

# Peacemaking Criminology

Hal Pepinsky

Published online: 18 May 2013  
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

**Abstract** This is an overview of the work of criminologists that informs how people build trust, safe and social security in the face of violent social differences. The article begins with a story of how the term “peacemaking” came to “criminology.” A theory of peacemaking emerging from this beginning is then stated, including a review of criminological literature that informs the theory. The theory is grounded in a paradigmatic departure from criminology’s tradition—the study of crime and criminality—to proposing instead of studying what replaces human separation with cooperation and mutual trust. This paradigm implies that stories of dispute handling are its most authoritative data, especially stories people tell about their own relations. It also implies new ways of evaluating the fruits of adopting a peacemaking paradigm for learning and living.

## Introduction

Caught in an academic world classified by (sub-)disciplines, I regard peacemaking criminology as a self-discipline. *Criminology as Peacemaking* (Pepinsky and Quinney 1991) was the title of a collection of essays collected primarily at three successive American Society of Criminology meetings in the late eighties. Given the prominence of a couple of generations of criminologists, or more broadly sociologists, who contributed to the book, “peacemaking criminology” became cited as a “school” or sub-discipline of criminology in textbooks in short order. Or was peacemaking criminology a theory? Or was it just a perspective?

I have been asked to contribute this article to the journal because I was co-editor of the book, the one who suggested using the word “peacemaking” instead of “peace” in the title. I wrote the summary chapter at the end of the book. I drew my own conclusions as to the significance of the chapters, which I had arranged into several sections, in the

---

H. Pepinsky (✉)  
Worthington, OH, USA  
e-mail: pepinsky@indiana.edu

concluding chapter. There I defined boundaries of the paradigm in which I henceforth was to construct my own theory of how to build interpersonal and intergroup trust, safety and security, of how to transform opposition into negotiation and accommodation of differences. Meanwhile, most of the contributors to the book have become more illustrious in the field of criminology on their own terms, in their own ways, in their own right. Some of them appear in this very issue. None of the contributors here has adopted the word “peacemaking” to describe her or his own work. Criminologists who have adopted the term have, as described below, used it in their own ways.

This review of literature on peacemaking criminology, then, is essentially a story of the development of my own thinking and practice about how to transform violence into cooperation, of how to make peace from the intrapersonal to global social levels. I build on literature from all manner of sources, most of which doesn’t use the term “peacemaking,” much of which is by folks who do not call themselves criminologists either. My concern for understanding how to transform violence transcends normal academic boundaries. My ultimate test of my understanding is my capacity to make peace in my own relations. In this article I lay out the theory and methods of learning and doing peacemaking, as that world has unfolded to me. It is a work in progress.

## Peacemaking Comes to Criminology

### Criminology as Peacemaking (Pepinsky and Quinney 1991)

I taught a required course for criminal justice majors at Indiana University called “alternative social control systems” from the spring of 1977 until I retired in 2009. That was the point at which Tift and Sullivan (1980) had made me aware that there was a place for those like me who questioned state definitions of crime; I was declaring myself to be a communist-anarchist criminologist too (Pepinsky 1978). Dennis and Larry later organized the Justice Studies Association ([www.justicestudies.org](http://www.justicestudies.org)); I am a charter life member and anarchist still.

By the early eighties, a number of my students were complaining. “Hal, you have a lot of negative things to say about the criminal justice system. Be practical. What do you propose instead?” By 1984 in *Myths That Cause Crime* (last updated 1992), Paul Jesilow and I concluded by pointing to a variety of approaches to crime control, from mediation to worker ownership and operation as an antidote to white-collar crime.

I had spent my last year before college going to a Norwegian school, and as a criminologist come to admire the work of Nils Christie, particularly his book on *Limits to Pain* (1981). Norway has had one of the lowest incarceration rates in the world. The spring of 1986 I returned to Norway on a Fulbright to spend time with Nils and to study “peaceful societies.” There as I translated my ideas into Norwegian, I discovered my positive alternative to criminal harm we don’t want, a way of relating with each other I labeled “responsiveness” after the Norwegian translation for three English words: responsibility, liability and accountability. I sent a draft of an article on “violence as unresponsiveness” (Pepinsky 1988) to a mentor of mine, Richard Quinney for comment. He proposed that we collect papers to publish a book on “criminology as peace.” I responded that to me, “peace” was not a state of things (except perhaps when we rest in peace)—that it was inherently human to be in conflict. I suggested we use “peacemaking” instead, to my knowledge, the first time anyone had used “peacemaking” and “criminology” together.

Soon after publication, this volume that Richard Quinney and I edited began to be cited in textbooks as the standard reference to represent a school called “peacemaking criminology.” Chapters came from a 3-year series of sessions titled “peacemaking” at American Society of Criminology meetings organized by Kevin Anderson (who contributed a chapter linking “Marxian and Gandhian humanism”); Richard and I gathered the rest. In chapter 1, Richard described “the [Buddhist] way of peace,” linking “crime, suffering and service” (echoed today for instance in the “restorative justice” network of families of Israeli and Palestinian murder victims calling themselves No More Taking Sides [“On Being” November 29, 2012]). The book is divided in four parts: religious and humanist traditions, feminist peacemaking traditions and women’s experience, critical peacemaking traditions, and my summary concluding chapter headed “the peacemaking choice.” Authors include several presidents of the Division on Critical Criminology and other active members of the DCC, and the earliest explicitly criminological or criminal justice feminists whose work in my lifetime I know, M. Kay Harris and the late “Quaker, feminist, pacifist” sexual violence activist, Safer Society Program founder Faye Honey Knopp, primary author of the first explicitly prison abolitionist text, *Instead of Prisons* (Knopp et al. 1976). Among us 25 contributors, only Richard and I have gone on to associate our work with the “peacemaking” label.

