others as legitimate subjects of moral consideration. Non-greed, another key principle, invites us to limit personal desires to basic needs, which aligns deeply with an ecological vision that denounces excessive consumption as the primary cause of environmental deterioration. Likewise, the principle of ahimsa—non-violence—prohibits harming, killing, or causing suffering to any sentient being, constituting a clear ethical basis for the protection of animals and ecosystems.

For Loy (2019), an ecology based on Buddhist philosophy is possible, since it is based on principles linked to it. One of these is the idea of interconnection, based on the notions of non-separation and no-self. For Buddhism, the self—separate, autonomous, individual—is an illusion. Recognizing this interconnection is essential to changing the dynamics of land exploitation that are built on the notions of self-environment separation. As a result, the author proposes that the Buddhist ideal of the Bodhisattva—in the context of the climate crisis—must integrate a commitment to spiritual practice and compassionate action towards all beings and the Earth, thus becoming an Eco-sattva. From this perspective, the author proposes an open and active contemplative practice, a contemplative activism which, based on the cultivation of wisdom and equanimity, seeks the transformation of problems as a natural extension of spiritual practice for the sake of the happiness of all beings.

One of the most important ideas in the Buddhist context is that of Dukkha: a notion of universal suffering linked to the constant dissatisfaction inherent in an unenlightened life. For Loy, the ecological crisis is a collective manifestation of Dukkha and is promoted, at the individual and collective levels, by the three poisons (or poisonous roots) in Buddhism: greed, ignorance, and aversion. Some of the manifestations of the three poisons at the ecological level would be: excessive and uncontrolled consumption, the indiscriminate exploitation of resources, the denial of evidence regarding climate change, etc.

From this ecological perspective, Kaza (2014) proposes a Buddhist climate ethic that, based on both Buddhist ethics and psychology, aims to minimize environmental suffering through individual and social practices. Kaza also analyzes the climate crisis from a Buddhist perspective and presents the denial of the crisis as its central problem. This arises, to a large extent, due to the privilege of people in positions of power over less fortunate people.

Likewise, Buddhism contains elements within its philosophy that allow for a response to the climate crisis. This must be based on an ethic upon which coherent responses can be established. There are three fundamental elements of such an ethic: the pursuit of general well-being, the cultivation of compassion and non-harm, and awareness and action linked to karma.

The pursuit of general well-being would be the work to ensure that all beings achieve satisfaction. From an ecological perspective, this would entail fighting for the well-being of the planet, for a society safe from climate change, and for people's ability to maintain a sense of internal control in the face of crisis.

Compassion is a virtue and psychological state that, within the Buddhist context, involves an experience composed of three elements: the ability to be sensitive to the pain of others, awareness of pain as a universal element, and the desire to alleviate suffering. It is linked to non-harm, the attitude and commitment to respect life and not cause harm to other beings in our path.

Finally, as part of this ethic, we must work with a long-term perspective, based on the law of cause and effect or the law of karma. We believe, along with the author, that a karmic understanding of time—measured in kalpas, an immeasurable measure of time that encompasses the time before and after the human species and the planet—allows us to reflect on the role of human

beings in the history of the universe and is a way to question and make visible the dominant anthropocentrism. We also agree that a long-term perspective is necessary to fight against climate change, since the results will not be seen in the short term and will require patience and equanimity.

Taken together, the contributions of Keown, Loy, and Kaza show that, although Buddhism was not formulated with a modern ecological agenda in mind, it offers a solid foundation for conceiving an integral climate ethic. This ethic is not built simply on prohibition or obligation, but on the cultivation of a deeply interdependent worldview, a commitment to the well-being of all beings, and a practice that unites personal transformation with compassionate action. Understood in this way, Buddhist ecology is not merely a theoretical proposal, but a path to spiritual and political transformation for a world in crisis. We are particularly interested in the possibility of promoting experiential work that contributes to the promotion of ecological peace in people. For the reasons mentioned above, in the next section we discuss the possibility that two of the main points presented can be structured, together with a third, as a basis for work in education in eco-peace: inter-being, compassion, and eco-pedagogy.

