

Becoming the Vulnerable Neighbour: From Trauma Research to Practice

Tiffany A. Beks

Abstract

In this article, I explore the relevancy and application of Gadamerian hermeneutics and Lévinasian philosophy (Lévinas, 1991) as adapted by Orange (2011) to the field of counselling psychology, with a focus on working with individuals who have experienced trauma. I begin by exploring an encounter that ignited my search for better understanding the suffering associated with traumatic betrayal in the context of military service, a journey which led me to an application of hermeneutics as a theoretical orientation in trauma counselling. I then examine Gadamerian hermeneutics and Lévinasian constructs with respect to how my practice was altered by this encounter and how my approach to working with survivors of trauma continually evolves. The review of Gadamer's constructs of dialogue and prejudice and Orange's hermeneutic sensibility brings me to new insights as to the application of hermeneutics in the context of counselling psychology and its associated work in trauma care.

Keywords

hermeneutics, counselling psychology, trauma, psychology, qualitative research

I can recall vividly the first time I became aware of the profound suffering experienced by veterans and their families in the aftermath of being betrayed by the military. I had nearly finished an interview with my first MSc thesis research participant, a spouse of a veteran who had been suffering with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) due to adverse events he experienced during a military deployment. The interview had focused on how spouses were affected by the veterans' PTSD, as well as the barriers and facilitators spouses face in engaging with psychosocial supports and services in their community. "Is there anything else you would like me to know before we end the interview?" I asked the standard question that typically

Corresponding Author:
Tiffany A. Beks, BA, MSc
Email: tiffany.beks@ucalgary.ca

proceeds this type of interview, not expecting much more of a response than a signal that she had expressed everything she needed to say. At this point, I was already thinking about everything I had to prepare for a different meeting later that day. Then, unexpectedly, my participant stated, “Actually yes. This didn’t come up in the interview but, I have to say it.” Her voice cracked. She fell silent for a moment. She began to cry. I was confused, concerned, and surprised. I thought: *this is not how an interview ends*. With uncertainty and anxiety, I encouraged her to continue. “I am forever talking my husband off a ledge. I am forever walking on eggshells, making sure he doesn’t take his life, avoiding triggering him, preventing angry outbursts. PTSD touches every part of our life. My kids are suffering with depression and anxiety now because he never got the help he needed. And not once have I ever been offered assistance or training from Veterans Affairs. My husband, my family, we have devoted our life to the military and the military destroyed him. But do you think they will take any responsibility? They promised to support injured veterans and their families, but instead they dismissed him from service, and then they abandoned us. And this...this was the ultimate betrayal.” I could feel my eyes well with tears. I was holding my pen so tight by this time I was shaking. Shaking in anger, disgust, and sorrow. I did not know how to respond and so I remained silent.

I have revisited this experience many times since because it represents the encounter that brought into question everything I thought I knew about trauma. The above narrative not only illustrates the potency of hermeneutic encounters, but it also represents the seedling of the transformation and sense of responsibility that is cultivated within researchers when they are guided by a topic and engage it care-fully (Moules, Venturato, Laing, & Field, 2017). It attends to the unpredictable, yet invaluable learning that takes place in coming to an understanding - -the kind of learning that, paradoxically, leaves us speechless at a time when we feel the intense need to say something. It is also the kind of research “findings” that are rarely articulated in traditional dissertations or empirically-oriented journal articles but are of vital importance to our relationship with a topic and the lives and community it inhabits. This form of learning – coming to an understanding - forms the foundation upon which we, as researchers and practitioners, become a vulnerable neighbour to the suffering stranger and establish a sense of commitment to a subject matter.