#### Subsequent Works on Peacemaking Criminology

Several other activist researchers have before and since explicitly dedicated books to applying “peacemaking” to problems of criminal justice: Fuller (1988), Braswell et al. (2001), Pranis et al. (2003), Pranis (2005), and Boyes-Watson (2008). Fuller (1988) sees peacemaking criminology as a progression of “ideas” about how to respond to crime: from a moral imperative on through classifying crime, selecting sanctions and defining due process, to including parties affected, to making responses socially just, to nonviolence. He too bases peacemaking criminology on the premise that crime is a social construction, and that differences in how we respond to crime are based more on who’s who than on what’s what. His collaboration with Braswell and Lozoff draws on stories of prisoners, conversations with prisoners and ideas for reforming prisons, which to them illustrate “the great wisdom traditions”—specifically Christianity, Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, and Native American, that “teach us that the way to liberation is through love, compassion, and peace while the way to remaining in our inner prison [‘being held hostage to fear and anger’] is through attachment to such things as accumulation of wealth, the attainment of success, and the grasping for power” (Braswell et al. 2001:24).

Pranis et al. (2003), Pranis (2005) and Boyes-Watson (2008) draw on the North American indigenous tradition of gathering in “peacemaking circles” to do community business. Applied first in place of sentencing convicted offenders in according to law, they can also be used for doing virtually any kind of business. Boyes-Watson’s interviews tell stories of the circle process as applied by a community organization, Roca (“rock” in Spanish), in “one of the most broken and dangerous neighborhoods near Boston.” Roca invited Kay Pranis, Barry Stuart and Chris Wedge and their associates to train them and help them get started. As of Boyes-Watson’s study, Roca had convened talking circles, conflict circles, healing circles, family circles, brainstorming and management circles, art circles, court-related circles, visioning circles, and support circles (as for a gang leader about to go to prison, and for grieving personal loss or trauma). For criminologists and criminal justice practitioners and policymakers, it is noteworthy that as an alternative to getting tough on gang leaders and taking them off the streets, gang leaders have come to

circles to talk issues through before shooting happens. Boyes-Watson (2008: 73) reports that in 1999, after Roca applying the process to its relationships with “community partners,” the local police chief stood up at a city council hearing on an ordinance proposed to extend police powers to arrest gang members, saying arrests “would not solve the gang problem and might even make it worse,” saying it would work better for police to “work with places like Roca.” Pranis (2005:33–46) offers a clear and concise summary of guidelines for peacemaking circles in which I ground my overview of the elements of peacemaking in the section below on “learning and making peace.”

### Restorative Justice

These writers on peacemaking circles see their work as falling under the heading of “restorative justice.” Van Ness and Strong (2010: 71–72) credit Eglash (1977, as adapted from 1958) for the original distinctions among “retributive justice” (punishment of offenders), “distributive justice” (treatment of offenders) and “restorative justice” (restitution by offenders). Eglash traces restorative justice to Christian roots of repairing social damage by crime rather than taking the crime out on the criminal. The label is most commonly applied as a criminal justice option worldwide to programs of victim-offender mediation and “conferencing” whose elements of peacemaking are described in the following section. In North America, the Mennonite Central Committees of Canada (1974) and of the United States (1977) introduced the first avowedly restorative alternatives to criminal justice as usual, calling them Victim Offender Reconciliation Programs. Mennonite Howard Zehr is widely recognized as a founding exponent of, and theoretical inspiration for, contemporary “restorative justice” programs worldwide. Interestingly, Zehr (2005: 8) starts his latest treatise on the subject by arguing that restorative justice is *not* primarily about reconciliation and forgiveness, but about assessing needs and assuming obligations to “right wrongs” offenders have done to victims.

In the section below on “dependent variables,” I explain how I believe that peacemaking transcends right and wrong and given sets of obligations. That is what law enforcement also seeks to do, although unlike restorative justice advocates, right, wrong and obligations in law enforcement are limited to persons’ relationship with the state. As I argue below, the peacemaking I know presumes no such absolute rules. Implicitly, “justice” implies an exalted definition of right and wrong for others. I have long taken issue even with close friends who espouse doing “justice” or “social justice” (what is “asocial justice”?). Justice is an act of power over others in itself, which as I explain below, is in the theory of peacemaking I hold, by definition, “violence” (see especially Pepinsky 2000b).

### Penal Abolition

“Penal abolition” also overlaps with “peacemaking criminology” (Morris and West 2000). Ruth Morris had organized the first International Conference on Prison Abolition in Toronto in 1983, which became the International Conference on Penal Abolition as of 1987 in Montreal. She arrayed a wide variety of alternatives of responding to crime, reserving incarceration for “the dangerous few” (Morris 1995). She later broadened “restorative justice” to “transformative justice,” where social unjust conditions like inequality were changed as well as individuals (Morris 1994). Ruth’s own inspiration came from her Quaker faith; European organizers of ICOPA 2 in Amsterdam were avowed “penal abolitionists” Mathiesen (1990) and Christie (1981) in Norway, and Bianchi (1994) and

Hulsman (1986) in the Netherlands, who argued for alternatives to treating social harms as “crimes” against the state.

### Other Writings on Peacemaking

There was a flurry of other writing on “peacemaking” by criminologists after *Criminology as Peacemaking* appeared. “Peacemaking” was extended to all manner of programs and theories that were thought to be positive rather than negative and punitive, extended to all manner of community corrections programs and alternative “courts,” so much so that I gave up trying to identify with, let alone fit into, any particular body of criminological literature. I therefore use this article to account for my present understanding of the principles by which human relations which I define as “violent” are transformed in a process I myself have in various places labeled “responsiveness,” “power sharing,” “democracy,” “synergy,” “mediation,” “fairness,” and “peacemaking” (see Pepinsky 2006a), for a variety of ways and words for talking about the process).

### Parameters of Peacemaking

#### Dependent Variables

I have had a career-long passion for discovering and defining what makes crime my problem and yours. It has been my greatest professional challenge to discover and describe the problem I myself want to address in terms that cross methodologically, legally, politically and culturally arbitrary labels, codes and other descriptions and classifications of “the problem” of crime or violence.