Towards an ecological contemplative pedagogy: Inter - being, compassion and eco- pedagogy

Within contemporary Buddhism, Zen master Thich Nhat Hanh develops and disseminates the idea of interbeing. This idea is linked to what, in primitive Buddhism, is understood as conditioned arising, co-arising, or interdependent arising; a term that refers to the Buddhist way of understanding being, according to which nothing in the world arises autonomously or sustains itself but rather requires other beings for its subsistence.

The author also offers a second interpretation of the term, linked to protest and social commitment: awareness of self-interest implies commitment and, eventually, protest and/or resistance. This new configuration has been dubbed Engaged Buddhism (Ling, 2019), that is, an attitude that seeks to provide help and actively collaborate with others for their safety. Aware of the

climate crisis, the author also reflects on the principle of self-interest and the human connection with the Earth:

> You are not just our environment. You are not something outside of us. You are not just the Earth we walk on. You are so much more than that. You are in we, and we are in you. There is no separate you and me. Interbeing is clearly there in the way you and I exist. You are exactly us, and we are you. The knowledge of interbeing can free us from the separation complex and can help us fall in love with the Earth, to protect and care for it as we do with our own bodies, with our own hearts (Nath Han, 2013:12).

As we can see, working with interbeing has both political and pedagogical implications. First, and in relation to pedagogy, this state implies a new way of thinking and feeling, and therefore, a learning process. This learning process cannot be achieved exclusively through traditional educational methods and therefore requires the integration of appropriate methodologies for such a process. Contemplative practice, we believe, is an essential element when it comes to learning to interbe. This process should involve looking more clearly, more deeply, and more fully at the everyday, at what is already here. For us, this also implies the possibility of overcoming the ignorance that—as described—lies behind the current hegemonic vision of the planet. Secondly, the approach to interbeing entails profound political implications. Being with others and thanks to others necessarily implies assuming an ethical commitment that transcends the individual. It presupposes an active commitment to the well-being, health, and safety of human beings, nonhumans, and the planet. This relational understanding of existence places the student or practitioner before the responsibility of acting in accordance with the assumed interdependence.

In this context, compassion is revealed as an emotion that goes beyond empathy and embraces the suffering of others—human and nonhuman—which implies a new form of transcendence of anthropocentrism. From this state, it is possible to be moved by the pain of others and, from this integral experience, take concrete action in the face of suffering. In this way,

compassion becomes a force for potential social change, capable of shaping our decisions in ways that are more respectful of the environment.

In addition to the above, we find it important, thirdly, to place eco-pedagogy, or earth pedagogy, as an element linked to a contemplative and ecological pedagogy (Ruiz-Peñalver et al., 2021). Emerging around the 1990s and based on the social outcry for a more critical reflection on the earth, it is a movement and pedagogy that seeks, on a critical basis, "to test the experience of a new paradigm: the visualization of the planet as a single unit" (p. 186) and whose values are summarized in: the diversity and interdependence of life; the concern that all human beings can live on the planet in dignified conditions; respect for human rights; the possibility of equitable, balanced, and sustainable development; equity and social justice; and the prevention of what can be harmful.

We believe that there are strong commonalities among the three elements proposed, which provide fertile ground for exploring pedagogical proposals that can provide answers to the ecological panorama described. The concept of interbeing allows us to realize that nothing exists separately; a relational vision is found both in the cultivation of compassion and in eco-pedagogy. Furthermore, complementing compassionate contemplative practice with eco-pedagogy can allow this exercise to be nourished with a critical awareness based on concrete facts on which to reflect and respond. In this sense, the political dimensions pointed out in relation to interbeing and compassion are expanded with reflection on social and ecological justice.

In short, we believe that, based on a vision of interbeing, it is possible to cultivate compassion in an engaged and situated way when linked to eco-pedagogy. An education that considers these elements can be consistent with the Gaia and imperfect peace that has been proposed and serve as the basis for new paradigms for thinking about the climate crisis.