Although my hermeneutic encounter occurred within the context of counselling psychology research, it exerted a profound influence on how I orient myself in counselling practice, specifically toward those who have suffered trauma. Gadamerian hermeneutics and Lévinasian constructs offered a philosophy by which I could make sense of the way my practice was altered by this encounter and how my approach to working with survivors of trauma continually evolves. Hence, the purpose of this article is not to demonstrate the application of hermeneutics in research, but to highlight how a hermeneutic encounter in research ignited a shift in my theoretical orientation toward counselling. Throughout this article, I discuss how Gadamerian hermeneutics and Lévinasian constructs adapted by Orange (2011) have informed my understanding of the work I do as an aspiring trauma-focused counselling psychologist. First, I discuss how the experience of being addressed by the topic called into question what I thought I knew about trauma. Next, I offer a rationale for the relevance of hermeneutics to my practice as an emergent trauma counselling psychologist. In the final section, I describe the application of Gadamer’s constructs of dialogue and prejudice and Orange’s hermeneutic sensibility in the discipline of counselling psychology and its associated work in trauma care.

Calling What is “Known” into Question: The Address of the Topic

Gadamerian philosophy asserts that a topic lives before we are aware of it and after we conceal it, but the place where our hermeneutic inquiry begins is likely when we are addressed by the topic (Moules et al., 2015). An address is the experience of being caught off-guard, called, or summoned by something (Moules et al., 2015). Addresses come in the form of an interruption, a break through or, perhaps more so, a *breakdown* in our regular day-to-day life and routine, calling on us to listen, to be vulnerable, and to be open (Moules et al., 2015). This opening to a topic allows us to be guided by its character, rather than previous reductions, labels, or categories we have ascribed to it (Moules et al., 2015). When an address occurs, the topic matters to us and demands a response, a “servitude” imbued in morals and conscience (Moules et al., 2015, p. 72). When a topic presents itself to us, parts of it are hidden and revealed at the same time, and consequently, it breeds questions about how to cultivate an understanding of what already exists (Moules et al., 2015).

Gadamer might have said that our topics are partially concealed from us because of our own biases, beliefs, attitudes, background, and traditions (Moules et al., 2015). Furthermore, it is our engagement and participation in our practice and the topic itself that conceals and reveals aspects of the topic (Moules et al., 2015). Our day to day discourses that constitute our practice remain unquestioned, unexamined, and taken-for-granted until this routine is interrupted by an address. This address problematizes the taken-for-granted, calling on us to understand it differently and wholly (Moules et al., 2015). As such, the address involves *aletheia* in that it is concerned with conserving, enlivening, and remembering something (Moules et al., 2015).

With Gadamerian philosophy in mind, I revisit my experience of being addressed by the topic of the suffering experienced by veterans and their families in the aftermath of being betrayed by the military. According to Moules et al. (2015), topics are often founded in our practice because, as practitioners, we suffer these things in our day to day work. As I actively listened to the narrative of the other (“participant”), I simultaneously understood that there was something about her and me, in this time and place, that created an emotional and psychological space that enabled and fostered a deepened sense of human and worldly connectedness. I felt inextricably linked not just to her and her story, but also society, its welfare, and the future of the world. Even though the content of her story was heart-breaking, it felt good and right to be in that space with her and connect with her. I was absorbed with care - - care for the other, her pain, her family’s suffering, and the betrayal they endured by an institution to which they had devoted their lives. I felt a profound sense of injustice, a need to understand how this could happen, what it meant to her and her family, and the looming question: now what do I do about it? Hearing her story transformed me as a researcher, counselling psychologist, and most importantly, a human being. She taught me about a world I did not know existed, a realm of experience I wanted to know more about. It was as if I had been called upon to devote the total sum of my energy to the topic of traumatic betrayal, and yet, at the same time, *it energized me*. It was through this dialogue and this experience we shared that this topic unfolded, far-removed from a literature review or from an objective, “rational,” logically deduced process. It did not feel as though I had “discovered” this issue, but rather that this topic greeted me and made itself accessible to me. It was almost as

if the topic itself was a living thing, and I held it with the same regard, responsiveness, and responsibility that I would another life.