From my dissertation study of “police patrolmen’s offense-reporting behavior” (Pepinsky 1976) through a series of field studies and secondary historical studies that culminated in a review of ideas on socially engineering trends in all measures of crime and criminality (Pepinsky 1980), I kept trying to find the good, true and beautiful index of the crime problem, until—reporting a 1983 study of 10 years of police recording trends in Sheffield, England—I called for a moratorium on all manner of attempts to count crime and criminality, period (Pepinsky 1987a).

A law school concentration on Communist Chinese law and social control that preceded my introduction to criminology had persuaded me that legal distinctions between murderers and martyrs, owners and thieves—potentially the entire range of “crimes” in any particular penal code—was ultimately an arbitrary political project. By the time I returned to Norway in 1986, Paul Jesilow’s and my book on *Myths That Cause Crime* (Pepinsky and Jesilow 1992 [1984]) had been published, featuring Paul’s specialty, white-collar crime. It followed from recognition of white-collar law violations as “crimes” that the problem of crime could not be defined as behavior alone without taking ideological sides that implicitly favored wealth and power regardless of who had it. What beyond something inherent in behavior, if anything, made behavior wrong regardless of laws? If I couldn’t even define a politically neutral wrong implicit in “crime” and “criminality,” how could I propose the alternatives my students were demanding? That was where I was stuck when I returned to Norway in 1986.

I was invited to talk about *Myths that Cause Crime* in the criminology institute at the University of Oslo. I decided to try giving the talks in Norwegian. Halting as my lectures might have been, the exercise confronted me with the fact that while Paul and I compared

whether people were “responsible” for street crime, “liable” for suite crime, or “accountable” for state crime, the Norwegians used the same word, *ansvarlig*, in all three cases. English “answer” comes from the same root as *ansvar*. The closest I could come to a literal translation was “responsive.” Since we punish or discipline “criminals” for social “irresponsibility,” and since “violence” is the word we use for more serious “crimes,” I came to label “violence as unresponsiveness,” the title of the article (Pepinsky 1988) that led Richard Quinney to propose our book together.

Responsiveness is an attribution of state of mind, in sociological terms an attribution of “meaning” to action, in psychological and legal terms an attribution of motivation. For years I had noticed that whenever my students challenged me to deal with the most dangerous category of prisoner I could imagine, they kept talking about “psychopaths” or people who had no conscience or just didn’t give a damn. (Mind you, it was the rare student among the hundreds at a time who raised a hand when I asked who had ever personally known a psychopath.) My late psychologist father used to define psycho-/sociopaths as people who made others feel their own anxieties. Whether in our lives or in our fantasies, the prototypic criminal psychopath is the kind of person who will take your life to get your money or your body without even a twinge of conscience, to whom you are nothing but a means to an end. It means being fixated on reaching a goal or obtaining an outcome regardless of who gets hurt along the way, unmoved by any pain or harm caused others.

The opposite of violence, then, is “responsiveness.” When we are hurt or scared, we want people to take time to notice what they are doing to us and change course. Instead of charging straight ahead, we want them to bend and accommodate us. In relationships where we can depend on that room for ourselves to be responded to in give-and-take exchanges, we build trust, which offers us a greater sense of safety and social (and national) security in our relations.

Toward the end of my return stay, Nils Christie took me to stay over for a couple of nights in a Steiner Village that Christie had cited as an example of a pain-free society. A Steiner Village is a place for what we now call mentally challenged where people on state support and state-paid workers live in harmony with the land, applying principles of “anthroposophy” spelled out by Swiss clairvoyant Rudolf Steiner. While Christie and I were staying there, the German anthropological hydrologist who had designed the water treatment system for the village gave us a lecture. He showed us aerial pictures of the Rhine River before and after it had been dredged and straightened to facilitate commerce and tourism. The river had been full of life as it meandered back and forth like a snake to the Baltic. At each bend the water had slowed down and cast aside silt, including plant and animal waste, that enriched the soil and impeded the force of swollen waters. As engineers straightened the river and “improved” its efficiency, turned it from a source and bearer of life to poison.

Vidaråsen was on a hilltop. Water passed through a solid waste filter at a ravine on the edge of the village, pouring down onto the first of a series of concrete pieces that were set into the hillside at slight downward angles in alternating directions. Each piece had been molded into the shape of the inside of a bisected kidney—two bowls. The water sloshed gently from the higher to the lower bowl of the first pair, spilling onto the higher bowl of the next lower piece, and so forth for some half dozen layers, into a pond, then over a grass spillway into another pond containing the village’s drinking water, which met Norwegian water quality standards. When water is allowed to change its course, it cleans itself. I propose that the same process which cleans the poop out of rivers takes the heat out of violence in human relations. This is what I mean today by “peacemaking” not only in

criminology, but in all our relations, which I also call “synergy” as opposed to violence as “entropy.” (See Pepinsky 2006a: 91–142 for an elaboration of what I mean by “violence” and “peacemaking.”) On one hand, the river keeps on heading toward the sea, flows in an unbending line. On the other, each time it has gone straight for a while, it bends yet again. By analogy, human sustenance is a balance between getting things done (forging straight on), and reframing what any or all of us are after (bending to accommodate others’ sentiments).

Traditionally, “crime” and “criminals” are the dependent variables of criminologists. The broader object of study in sociology is “deviance.” In psychology, it is “deviation.” In medicine, it may be “mental illness.” In religion, it may be “sin.” I have called upon my fellow criminologists for a paradigm shift, weighing whether getting things done like giving criminals their just deserts, and growing economies and enterprises, aren’t out of balance with attending to the suffering singlemindedness causes—haven’t become harmful, haven’t become “violent” sources of human separation and degradation; and if so, how peacemaking can intercede. Violence and peacemaking have become my own dependent variables. I draw on whatever data and findings increase my understanding of what makes violence heat up and of how things cool down when they do. That includes data and ideas from criminologists who call peacemaking by other names such as restorative justice and mediation.

Violence and peacemaking are like opiate bliss and withdrawal pains. It is not a matter of the level of endorphins or opiate substitutes on one side or level of the body’s own antidote on the other, but the balance of the two that helps maintain homeostasis—also known as “life”—in the human organism.