Exploring an experiential and contemplative model in education for eco-peace: experiences from the Circulo de estudios para la paz

In Factis Pax
Volume 19 Number 1 (2025): 123-144
https://openjournals.utoledo.edu/index.php/infactispax

In light of the above, the question arises as to whether the perspective of interbeing, the practice of compassion, and education about the Earth can coherently coexist within a peacebuilding program strongly rooted in educational interventions. First, we understand, along with Freire (1970), that:

> The function of education , in this sense, is not to adapt the individual to reality, but to transform it with him . It is not to domesticate him, but to liberate him. Education is , therefore, an act of knowledge, a critical approximation to reality. The more critical it is , the closer it comes to true education . (pp. 100)

This approach allows us to conceive of education not as a tool at the service of a pre-existing order but as a space for the active reconfiguration of the world. In this sense, the liberation proposed by Freire refers not only to social or political emancipation, but also to epistemological and ontological liberation, that is, to the possibility of questioning the frameworks of knowledge, perception, and experience that sustain the dominant paradigm of separation between the subject and the world. Therefore, we understand that an education such as the one described should be liberating and promote critical thinking that helps people criticize the ethnocentric, mercantilist positions based on a vision disconnected from the planet that are at the base of current civilization.

This critique implies a process of deep awareness about how our ways of seeing, feeling, and acting in relation to our environment are constructed. Moving from a hegemonic relationship with the planet to one based on interbeing, compassion, and care would imply, first, freeing oneself from one's own epistemology — from the colonial, individualistic, and extractivist frameworks that shape our perspective — and then moving on to transformative action. This is a process of "decolonizing being," in Walsh's (2009) terms, which also includes an affective and spiritual reorientation with respect to the natural world.

However, in order to establish such a process, it is essential to keep in mind that transcending the concept of separation, cultivating compassion, and understanding the Earth experientially implies practices that are in tune with tradition, context, and the purpose of such objectives. In other words, it is not enough to transmit content or concepts about ecology or spirituality; it is

necessary to create experiential, sensitive, and relational spaces where such knowledge can be embodied and transformed into living wisdom. Therefore, it seems essential to us that education not only be liberating, but also contemplative, which we understand, with Zajonc (2013), as a praxis that does not seek to "replace critical thinking, but to root it in a deeper awareness of the being and the world, promoting a sense of interconnection, ethical responsibility, and care for life in all its forms" (p. 83).

This grounded view of knowledge implies a pedagogy that does not fragment the subject but rather considers them as a whole—corporeal, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual. From this perspective, it is understood that any method based on these assumptions must have a learning context that allows for the inclusion of pedagogical activities to deepen or expand mindfulness, deconstruct selfhood, and cultivate virtuous sentiments. Some contemplative practices that have been established (Barbezat and Bush, 2014), when used in a secular context to promote better balance, compassion, and ethics, include: 1) mindfulness practices, 2) contemplative reading, 3) journaling to develop self-awareness and integrate experiences, 4) deep listening and dialogue to learn to cultivate empathy and compassion in the relational process—verbal and non-verbal, 5) aesthetic practices such as mindful looking or painting, 6) conscious movement practices, walking meditation, mindful yoga, qi gong, 7) loving-kindness compassion practices, which aim to develop a worldview from cultivated emotionality, and 8) conscious silence.

We believe that these practices not only can but should be included in the context of ecological teaching if it is to be transformative. Their inclusion is not a fad or a pedagogical ornament, but a structural necessity for education to connect individuals with their own interiority and with life as a whole. We believe that, in addition to critical and liberating thinking, contemplation can provide enormous benefits in the deconstruction of our relationship with the Earth. We believe that starting from the idea of interbeing implies cultivating contemplation, since the recognition of interdependence is not realized solely at the conceptual level but is experienced through attentive and compassionate practice. We maintain that cultivating an awareness of nonduality—present in the anthropocentric relationship of domination of the Earth—is essential if

change is to be comprehensive and integrative, not merely cognitive. This represents a radical shift toward an education for being, not just for knowing.

Along the same lines, a third component of the model described is experiential education, which for us represents an ideal framework within which to work with the critical and contemplative perspectives previously described. We agree with Kolb (1984) that the learning process must be active and reflective. For the author, this path is structured in four phases: 1) concrete experience, 2) reflective observation, 3) abstract conceptualization, and 4) active experimentation. This cycle allows knowledge to be formed through experience, not just through instruction. For us, this journey is fundamental to ecological education because it enables us to revisit our concern for the planet and redefine it as a concrete reality, from which we begin the subsequent critical or contemplative process. The direct experimentation phase, for its part, is the ideal ground for promoting prior learning in a real social context and fostering an Earth activism rooted in the exploration of the internal and external world. In this sense, the concrete experience can include everything from conscious walks through nature to regenerative agriculture practices, community rituals of connection with the Earth, or collaborative ecosystem restoration projects, which serve as a basis for critical reflection and transformative action. Thus, experiential education becomes a bridge between contemplation and commitment, between feeling and doing, between the internal world and social transformation.