In reflecting upon my encounter with this topic, and in keeping with the principle of historicism, I must acknowledge a tradition in which I have been situated and entrenched. I am intrigued and passionate about working with individuals who have suffered trauma and with military families because the suffering associated with military service has been a part of my life since I experienced the “thrownness” (Field, 2018) of the world at birth. I come from a long line of descendants who served in the military, and in many ways, my upbringing carries many military traditions, artifacts, and customs forward from the past into the present and future. A description of these traditions is beyond the scope of this article; however, the main point is that there exists an immutable relationship between my decision to focus on trauma in my counselling practice and my family’s military identity, history, and the suffering they have endured. It was not, however, until I began conducting research that my understanding of trauma was challenged. As my research participant shared her story with me, it was her perspective that caught me. It was fresh, new, and very different from my own. I had never thought about the actions of the military institution in the aftermath of traumatic military experiences, its impact on veterans and their family members. On the contrary, I had always thought about their suffering as a mental health condition, categorizing their behaviours and attaching a label in accordance with dominant psychiatric and diagnostic entities. The possibility of a different phenomenon at work sent shockwaves through me, jolted my perspective, and overturned what I thought I knew about trauma. For example, empirical studies have suggested that biological mechanisms may underly PTSD – that is, individuals may be genetically predisposed to develop PTSD based on their DNA (i.e., genetic risk) and this structure may be passed down to offspring, resulting in an intergenerationally produced risk for PTSD (Yehuda, & Bierer, 2009). At the same time, when exposed to a particularly stressful environment, an individual’s genetic functioning may be altered (i.e., epigenetic trauma) and result in PTSD (Yehuda, & Bierer, 2009). This body of knowledge has contributed significantly to my understanding of trauma and its systemic occurrence within and across generations. Yet, I was left wondering: Given this new understanding of betrayal, how I do I make sense of trauma and its origins against the backdrop of my traditions? What other forms of trauma have been concealed by my theories and orientations toward human suffering? Finally, how does this new perspective change the way I practice?

Through the experience described above, something taken-for-granted and never seen was enlivened through listening to the other. In the spirit of Gadamerian philosophy, hermeneutic inquiry seeks to understand that which has been previously concealed (Moules et al., 2015). Furthermore, Gadamerian philosophy emphasizes understanding in terms of practical wisdom and how it occurs in living examples (Moules et al., 2015). This form of knowledge, *phronesis*, is cultivated in our everyday work (Moules et al., 2015). Said differently, it is through listening to the other that I come to an understanding of how I might respond better to the suffering associated with military trauma in my counselling research and practice. I now turn to the writings of Orange (2011) who, in drawing upon Gadamerian and Lévinasian constructs, facilitated my understanding of the applicability of hermeneutic philosophy to the discipline of counselling psychology and its associated work in trauma care.

Entering A Hermeneutics of Trauma and Betrayal

In this section, I provide a rationale for the relevance of hermeneutics to my practice as an emergent trauma counsellor. The rationale for selecting hermeneutics to guide my practice is grounded in three important assumptions. The first pertains to the idea that the practice of counselling psychology is inherently interpretive. The second pertains to the notion that counselling individuals who have suffered trauma requires a shift in our understanding of human distress. The third pertains to the notion that counselling psychologists engaging trauma work must expect to be changed by their practice. Each of these revelations are described in greater detail below.

Counselling as an Interpretive Practice

In the practice of counselling psychology, “interpretation is an omnipresent force that psychologists and clients alike must appreciate and revere” (Klinge, 2015, p. 1). This means that interpretive practice is constantly at work as we search for understanding, not only with respect to the experiences of the other (commonly referred to as “client”), but also our own experiences. Our interpretation and the interpretation brought by the other to the counselling session occurs within an interpersonal and intrapersonal relationship, the self and the other (Klinge, 2015). Further, interpretation is shaped by others and the world around us. The practice of counselling psychology can be thought of as a dialogue between the counsellor and the other that has potential to shape and transform both individuals (Klinge, 2015). Yet, this transformation depends on the extent to which counsellors are open to being transformed by our own experiences and by bearing witness to the narratives of the other.

