

Voice No Voice Counter Voice ...

Tone Sævi, NLA University College Bergen, Norway
Email: tone.saevi@nla.no

In phenomenology we acknowledge hearing the voice of the author in our reading of his or her text. In fact, P&P endeavours this subjective translucent quality in a good phenomenological analysis and strives to attend to and reinforce it throughout the editing process. The voice of the author often is a significant part of the subjective stamp of quality of a phenomenological text, and unlike mathematics and computer symbols, to phenomenology, "language is [...] voiced" (Ihde, 1986, p. 42). Writing, more than speech, can hide a self. The invisible self is a premise in academic writing but not so in phenomenology.

To Ihde, the hidden self is a second reduction; "the reduction which reduces both sound and sight to such notions as 'information' - as if the only thing conveyed in speech and writing is what the technology proclaims" (p.43). Although language is embodied and always is, language also differentiates the spoken from the speaker. A subjective voice thus never speaks alone. Any voice is faceted – "the who of speech is multiple," Ihde asserts (p. 41). As an example, he mentions Pavarotti singing in Giuseppe Verdi's opera *Il Trovatore* and is experientially heard both as the protagonist Manrico and as Pavarotti (p. 41). The strange thing is that while Pavarotti's outstanding voice draws attention to itself, it at the same time "denies itself on behalf of the world which is presented" (p. 40). This I think, is also the case in writing phenomenology.

The voice of the writer is recognizably heard in the writing – choice of words, intervals, silences, phrasings – or more subtle signs like how she or he expresses thoughts, insights, and meanings. And in particular so when you know the person; he or she speaks to you through their writing. And as Ihde says: "Through the voice of language [...] a world or a new perspective of the world is heard" (1986, p. 40). The authors who contribute to P&P are members of societies, cultures, and subcultures. They share their oral cultural customs displayed in music, songs, poetry, aphorisms, and the like, along with their culture based on written language. Utterances of improvisation, creativeness, or invention mix with traditional patterns, norms, and forms. But living itself "fundamentally [is] improvisation," Ihde says (1986, p. 47). How then are the voices of the authors, the informants, or participants in their studies, or the voice of language itself, coming through in the papers of this current issue?

Kathy Howery introduces us to an experience that very few have had. What is the experience of not having a personal voice, or more precisely to speak with a borrowed voice, because you lack an intelligible voice of your own? What is it like to express one's thoughts, feelings, desires through a technical device like an SGD? Wikipedia explains Voice Output Communication Aids (VOCAs) or Speech Generating Devices (SGDs) as devices which enable the user to speak. The simplest VOCAs store a single pre-recorded message, which is produced in the form of digitised speech when the person

using the device presses a button, switch, or key. The phenomenological interest however, is on the meaning of a technical tool to human experience, or the relationship between the device and the human being. How does the technical device mediate the relationship between the person and the world, and how does the tool influence the person's sense of self and others? For instance how is the experience of having to *chose or find* a voice that you feel comfortable with while most people simply *have* a voice of their own? Howery shows how a person might be heard and part of conversations with others in ways that keep open the question of whose voice and whose participation.

Bjorbækmo, Vindhol Evensen, Groven, Rugseth and Standal argue with Nancy that relationality as contact requires displacement or a shifting of positions of the parties. The relation speaks - often without words, indeed voiceless – yet also in movements, silence, expectant waiting, like in the depicted relationship of Sara and Anna. Our inter-actions speak in a variety of ways and ask from us to wait, respect, tactfully accept, risk and re-locate, re- place, or re-orient ourselves to allow the other to be part of the relationship.

To postoperative patients in a modern hospital the fast-track intensive care speaks of a very short time span for the patient to stay hospitalized. The article of Dreyer, Martinsen, Norlyk and Haahr indirectly forms a counter voice to this (money and resource saving) high – impact medical evidence practice by showing how good nurses might act slowly in the fast world, and thus they create an imaginative space to make the time warp. Objective time is strictly measured according to standardized programmes, but attentive presence and smoothly acting upon the needs of the patients, allow an opening towards more generously experienced time.

Support as professional practice speaks to the person's sense of space in ways that are opening as well as closing. Sommer and Saevi represent a gentle counter voice to the efficient programs of supportive services dealing with young people's problematic and perhaps also paradoxical lives and life-situations. How does the very way the relation takes place speak to the persons involved, and what does it in fact say? What does *supportive support* look like, and how does support open up a spacious room for the young to live, act, and hope in? The socio-political language might prevent us from a deeper understanding of what it is like to be in need of supportive support, and we might think that people with problems are so different from us that we start to call them "they."

Christine Bellerose translates her own embodied and imagined experience of what she describes as "dancing with wings" to readers, who likely have not had an experience like that. Her voice is personal, insistent, gentle, and convincing as it draws out meaning of how the awareness of body and mind can bring us to experiences we never knew we could have. How does the voice of imagination sound, and how does this unheard voice come through while so easily suppressed by pragmatic everyday hustle and bustle – and what do we hear when we hear it?

Jan Jaap Rothuizen in his book review of van Manen's latest book *Pedagogical Tact*, deliberately tells us that the author gives voice to a tradition that has not lost its potency, and moreover, is an important voice in a chorus that opposes the instrumentalization of education. The echo of that voice suggests that existential conditions are not as changable as socio- realistic life is, and children, young people, as well as adults, are in need of pathic pedagogical thinking about pedagogical action.

The voices of two significant philosophers consequential to phenomenology in each of their ways were silenced in 2017 – Lester Embree in January and Eugene Gendlin in May. Kevin Krycka and Scott Churchill – personal friend and colleague of the two – have written their In Memoriams. While the voices of Embree and Gendlin are no longer with us physically, their words, thoughts, and insights will continue to resonate in their

writing and the writing of others who read their works.

References

Ihde, D. (1986). *Consequences of Phenomenology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.