In short, I believe that a critical and liberating education can be complemented by contemplative and experiential education, giving rise to learning processes in which people can go beyond intellectual knowledge to connect with spaces where, starting from concrete reality but passing through contemplative practice, they can insert themselves into processes of concrete change in ecological and social reality.

Contributions to the discussion on the eco-relational paradigm of peace at IIPE

In 2024, the International Institute for Peace Education (IIPE) convened an international meeting for educators, researchers, and policymakers involved in

peace education. On this occasion, in which we had the opportunity to share some of our psychoeducational research progress, we raised the need—in light of the current climate crisis—to explore the relational ecological paradigm of peace. This is an emerging perspective that is developed, in our view, based on two fundamental needs: 1) the need to rethink peace and peace education in light of the global ecological crisis, and 2) the need to explore and, potentially, consolidate pedagogical models to address it, a need that Kyrou (2007) identified years ago and that we believe has not been sufficiently explored.

From the perspective of this paper, moving toward an eco-relational paradigm of peace implies a process of decolonizing nature as a human resource and, consequently, questioning anthropocentrism, the foundation upon which current Western civilization has largely been built. For us, given the above, it is no coincidence that the concepts of interbeing, compassion, and ecopedagogy can offer alternatives at this point. Born within Eastern civilizational frameworks (the first two), and in line with the vision and demands of many indigenous peoples of the Americas (the third), these visions—placed in the context of current problems—represent critical views of the relationship of domination with the Earth and situate the human being as a part of a whole that involves and contains them.

In short, the eco-relational paradigm, from the perspective we have explored and discussed in this paper, entails a shift in worldview. It shifts from an ethic of exploitation to an ethic of care and interdependence among all beings. This vision engages with eco-feminist knowledge, the ancestral—and current—perspectives of many indigenous peoples, and contemplative approaches, all of which support an ecological paradigm while simultaneously explaining the human role and behavior within it.

Despite the above, we believe that the transition toward this paradigm entails profound challenges. The first of these is related to the possibility of including in the current dialogue, within scientific frameworks closely linked to Western thought, knowledge from traditions that have historically been excluded as legitimate discourses on reality. We therefore believe that an open attitude to academic debate and the exploration of models and forms of knowledge about the Earth can be the basis for new—always imperfect—solutions to the crisis.

The second challenge identified relates to the political implications of the eco-relational paradigm of peace in the face of the global crisis. In a context in which the struggle for and defense of the Earth is, in many cases, punished and persecuted by de facto powers anchored in colonialism, relational enterprises in the face of ecology may be jeopardized. We therefore believe it is essential to incorporate the voices of social and political actors who find themselves in risk zones in the reflection on the new paradigm in two essential areas: 1) reflection on its political implications and 2) pedagogical implications. We believe that only on this basis will it be possible for the paradigm to be truly critical, truly relational, ecological, and participatory.

Finally, we identify a third and final challenge, linked to the possibility of changing the affective and spiritual relationship with the planet in a context of growing disconnection from life in non-urban settings. Relationalism presupposes presence and coexistence. In a context that increasingly tends toward urbanization and ignorance of the Earth, it is possible that new molds will be confronted by a technological mediation that gives an image of relationality but does not imply being-with-the-Earth. We therefore believe that it is essential that the psychoeducation we have proposed in this paper, as well as the paradigm we discuss, be based on full presence with the Earth, emphasizing and promoting direct experience in non-urban contexts.

Conclusion

The current ecological crisis challenges our old ways of thinking about and relating to the planet. In the face of devastation, we need to rethink peace outside of anthropocentric molds. This requires changing the way we think about peace and placing the Earth at the center of that reflection. It has been proposed, therefore, that peace must open itself to an ecological understanding that is capable of rethinking and responding to colonialism and the commodification of the planet.