According to some of the major teachings underpinning counselling psychology as a practice and profession, interpretation is critical to the counselling relationship because interpretation itself is conceived as necessary for therapeutic change to occur (Paré, 2013; Patterson, 1974; Porter, 1959). Moreover, interpretation is viewed as a technique, a skilled art form that must be cultivated and offered carefully and sincerely, with the goal of deepening understanding for both parties (Patterson, 1974). Previous authors have suggested that the distinction between therapeutic reflection and interpretation lies in the motivation underpinning the interaction (Paré, 2013; Porter, 1959). Hence, when a counsellor offers his or her perspective, this is merely the technique of reflection (Klinge, 2015). In contrast, the interaction moves toward interpretation when the intention of an interaction, or offering, is to cultivate deeper understanding (Klinge, 2015). However, I argue that therapeutic interpretation involves more than an intention to deepen understanding. As counselling psychologists, we must remain aware that we cannot escape the fact that interpretation is shaped by our beliefs, attitudes, biases, past experiences, and histories (Klinge, 2015). Thus, if the intention of therapeutic interpretation aims to deepen understanding, the historical, social, emotional, cognitive, and cultural context in which our perspective is rooted must be considered. Furthermore, I offer a different perspective in that *to deepen understanding* is to *question previous understandings and come to new understandings*, for both the counsellor and the client. Gadamer (2013) reminds of us the nature of transformation:

...transformation means that something is suddenly and as a whole something else, that this other transformed thing that it has become is its true being, in comparison with which its earlier being is nil. When we find someone transformed we mean precisely this, that he has become another person. (p. 115)

Thus, the interpretive practice of counselling psychology cultivates *change and transformation* as it transforms both the client and the counsellor.

Shifting Perspectives on Trauma and Distress

In drawing from Lévinasian philosophy, Orange (2011) stated that trauma is inherently relational, and that to be traumatized is a complex series of moments. The first moment is constitutive of the trauma (Greek for *injury*) – the shocking, abusive, or neglectful occurrence – followed by the denial, hypocrisy, dismissal, and silencing both by the perpetrators and by others to whom the individual may have turned to for help. Hence, trauma and betrayal are not distinct events, but are a complex, interconnected sequence of moments that occurs in the process of traumatization. According to Orange, and of critical importance in working with traumatized individuals, we must shift our focus away from what is wrong with the person (i.e., the pathology) to what has happened to the person to result in such distress, a transformation referred to as “entering a hermeneutics of trauma” (p. 83). Importantly, Orange’s account of entering a hermeneutics of trauma parallels my experience of being addressed by the topic of betrayal in the context of military trauma. Indeed, my perspective shifted from a focus on traumatization as a pathology to better understanding the betrayal that happens alongside trauma and its role in human suffering *because* I was confronted with a new perspective that challenged my own traditions. As such, I argue that a hermeneutic approach is necessary for guiding trauma counselling because to better understand the suffering of others and make their pain accessible, I must begin by understanding what within myself impedes my compassion, empathy, and care.

Clinical Attitude and Transformation

According to Orange (2011), in our work in trauma and the accompanying instances of betrayal, rejection, and disavowal experienced by trauma victims, it is necessary that counsellors both listen and *expect* to learn something from the traumatized other. This expectation shapes the attitude of counsellors working in the area of trauma. According to Orange (2011), clinical care in the field of trauma must be guided by the needs of the other, the expectation that one will be questioned by the other with whom we seek understanding, the assumption that the other is surviving despite being wounded, and the presumption that the other is our partner in the search for meaning and understanding. The expectations and, by extension, the attitude described by Orange echoes Gadamerian philosophy and its emphasis on understanding through being with the other (Field, 2018). Given the importance of allowing oneself to learn from, and be changed by, the traumatized other, and the need for clinical trauma work to be guided by a caring and compassionate attitude, hermeneutic philosophy is an appropriate theoretical orientation for counsellors to take in working with those who have suffered forms of trauma, including betrayal.