### Synergy: The Desired Outcome

The “peacemaking circle” (Boyes-Watson 2008, Pranis 2005, Pranis et al. 2003) is a metaphor for power sharing. In a circle in which minimal rules of taking turns in safe and civil honest conversation are followed, no one can dominate the conversation. Ideally, when you face people who know you, you are honest. When time is permitted for the conversation to continue until everyone has said everything s/he needs to be said, a conversation is considered to have become balanced.

This is explicitly the theory underlying the Navajo peacemaking court, where violence is viewed as imbalances of power among people, which are balanced and harmonized as stakeholders are granted equal voice in peacemaking circles (Yazzie and Zion 1996). During discussion following a lecture I recently gave a group of criminologists on my alternative to studying crime and criminality, a fellow criminologist asked what I wanted him to take away. I borrowed a Navajo saying, “It’s up to you.” I have found that a particularly useful attitude to take with students, for peacemaking principles work the same way in any group as they do with “offenders.” From the intra-personal to global levels, the principles of making peace by balancing conversations among parties to violence are principles of social control, of which crime control is a part.

When information is openly and honestly shared, it is by definition synergistic (as I first observed in Pepinsky 1987b, c). If I give you an item of honest information, I don’t lose it. If I get your honest reaction back, I then have more information than I started with. Not only do I have your information plus mine, I have your information in reaction to mine, as though if I gave you yellow and you gave me blue, together we would create green between us. Synergy is interactive, not additive. Honest information exchange defies material laws of entropy, economies of scarcity, and has the same super-potential to make

and accomplish things together that an acorn hitting the ground has to become an oak tree. In peacemaking, I seek ways to potentiate the power that comes from honestly sharing information across lines of human separation and division, that is, of the entropy or social heat being stuck in violence generates, and which is deeply embedded in institutions like what we know today as the prison-industrial complex, that keep people in their places in class and power structures, with all the heat, waste, and destruction that maintenance of any hierarchy entails.

## Data

Violence and peacemaking are processes. Statistically speaking, the probability is zero of any single case turning out to be like some average of a group. At the level of a single case, the probability is zero that changes between any particular two cross-sections of data, as between an intervention and a measure of recidivism, distinguish whether a process is going one direction or another.

Courses of violence and peacemaking come in waves that occur on no known time scale. I faced this issue when I asked a distinguished colleague for a response to a draft of my analysis of 10 years of police recording of offenses in Sheffield, England (Pepinsky 1987a). He recommended that I do a regression analysis of my quantitative data. I didn't do so because I had found that what made reports climb, notably infusions of new constables onto city streets, was different from the sort of pressure to "solve" crime that accompanied reporting declines. It isn't just that processes of violence and peacemaking aren't unilinear, they're not even curvilinear. Regardless of good intentions, by defining violence as goal fixation I mean to imply that quantitative trend analyses do violence to what conflicts and peacemaking mean to participants in social discourse, as they become applied for these days for instance as "evidence-based best practices." A dear colleague used to castigate me for not teaching because so many of my classes were devoted to visits by guests students called "real people." In my belief in the synergy of honest information sharing, in "research" as in "teaching"—that is, in learning as a whole—I have sought to understand "offenders" and victims or survivors—by what they say about themselves rather than by what is said about them, a way of learning I have called "transcending literatyranny" (Pepinsky 1998).

By definition, all information is ultimately quantitative; it comes in bytes, in ones and zeroes. Everyone's most basic byte of response to any stream of information is whether to pay attention to it at all. Protestations that "I'm not racist and you're not including me," or in legalese, a party doesn't have "standing to be heard," let alone any limitations on admissible evidence conditions for beginning international talks, all raise not hearing what others say from unconscious to cultural, institutional self-imposition of what I have called "the violence of silence," imposed on those like children who are punished for lying when they are trying to tell someone they are being hurt (see Pepinsky 1988).

If you take the time to tune into a story of harm without interrupting, meaningful responses will convey where you are coming from, accounted for, explored or negotiable as accounts of your own. Whether you call the items of information that you trade in the course of meaningful discussion of your problems anecdotes, complaints, statements, accounts, narratives, fables, folklore or myths, stories are the units of information I use to distinguish between violence and peacemaking. Stories may contain numbers. For example, one item of information I and countless others find useful to tell is a story that the incarceration rate in my country has grown three times from what US criminologists thought was already far too high a number 40 years ago when I started teaching, to the point where 4 % of the world's people today hold over 20 % of the world's prisoners.



Back when I was sending out uninvited manuscripts for review, as in negative reviews on my rocky road to tenure and promotion, a common basis for rejections was that my findings were (as they remain) “anecdotal.” How true. This is where my methodology of learning how peacemaking transforms violence has carried me: to exchanging and creating stories of violence and its transformation, and of distilling elements of peacemaking, such as unconditional listening to suffering, from stories of how people transcend and transform violence from everyday disagreements to genocide. I live and learn by stories.

I have also consistently written in the first person. I do so on ethical or moral principle. As I reached nominal adulthood, on home visits my parents would interrupt me when I claimed to “know” something, reminding me, “You THINK you know, Harold, that is all.” I now claim to speak only for myself, for the same reason that from the first manuscript I got for review back in graduate school, I have always put my name and contact information in the body of the only evaluation that I send to editors. I thus try to act on all three elements of *ansvar* at once: to make myself *liable* to criticism or attack by assuming *responsibility* for the *accounts* I ask others to hear or see. My research method of choice is to make my learning and teaching as “responsive” as I hope to receive in return, as I try to let conversations take their own meandering course. I claim no higher authority for how I approach crimes or criminals than analogies I draw from my and others’ stories of what worsens or eases violence, illustrations of what works and what doesn’t.

The magic of peacemaking lies in the movement from positions to interests that Fisher et al. (2011) argue enables parties in international negotiations to “get to yes.” Moving from positions to interests is human synergy, accommodation, acceptance, tolerance, respect, dignity in action. It is the climate in which people gain control over violence rather than being controlled by it.