A pedagogical approach was proposed that articulates three elements: awareness of interbeing as a substratum and ontological vision, the cultivation of compassion as a relational principle, and ecopedagogy as a transformative critical framework. We believe this approach can be an appropriate and fertile

ground for new explorations of an ecological contemplative pedagogy where practice is linked to direct social action.

Finally, we have identified some challenges in the consolidation of the eco-relational paradigm: the possibility of consensual inclusion of knowledge historically excluded from the scientific and academic fields, the active participation of social and political actors in contexts of political struggle and persecution, and the need to establish a direct experiential relationship with the land in a context of increasing urbanization and relational mediation by technology. Faced with these challenges, we believe that an attitude of constant explanation of new educational paradigms, participatory research, and direct experience of the land are fertile avenues for future work.

References

Alkoby, A., Halperin, E., Tarrasch, R., & Levit-Binnun, N. (2017). Increased support for political compromise in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict following an 8-week mindfulness workshop. *Mindfulness, 8*, 1345–1353. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-017-0710-5

Barbezat, D. P., & Bush, M. (2014). Contemplative practices in higher education: Powerful methods to transform teaching and learning. Jossey-Bass.

Bergen-Cico, D. & Proulx, J. (2018). *Mindfulness and contemplative practices for diverse cultures*, https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.25337.52324

Bleazby, J., Burgh, G., Thornton, S., Graham, M., Reid, A., & Finefter-Ronsebluh, I. (2023). Teaching about climate change in the midst of ecological crisis: Responsibilities, challenges, and possibilities. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *55*(10), 1087–1095. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2023.2211260

Broome, B. (2017). Intercultural peacebuilding. In Young Sun Kim (Ed), *The International Encyclopedia of Intercultural Communication* (pp. 1-9),

John Wiley & Sons, Inc,
https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118783665.ieicc0059

Chaitin, J. (2014). I need you to listen to what happened to me: Personal narratives of social trauma in research and peace-building. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 84*, 475–486. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000023

Crosby, A. W. (1986). *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900*. Cambridge University Press.

DeLuca, S. K., Kelman, A. R., & Waelde, L. C. (2018). A systematic review of ethnoracial representation and cultural adaptation of mindfulness- and meditation-based interventions, *Psychological Studies, 63*, 117–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12646-018-0452-z

Djikic, M., Langer, E. J., & Stapleton, S. F. (2008). Reducing stereotyping through mindfulness: Effects on automatic stereotype-activated behaviors. *Journal of Adult Development, 15*, 106–111. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-008-9040-0

EarthRights International (2020). Criminalización de defensores y defensoras de la Tierra: elementos para la defensa legal desde el análisis de casos. Recuperado de https://earthrights.org/publication/criminalizacion-defensores-tierra-defensa-legal/

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogía del oprimido (2.ª ed.). Siglo XXI Editores.

Galtung, J. (2003). *Violencia Cultural*, Guernika-Lumo, Gernika Gogoratuz, España.

Gilbert, P. (2020). Compassion: From its evolution to a psychotherapy, *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*. 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.586161.

González, L. &. López, L. (2016). Noviolencia como alternativa de resistencia en Chiapas, México: el caso de las Abejas de Acteal, *Polis*, 181-201, 10.4067/S0718-65682016000100009

Guha R. y Martínez-Alier J. (2000): Ecologistas del Sur: Ecología y política en la edad del desarrollo. Icaria

Harris, I. (1995). Buddhist environmental ethics and detraditionalization: The case of EcoBuddhism. Religion, 25(3), 199–211. https://doi.org/10.1006/reli.1995.0019

Heise, A., Panting, A., Waelde L. C. (2019). Mindfulness in the peacebuilding process. *The Psychology of Peace Promotion*. Springer. 11-24. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-14943-7_2

Hui Ling Lim (2019) *Environmental Revolution in Contemporary Buddhism: The Interbeing of Individual and Collective Consciousness in Ecology Religions, 10, 120*

Hyukmin, K. (2022). Enforced silence or mindful non-violent action? Everyday peace and South Korean victims of civilian massacres in the Korean War, *Peacebuilding, 10* (3), 297-312, DOI: 10.1080/21647259.2021.1989901