The Suffering Stranger: Applied Hermeneutics in Trauma Counselling

Applied hermeneutics refers to the application of hermeneutics to the lived realities of professional practice disciplines (Moules, McCaffrey, Morck, & Jardine, 2011). It offers a means to explore professional practice with respect to the inherent complexities and meanings, the dialogues of communal and self-understanding that occur, and how our practice occurs through language and tradition (Moules et al., 2011). Moules et al. (2011) reminds us that “our day to day work is hermeneutic in character” (p. 2).

The practice of counselling psychology is a deeply interpretive discipline wherein the philosophy and method of hermeneutics is central to the work of practitioners (Klingle, 2015; Williams, 2017). An important responsibility of counselling psychologists is to remain abreast of new understandings that inform the way we practice and how we interact with clients – a responsibility that is codified in our ethical professional guidelines (Canadian Psychological Association, 2017). In the context of clients who have suffered trauma, this ethic is extended, not just to include the responsibility to remain current about new understandings, but to remain accountable and ethical to clients through understanding their pre- and post-trauma reality. The experience of being *traumatized* is multi-faceted, touching the cultural, social, physical, spiritual, mental, and emotional fabric of our being (Freyd & Birrell, 2013). Violations of trust and protection perpetrated by powerful and depended-upon institutions, such as the military, either concurrently or in the after-math of traumatic events, might be understood as an additional traumatic experience in its own right or as an event that cannot be separated from what it means to become traumatized (Freyd & Birrell, 2013). It is this emphasis on understanding the suffering of the other who has experienced concurrent or post-trauma betrayal, in an interpretive profession such as counselling psychology, that makes hermeneutics a fitting approach for coming-to-an-understanding of effective trauma care.

In her book *The Suffering Stranger*, Orange (2011) asserted that hermeneutics is a “clinical philosophy” (p. 15). According to Orange, Gadamerian philosophy reminds us that hermeneutics emphasizes a “readiness to listen to and learn from the voice of the other” (p. 15), meaning that the clinical practice of counselling psychologists calls on us to respond to the suffering of the other through dialogical understanding and a hermeneutic of trust. As counselling psychologists, we have an infinite responsibility to respond to the suffering stranger and let him/her teach us. It is this combination of dialogical understanding, in a hermeneutic of trust, that cultivates the response and infinite responsibility to the suffering other, a “hermeneutic clinical sensibility” (p. 3). In drawing from her own experience as clinical hermeneut, Orange stated that the Gadamerian constructs of dialogue and prejudice are continually at work in caring for those who are suffering from trauma. Each of these constructs and their application to counselling psychology are briefly outlined below.

Gadamer thought that we can understand only from participating in conversation with the other, with the expectancy of learning from the other (Orange, 2011). Moreover, one should *expect* to be surprised or caught-off guard by the other and what one learns from the other. According to Gadamer, we “fall into” conversation, without knowing the outcome or the path of the conversation (Orange, 2011, p. 16). Understanding (or not understanding) is an event that occurs. Thus, the path is unpredictable. The construct of dialogue is important with respect to clinical practice, as our work can be thought of as an interpretive interaction between two human beings

(Klinge, 2015; Williams, 2017). For counselling psychologists to help clients, we must engage in dialogue – be it through spoken word, expressive arts, music, or an outdoor walk. Through dialogue, we enter clients' lives and experience and tap into the strands of their lives that have fallen into the background of, or completely disappeared from, the dominant narrative they bring to counselling. We reflect, make, and clarify meaning with our clients. It is our greatest hope that through this dialogue and meaning-making, that life flourishes. This means that dialogue is not a means to an end, but rather, dialogue *is* the meaning-making and the therapeutic ingredient of counselling (Paré, 2013).