## Learning and Making Peace

### A New/Old Approach to Peacemaking

... is the subtitle of Kay Pranis’s *Little Book of Circle Processes* (2005). Pranis became internationally renowned as the first statewide criminal justice official in the United States given the job of “restorative justice planner” by the Minnesota Department of Corrections. There she helped communities offer an extension of victim-offender mediation called “group conferencing.” By law in New Zealand in 1989 (New Zealand 1989), “family group conferencing” was offered prior to court proceedings to all youth charged with delinquent offenses who admitted guilt. The process was modeled on the traditional practice of New Zealand’s original inhabitants, the Maori, who like people of color in the United States make up about half their country’s incarcerated population. Every judicial district has a state-paid “coordinator” to arrange for the young defendants, victims who are willing to attend, defense counsel, a police and probation officer, parents or guardians, and community members such as teachers or clergy, to join a circle. Beginning with the “offenders,” participants take turns telling their stories of what they have done or suffered, of their reactions to events at hand, ask their questions, and offer their ideas of what might next be done. Any agreement reached among all parties in the circle is presented to the court, which may accept it in place of or in addition to any other lawful sentence. Conference coordinators follow up on carrying out agreements and with victims. This “alternative to retributive justice” cut youth detention in the country by half in short order. Conferencing has since been introduced worldwide at all stages of the criminal justice

system for young people and for adults. One award-winning Australian television documentary, “Facing the Demons” (1999), films the preparation, conference itself, and its aftermath, in a prison, that includes two of the four men convicted of the shotgun murder of an adolescent Pizza Hut worker outside Sydney, family, friends and co-workers of the victim, and a mother and chaplain as support persons for the prisoners. The accompanying commentary by facilitator Terry O’Connell indicates some concrete good to have resulted. For instance, the mother remembers and remembers her son as he lived rather than as she saw him in the morgue, and the father, who has established an anti-violence program in his son’s memory, recruits one of the prisoners to do the program with him in prison, while a girlfriend recovers from clinical depression and returns to school. This illustrates the potential of conferences to mend relations that violence has torn apart. As the Israeli-Palestinian murder victims family members in the “restorative justice” network No More Taking Sides (“On Being” 2012) explicitly recognize, the safe and honest sharing of suffering—including the shame of the prisoners in the Australian video facing the pain and anger of their victims—becomes a foundation for the empathy, the synergy, that participants in the process share.

It is a convention in Western science like theoretical physics that the simplest, clearest explanation of a phenomenon is the most profound. Pranis’s chapter on “key elements of peacemaking” (2005: 33–46) gives the simplest, clearest description of the structure of a peacemaking process I have encountered. She cites five elements drawn from North American indigenous traditions: “ceremony, guidelines, a talking piece, keeping/facilitation, and consensus decision-making.”

### *Ceremony*

A circle or conference might traditionally have opened and closed with a prayer first for guidance, then a celebration of the birth of new relations. I volunteered facilitating victim-offender mediations for a decade before I retired. My opening “prayer” would consist of thanking the parties for their courage and willingness to face their problems together, noting that parties often left agreeing on what would happen next, and hoping in any event they would leave the mediation at least no longer afraid of running into each other again. I and my co-mediators would close with a handshake, a big thanks, and a promise to follow-up. It has become common in criminal justice conferencing, as in “Facing the Demons,” to offer refreshments and informal conversation when conferences are finished.

### *Guidelines*

While protocols for formal peacemaking alternatives to criminal justice as usual may spell out rules for victim-offender mediation, conferencing and its post-conviction counterpart, sentencing circles (Pranis 2005: 46), Pranis allows for the possibilities that participants can by consensus set their own rules and subjects of conversation. She, like Boyes-Watson (2008) and me, proposes that principles of peacemaking as practiced in criminal justice matters are applicable to making peace in any setting, within or among any groups, to accomplish any task. Her description of guidelines assumes that they apply to peacemaking circles, for which she lays down specific rules, notably in what gets talked about, in what order, in the context of a community’s deciding how to respond to harms convicted or admitted offenders have done to victims. As I see it, peacemaking doesn’t need to stand on ceremony, literally take place in circles, or be followed up to transform struggles of imposing power on others into power sharing. Among Pranis’s “elements of circles,” the

idea of passing a “talking piece” around the circle represents the universal elements of peacemaking.

### *The Principle of the Talking Piece in Victim-Offender Mediation and Conferencing*

In the circle process, there is one talking piece. It can be anything that can be held, a stick, a rock, a sacred object, whatever. A cardinal rule of the process is that only the person holding the piece speaks. The person convening the circle begins the conversation. There may come a time when someone signals a request to receive the piece from its holder from anywhere in the circle, but initially and normally, the piece is simply passed in one direction from one person to the next, who may speak or simply pass the piece on. This addresses the potential for violence in the conversation, where power over others takes the form of dominating conversations. The rule of the talking piece balances taking turns talking and listening, with allowing each speaker control of taking time, however slowly, fitfully and thoughtfully, to get through what s/he has to say at any moment.

As a victim-offender mediator I only on occasion had enough participants or enough open space to seat people in a circle. Since most of the referrals our non-profit organization got were teenagers, a typical mediation might have one “offender,” a parent or guardian, a victim and a co-mediator. At intake where we mediators told other participants what would happen as a prelude to asking their informed consent to go to mediation itself, and again in my version of an opening ceremony, I laid out the order in which I would ask others to begin to speak to ensure that everyone was included. I operated on the principle that the person least heard prior to mediation—the victim rather than the offender who had had the power position in the event at hand—should be given control of who went first, which normally meant asking the offender to begin by telling what s/he had done, why s/he had done it, and add anything s/he wanted to say to the victim. I never explicitly asked for an apology, on the principle that I shouldn’t tell anyone what to say because I want them, not me, to be in control of the words that come out of anyone’s mouth but mine. I added that for my part, I was prepared to keep the conversation going until everyone in the room had said everything s/he thought needed to be said, scheduling extra sessions if needed. That is, I wanted parties to leave mediation feeling nothing was left unsaid. In place of the talking piece, I laid down two rules to prevent anyone silencing anyone else: no interruptions, and no name calling. I never encountered enough of either to interrupt any participant myself.