Jenkins, T. (2008), The International Institute on Peace Education: Twenty-six years modeling critical, participatory peace pedagogy", *In Factis Pax, 2*, (8), 166-174 in: http://www.infactispax.org/Volume_special_IIPE/Jenkins.pdf

Jiménez Bautista, F. (2017). *Paz ecológica y Paz gaia: Nuevas formas de construcción de paz. Revista de Cultura de Paz, 1, 7–29. Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja. https://revistadeculturadepaz.com/index.php/culturapaz/article/view/2/0*

Kabat-Zinn. (2015) Mindfulness. *Mindfulness, 6*,1481–1483, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-015-0456-x

Kaza, S. (2019). *Buddhist contributions to climate response.* En Green Buddhism: Practice and compassionate action in uncertain times (pp. 157–170). Shambhala Publications.

Keown, D. (2007). *Buddhism and ecology: A virtue ethics approach1.* Contemporary Buddhism, 8(2), 97–112.

Kolb, D. (1984), Experiential learning experiences as the source of learning development. Nueva York: Prentice Hall.

Kyrou, Ch. N. (2007). Peace ecology: An emerging paradigm in peace studies. International Journal of Peace Studies, 12(1), 73-92. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41852955

Lovelock, J. E. (2000). *Gaia: A new look at life on Earth (Rev. ed.).* Oxford University Press.

Loy, D. R. (2019). *Ecodharma: Buddhist teachings for the ecological crisis.* Wisdom Publications.

Muñoz, F. (2001). La paz imperfecta: apuntes para la reconstrucción del pensamiento «pacifista». Universidad de Granada. https://www.ugr.es/~fmunoz/documentos/pimunozespa%C3%B1ol.pdf

Nhất Hạnh, T. (2013). *Love letter to the Earth.* Parallax Press.

Pettigrew, T., Christ, O. Wagner, U, & Stellmacher, J. (2007) Direct and indirect intergroup contact effects on prejudice: A normative

interpretation *International Journal of Intercultural Relations,* 31, (4), 411-425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.11.003

Plumwood, V. (2002). Environmental Culture: The Ecological Crisis of Reason. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203996430

Reardon, (1988) *Comprehensive Peace Education: Educating for Global Responsibility,* Teachers College Press.

Ruiz Peñalver, S. , Porcel Rodríguez, L. & Ruiz Peñalver, A. (2021). *La ecopedagogía en cuestión: una revisión bibliográfica.* Contextos Educativos: Revista de Educación, (28), 183–201. https://doi.org/10.18172/con.4489

Spijkerman, Pots & Bohlmeijer (2016) Effectiveness of online mindfulness-based interventions in improving mental health: A review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials, *Clinical Psychology Review, 45*, 102-114, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2016.03.009.

Shapiro, S. (2002). Towards a critical pedagogy of peace. In G. Salomon & B. Nevo (Eds.), *Peace education: The concept, principles and practices around the world*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Snauwaert, D. (2012). Betty Reardon's conception of "peace" and its implications for a philosophy of peace education". *Peace Studies Journal, 5*, (3), 45-5.2

Shiva, V. (2005). *Earth democracy: Justice, sustainability, and peace*. South End Press.

Anderson, T. & Suominen Guyas, A (2012) *Earth Education, Interbeing, and Deep Ecology,* Studies in Art Education, 53:3, 223-245

Upadhyay, P. (2017). Climate Change as Ecological Colonialism: Dilemma of Innocent Victims. *Himalayan Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, *7*, 111–140. https://doi.org/10.3126/hjsa.v7i0.17153

Walsh, C. (2009). Interculturalidad, Estado, Sociedad. Luchas (de)coloniales de nuestra época. Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar. *https://www.uasb.edu.ec/publicacion/interculturalidad-estado-sociedad-luchas-decoloniales-de-nuestra-epoca/*

Zajonc, A. (2013). Contemplative pedagogy: A quiet revolution in higher education. In Barbezat, D. P., & Bush, M. (Eds.), Contemplative practices in higher education: Powerful methods to transform teaching and learning (pp. 81–98). Jossey-Bass.