Hermeneutics recognizes that understandings “come from somewhere; they are not simply fabricated” (Moules et al., 2015, p. 3). Gadamer proposed that dialogical understanding takes place between worlds of experience steeped in traditions. This is, of course, the case in counselling practice, where counsellor and client encounter one another and represent two worlds of experience existing in the traditions in which we live (Orange, 2011). We each bring to conversation a perspective that is historically built, and thus, it is crucial that we know ourselves, our perspectives, and our traditions better. In counselling practice, we must become astutely aware of our perspective, and appreciate that what occurs between counsellor and client is not void of perspective, beliefs, attitudes, history, or tradition. According to Orange, this does not mean that we are to suspend our prejudices and traditions, but that we develop an ethic and integrity that requires richer and more far-reaching truthfulness with ourselves and with the other. In the words of Gadamer:

It is neither possible, necessary, nor desirable that we put ourselves within brackets. The hermeneutical attitude supposes only that we self-consciously designate our opinions and prejudices and qualify them as such, and in so doing strip them of their extreme character. In keeping to this attitude, we grant the text the opportunity to appear as an authentically different being and to manifest its own truth, over and against our own preconceived notions. (1987, p. 132)

In counselling practice, awareness of the personal and therapeutic theories and traditions in which our practice is grounded, as well as our personal background (e.g., cultural, social, gender), outlines the margins of our perspectives and interpretations (Orange, 2011). In so doing, we return to dialogue as it provides a corrective mechanism to our perspective, broadening and expanding it (Orange, 2011).

Orange (2011) referred to the abovementioned elements as a “hermeneutic sensibility in everyday therapeutics” (p. 22). Counselling as an activity is an endeavour to make contact with the other through language, and to articulate in words what comes to be understood with the other. Counselling is the shared search for understanding. Furthermore, Orange reminds us that clinically-focused work is a matter of the hermeneutics of trust, in that we must allow the other the opportunity to educate us. Counselling involves a willingness to see that the other may have a perspective, an idea, which we have been unsuccessful in understanding. Furthermore, this hermeneutic attitude assumes that, as practitioners, we believe in the veracity, authenticity, and honesty of what the other is saying. Finally, the hermeneutic attitude of trust does not assume that the other will trust us as a counsellor, given their history and background of betrayal, violence, and victimization. In turn, it is this attitude that guides our work with those who are

suffering and cultivates an environment in which the other may learn that he or she belongs and is safe. According to Orange, interpretation is not synonymous with understanding, but rather interpretation makes the understanding explicit. In counselling practice, we must suspend our desire to be right, our theoretical orientations surrounding clients' problems, and our assumptions about ourselves if we are to "hear the voice of the other" and let him or her teach us (p. 43).

In the spirit of a clinical hermeneutic sensibility, Orange (2011) called upon counsellors to better understand the parallels between traumatic suffering, clinical practice, and Lévinasian philosophy. The hermeneutics of trauma, according to Orange, means the clinician allows oneself to be traumatized by the suffering other. Similarly, Gadamerian philosophy reminds us that we belong to a common world, and belonging in a community means we are obligated to our neighbor. To be ethical in trauma care is to respond, and a response is a "refusal to be unmoved, or indifferent, to the face of the other" and the suffering of the other (p. 43). Drawing from the Lévinasian construct of *incumbency*, Orange asserted that there is no time to decide whether the other is worthy of our care, our response; the other's need rises above us, so that we are never in the place to judge. It is the needs of the other, "the suffering stranger" (p. 57), and a counsellor's compassion and receptivity to suffering through dialogue, that is the purpose of the therapeutic relationship. Furthermore, to conceal or misremember this responsibility is a collapse of ethical clinical work. Through this compassion and receptivity to the suffering of the other, we take a risk in that we are then vulnerable, we suffer, and we become traumatized. Orange claimed that our modern obsession with applying palpable tools and procedural interventions deters from the response that is most needed – that is, our willingness to respond by becoming traumatized by the suffering of the other and by coming to a shared understanding of the meaning of the trauma through our dialogue and own traumatization.