Trust to engage in peacemaking rests on trust that the conversation is honest—that people can disclose vulnerability and presume that those they are talking with aren’t going to manipulate them for some undisclosed purpose. That requires that people believe that they have real power to decide whether to join or leave a conversation, and that nothing they say will be used against them outside the conversation. Making people do things is an exercise of power by definition, violence itself, and is a good way to get people tell you what they think you want to hear to hide from you, and trust also requires that promises made be kept, including promises of confidentiality. This contrasts to making people keep secrets about what you do to or with them, which to me defines child abuse and domestic violence. (I discern a greater taboo in practice in my society against openly criticizing one’s parents or other adult authority figures, than against incest.) In mediation, I ceded parties to mediation control of what they did with the information when the mediation was over. Confidentiality was my special obligation as mediator. Parties were not required to reach written agreement, and if they did, were free to decide whether mediators shared their agreements with referring agencies.

### *Facilitation*

It is a general rule of mediation and restorative justice that third parties, like judges, should be impartial. Since, as I propose below in the section on “may the force be with you,” I infer peacemaking to be a process guided by how emotion affects substance. In retrospect, I find that empathy—showing implicit respect for and recognition of others’ emotional needs moment to moment—is what turns out to be my role in making mediation “transformative” to observers as it appears to be to parties themselves. I call this being equally partial.

### *Follow-Up*

Where agreements are reached in mediation or circles, follow-up is normally provided to check on whether agreements are fulfilled. In some criminal justice circumstances such as mediation or conferencing with prisoners and victims, no agreements are anticipated. In the “Facing the Demons” case, facilitator Terry O’Connell bases his commentary on the follow-up he himself did anyway, but that is not always the case.

That’s all the rules of evidence and procedure peacemaking responses to criminality need have. Beyond that, mediators can let parties take complete charge of what they say, of how they say it, and of whether they agree to do anything afterwards. Peacemaking entails giving parties ownership of their own disputes and actions (Christie, 1977).

### Peacemaking in the Classroom

#### *Grading by not Grading*

Peacemaking principles can be applied in any and all of our relations. I considered a course on “alternative social control systems” required for criminal justice majors to be my major laboratory to learning and applying peacemaking principles to the classroom (see Pepinsky 2000a). “Peacemaking in the Classroom” (Pepinsky 2006b) is the title of an article, with a sample syllabus appended, describing the system of “grading by not grading” that I developed over four decades of trying to take my power over students out of our learning together. Grades were based solely on journal entries of minimal length relating readings to class, and lectures to discussion section conversations, that were of satisfactory substance and turned in weekly, on time. It took the equivalent of 30 pages for students in the sophomore class to earn A’s. Grade averages actually fell when I stopped grading writings because students’ failures to turn in assignments on time; I allowed an option of retaking the class from scratch the next term to remove an “incomplete.” I and associate instructors in the large class would respond weekly to issues raised across journal entries, although we often became intrigued enough by what people wrote to catch ourselves writing individual comments. In upper division and graduate classes where I required longer journal entries, it normally took me 20 min or less to record points for a week’s journal entries and find issues about which to write a group response, belying the common wisdom that it is only practical to use objective tests in large classes.

It was common wisdom on my university campus of over a thousand full-time faculty that you couldn’t carry on a discussion in a class of 2–300. You could show films and have graphics, but basically, you had to lecture at students, and the only feasible way to evaluate their learning was by multiple-choice, short-answer exams. A veteran staff member of the campus teaching resources center was intrigued enough to sit in on a few of my “lectures.”

The center began offering workshops on discussion in large lecture sections shortly thereafter, apparently having discovered that I wasn't the only one who had managed the feat.

### *Letting Go of the Course Agenda and Its Results*

By definition, peacemaking implies that learning takes a meandering course through exchanges of stories, of accounts of what we believe and feel and why we do. In the classroom, that means a teacher's letting go of covering certain preset "material" in favor of letting terms of conversation on contentious issues change in the flow of discourse. As I let go of trying to figure out how to frame the substance of an "offense" and the harm done in intake and mediation sessions, so I had learned to resist laying out readings and topics for a class for more than the first 2 weeks in a syllabus. I had many "real people" visiting my classes as guest speakers. Scheduling beyond the first couple of weeks became a matter of combining visitors' availability and need for advance notice (especially for working people if they were traveling to Bloomington from out of town), with picking up on and pursuing issues that arose in class from 1 week to the next. As in mediation, I trusted the process to let the substance of our conversations change course. I allowed extra time for discussions started in class as I offered to stay with parties to mediation until all that everyone thought needed to be said had been said. In peacemaking, violence and all electrical circuits human and otherwise, time is power.

To share conversational space with students I paid attention to restraining how much time I took to lay out two or three related propositions to open for response—with comments always explicitly as welcome as questions. I got in the habit of "active listening" by paraphrasing what students said to me and to each other back to then as a framework for any response of my own. It also had helped that my avowedly radical feminist wife and my daughter had taught me to shut up and listen. As I learned to switch from the violent practice of trying to win debates with my students (Kohn 1986: 55–57, 155–157) toward showing respect for their honesty, and toward letting them as subordinates have the last word in cases of disagreement, I noticed law'n'order proponents begin to declare genuine interest in even my own far-out views. And even when my own basic peacemaking beliefs did not change, I certainly learned new ways to talk about peacemaking that students respected enough to hear regardless of whether they agreed. In class, in writings and in course evaluations, I gained student respect for and curiosity about my positions by showing attention, appreciation, respect and desire for theirs, especially by those who dared in all candor to disagree with "the professor" (as many wrote, for "the first time") when I "lectured." I considered that shift especially gratifying in a country where it is relatively hard for people to face one another in open, dignified and respectful, political disagreement. I infer, too, that this cultural fear helps account for how pleasantly surprised by the encounter many parties to mediations I attended appeared to be.

### From Teaching to Mediating Between Victims and Offenders

It is a moot point to me whether I learned more about mediation from teaching or about teaching from mediation. I have called the process of learning to make peace in any setting, as I did in the classroom and elsewhere an "attitude." In retrospect, I pretty much boiled down all the techniques like reframing and active listening I encountered in some half dozen mediation training courses to the same few conditions for synergy that I applied to myself with students about sensitive issues of power and control. I became labeled a

“master mediator” for co-mediators to learn with. I had victims and offenders wanting to become volunteers themselves. I infer that I got there letting all the training injunctions go. Following the principles that came with the attitude just came naturally, and so I was a minimalist. Once I had translated from the context from the classroom to the mediation setting, I could forget all those training checklists and clearly and fully complete the “opening ceremony” of a mediation session, including answers to any questions, in less than 5 min, appreciating that parties were so anxious to begin and preoccupied with what they would say that they could hardly hear me anyway. And while many a manual will instruct mediators to have parties in conflict to start by talking to the mediator, I followed the same principle to closing my opening remarks: “... please tell Mr./Ms. Doe what you did ...” rather than “...please tell me...” I meant to show them I felt perfectly safe that they wouldn’t hurt each other if I didn’t stand between them. In essence, I volunteered to let them take over the handling of their own issues from the outset. Above all, I recognized that my own monopoly of conversational space was the violence I had to control. To expect other parties to become responsible for their own actions, I felt obliged to assume responsibility for letting go of control of the mediation agenda. By analogy rather than literally, my teaching in turn morphed into following the simple rules of evidence and procedure I applied to victim-offender mediation.

### Peacemaking Journalism

At this stage of life especially when I no longer take time to work for pay and when demands of daily life have become few and no more difficult than filling in my tax returns, I have plenty of time to pause to listen and learn at each occasion for conversation that arises in my daily life, including the email that arrives at the one account I use, and that I come across from any source, including stories by people who are more talked about in the news than heard themselves, or points of view seldom heard in the news framed by “authoritative sources.” For instance, the daily news source in the United States that most fills my peacemaking bill of giving voice to seldom-heard voices, that most shares my peacemaking quest to bring silenced voices into political conversation, is “Democracy Now!” at [www.democracynow.org](http://www.democracynow.org). The US public radio program that has become my peacemaking version of a Sunday wake-up worship service is “On Being” ([www.onbeing.org](http://www.onbeing.org)), because the people host Krista Tippett interviews all share stories to illustrate what is sacred to them in terms of the quality of our relations rather than of distinguishing right from wrong—within peacemaking rather than within violent parameters or frames of teaching and learning. In the course of my own life, I attribute insights about how peacemaking works to my taking the time to listen to folks who have walked unexpectedly into my life, like prisoners, survivors of ritual torture, or the anthroposophical hydrologist in Vidaråsen who showed me the difference between waterways that give life and those that die from pollution, participants who come to victim-offender mediation, or students whose loved ones have been killed when we discuss how to respond to murder.

### Peacemaking as Four Rules of Conduct

I have seen this saying labeled simply indigenous and particularly as Navajo though Navajo tell me they have no sayings: show up, pay attention, tell the truth, and don’t be attached to outcome. I take each of the four admonitions as metaphors for peacemaking in all our relations.

### *Show Up*

When victims and “offenders” and I volunteer to get together for a mediation session, we decide to *show up* to face their problem together. One of my peacemaking rules to myself is to try always to promise less than I think I can deliver, for trust’s sake. The corollary is to try to keep the promises I make. That includes a promise to myself that I will try to raise problems I have with what other people do to their face before I react behind their backs. That is why I have from the outset inserted my name and contact information into comments for authors in all “blind” reviews, and given copies to anyone for whom I agree to write a letter of evaluation or recommendation. It is the responsibility I hope I would feel to confront anyone who killed a loved one to face the killers before I sought to have anything but preliminary restraint done to them, not least to understand why. When I think other people are my problem, I try to show up to deal with it before I take other action. When victims of horrific violence sought to tell me their stories, I found myself making time, in effect by getting myself to show up for them to be heard.

### *Pay Attention*

To pay attention means consciously taking time to stop talking and listen to try to discern what the other person is really trying to tell you—to let go of trying to do anything or get things over and done—without interruption, without name calling—hear the person out.

### *Tell the Truth*

To tell the truth means being straight out rather than manipulative, expressing honest feelings and beliefs rather than telling people what you think they want to hear or ought to hear. It is one reason that in writing as in everyday life, I speak in the first person, separating what I from what “we” know and feel. That is my primary responsibility in any conversation.

### *Don’t Be Attached to Outcome*

Not being attached to outcome is expressed in the Serenity Prayer as drawing boundaries between getting done what needs doing and accepting what cannot be done. I am reminded of a conversation I had recently with a former aide to a US general in Afghanistan who told me that losing the war in Afghanistan was “unacceptable.” I think gaining national security by winning wars against foreign and domestic enemies like Afghan resistance fighters is as counterproductive as transforming delinquents by punishing them harder. There is no more reason to believe that a N.A.T.O. force can win a war of occupation in Afghanistan than the British or Soviets managed. Where combatants are not prepared to negotiate terms of settlement, the most “we” can do is to withdraw in orderly fashion as we are now doing and do nothing more, what legal anthropologist Leon Felstiner (1975) called handling a dispute by “lumping it.” Once in process of trying to make peace where parties are willing, the process “works” as parties create their own terms of settlement, rather than imposing a “solution” to the violence on one side or another. As Bateson (2002) puts it, the only proof of anything is tautology, truth by definition, in closed systems. Our lives together are immanent, open systems. Human problems have no solutions.