The practice of counselling psychology and its associated work in traumatic suffering is deeply hermeneutic. Through dialogue and interpretation, we strive to understand clients' realities, perspectives, and suffering. In working with those who have endured trauma, counsellors are confronted with the responsibility to respond to the suffering of the other, and through a dialogical understanding, we too make ourselves vulnerable and are, in turn, traumatized. By taking this risk and responsibility, we gain self-understanding and mutual understanding. Thus, a hermeneutic sensibility to working with those who have experienced trauma does not require one to *relieve* the suffering of the other, but to *live with the other* in their suffering.

Summary

In this article, I have explored an encounter that ignited my search for better understanding the suffering associated with traumatic betrayal, a journey which led me to an application of hermeneutics as a theoretical orientation in trauma counselling. Through this work, I have come to an understanding and an appreciation of counselling psychology as an interpretive practice, as well as the human concerns I attempt to understand and respond to in my counselling practice. Our interpretation of the trepidations and suffering our clients bring to counselling informs the way we practice, and thus, each new encounter transforms us and we become a different counsellor than we were before. Through hermeneutics, we approach the other with humility, curiosity, and a desire to learn, an attitude that parallels the practice of counselling. Therefore, in applying a hermeneutic sensibility to my practice, I will attempt to live with the other who is

suffering the effects of trauma, to be the vulnerable neighbour, and through dialogue, search for a communal understanding of what it means to survive and flourish after trauma.

References

Canadian Psychological Association. (2017). *Canadian code of ethics for psychologists* (4th ed.). Ottawa, ON, Canada: Author.

Field, J. C. (2018). Lecture on Gadamer and Grondin [Class notes, EDER-701]. Calgary, AB, Canada: University of Calgary.

Freyd, J. J., & Birrell, P. J. (2013). *Blind to betrayal: Why we fool ourselves we aren't being fooled*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1987). The problem of historical consciousness. In P. Rabinow & W. Sullivan (Eds.), *Interpretive social science: A second look* (pp. 82-140). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gadamer, H-G. (1960/2013). *Truth and method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.). London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Klinge, K. (2015). Batman and the sticky-fingered maiden: Psychology as an interpretive practice. *Journal of Applied Hermeneutics*, Article 5. Retrieved from <http://jah.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca>

Lévinas, E. (1991). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority* (3rd ed.). Dordrecht, NL: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Moules, N. J., McCaffrey, G., Field, J. C., & Laing, C. M. (2015). *Conducting hermeneutic research: From philosophy to practice*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Moules, N. J., McCaffrey, G., Morck, A. C., & Jardine, D. W. (2011). On applied hermeneutics and the work of the world. *Journal of Applied Hermeneutics*, Editorial 1. Retrieved from <http://jah.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/jah>

Moules, N. J., Venturato, L., Laing, C. M., & Field, J. C. (2017). Is it really “yesterday’s war”? What Gadamer has to say about what gets counted. *Journal of Applied Hermeneutics*, Article 1. Retrieved from <http://jah.journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/jah/index.php/jah/index>

Orange, D. M. (2011). *The suffering stranger: Hermeneutics for everyday clinical practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Paré, D. (2013). *The practice of collaborative counseling and psychotherapy: Developing skills in culturally mindful helping*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patterson, C. H. (1974). *Relationship counseling and psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Porter, E. H. (1959). *Critical incidents in psychotherapy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Williams, E. P. (2017). What should I do? What would you do? A counselling psychologist's interpretation. *Emerging Perspectives*, 1(2), 1-5. Retrieved from <https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ep/index>

Yehuda, R., & Bierer, L. (2009). The relevance of epigenetics to PTSD: Implications for the DSM-V. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 22(5), 427-434. doi:10.1002/jts.20448