## General Application

### *Making Peace with Others*

Insofar as parties to violence are willing to face those who aggrieve them, to take turns listening and being personally honest, and to hear each other out before they determine what if anything ought to happen next, they are in effect applying the principles that make responses to violence synergistic, making violence a ground for learning rather than for battle, for letting old truths become fresh understanding. I believe peace is, in principle, that simple to make. The challenge is for antagonists to pay attention to what a peacemaking attitude entails, to try taking it. The only way I know to spread that attitude is find various ways and languages to describe it, and to teach by personal example. I find that experience of peacemaking is a better teacher than preaching, so much so that people—children most readily—learn to adopt peacemaking attitudes without consciously knowing the rules they are following. The most common label I hear for this attitude is “showing respect” for self and others. As we feel the synergy in our relations, so assuming the attitude that produces it can become as natural to the neophyte as it feels to the experienced practitioner. It does not require special knowledge or expertise. Quite often, I find that people who are introduced to the peacemaking attitude recognize that they have been doing this with people they love and respect—being responsive—as long as they can remember. It’s what people generations younger than I call being best of friends, or “bofs.” I infer it is why members of the peace church called “Quakers” call themselves the “society of friends,” and what Confucius meant by naming the only one of his five sacred relationships that is one of power sharing rather than proper power of some over others “friend to friend.”

### **Self-Control**

Peacemaking can transform violence against oneself. I found myself consciously applying peacemaking principles to controlling my own fixation with numbing myself out on alcohol, when I decided it was time to stop drinking or die alone. I chose to show up and face other people I knew by telling them I had stopped and why. That relieved the anxiety and shame that had secretly wondering when and where I could “safely” get my next drink and passing for sober in public. One local bartender told me if he ever saw me lifting a glass or bottle of alcohol to my lips, he would slap it away. I protected myself at conferences even with old drinking buddies by telling them the promise I had made to my nearest and dearest relations. I felt I had a reputation for honesty to maintain. It was not, as some advocate doing to treat addictions and other violence, that I was shamed out of drinking. The shame that lay in living a secret life evaporated as I acknowledged the harm I had been doing myself and others, and got respect and appreciation in return. I particularly remember a moment when I told my wife I had always drunk for the effect rather than for the taste, and so there was no other point in taking a drink even to prove I could. I began to notice and comment on things I remembered I was liberated from worrying about, like whether I could safely drive or whether I would shake in public. That made it easier for me to be conscious when I was with others who were drinking that that part of me that wanted to join them was as real as always, and to separate but that was then from this is now. As I did so, the desire to drink came and dissipated more readily as I let myself remember and



feel my drinking experiences, rather than by trying to suppress those feelings “1 day at a time” while sharing my feelings and experience in anonymity.

I drew on how survivors of childhood torture taught me they had gained control over having programmed alters triggered and take over their identities, feelings and behavior, including body memories. In safe company, they became able to let these alters disclose their secret selves. As their “normal” identities thus became co-conscious with their “alter” personalities, they learned that what the difference between the need for the alter to survive torture in past relations in reflex self-defense, from the safety of at least one relationship to begin with in the here and now. At first on each new social occasion, I devoted more conscious effort to recalling the aftermath of trying to keep my drinking under control after I had stopped and tried restarted in the past. My choice to stop drinking was reinforced with the passage of conscious time between me and my relations then, and now. Sobriety becomes a matter of gaining control by openly, publicly, facing my own internal “offender” rather than by trying to silence his voice. Survivors with “multiple personalities” showed me that I myself have multiple parts that lead me to respond to social circumstances in different ways, and that I can negotiate transformation of differences within myself by allowing them to express themselves to one another. My exercise of socially constrained rather than “free” will makes the difference. It amounts to becoming responsible instead of being held responsible, of dealing with consequences of my actions at hand rather than being given consequences, through a process of accounting for myself rather than being held accountable. I infer that what goes for gaining control of my relations with others applies to controlling myself. Facilitating self-control is the only approach to social control I have seen live up to its promise in all my relations.

### **What Distinguishes Peacemaking in Criminology?**

#### Evaluating Better and Worse

The paradigm I propose rests on the conclusion that all measures of crime and criminality are politically and organizationally coincidental. Early in my career I had the good luck to meet a visiting editor of the social science series at Oxford Press in New York, who had a Ph.D. in social philosophy. Learning of my work on crime and criminality measurement, he invited me to send him a proposal for a text, then gave me the only advance I have ever received from a publisher (which royalties just managed to repay) and published *Crime Control Strategies: An Introduction to the Study of Crime* (1980). From victim survey results through convictions, chapter by chapter, I reviewed measures of crime. Then came chapters on measures of criminality, from self-reports through recidivism, then on cost-benefit analyses. I began each chapter with a section summarizing measures of numerators, then denominators, then ways of making rates and trends go up or down, their side effects, and political considerations entailed in making “the crime problem” go one way or another. In the process, I reviewed and critiqued various interpretations of significance of trends in criminological literature. I dedicated the book to my Albany colleague Leslie T. Wilkins (1967), and applied the systems analysis he had taught me to the task of engineering “crime control.” There aren’t any kinds of measures of criminality today that I did not review then. I concluded then as now that there is no such thing as a politically neutral index of control of “crime” or of “criminality,” in contrast to the political neutrality of stories of differences between or among people drive people apart, or draw them together. I propose the difference depends on whether people are locked into set agendas, or let

themselves bend what they are after out of empathy—let their desires intertwine like healthy rivers and the earth rivers flow through. I infer trends in violence and peacemaking (which can increase or decrease at the same time) from people’s varying accounts of suffering, of becoming afraid, angry or otherwise offended, and of how time with others has relieved fear and pain, and built trust and social security. In this paradigm, attention to individual outcomes is secondary to social outcomes.

### Stories as Data

I am certainly not the only social scientist of any stripe, let alone criminologist, to use stories as data. I routinely interpret trends in crime and criminality as social constructs. For instance, I still infer that in the United States, when arrest rates for public order offenses (and now reportedly for concocted felonies) go up, index “crimes” go down, as I first inferred from analysis of Indianapolis police statistics from 1948 to 1978 (Selke and Pepinsky 1982). I discovered the significance of these ups and downs from trends in local crime news stories over the period. I labeled alternating trends upward and downward a “rollercoaster effect,” as political winds shifted from the moment in 1957 when police first got two-way radios in their cars and offense reports shot up, until complaints that police weren’t getting the bad guys led patrol officers to make arrests and become marginally but “significantly” less likely to report offenses, until residents complained that their crimes were not even being reported, and so on...

You can draw curves through three or more data points, but you’re left explaining what the curves or their relationship to other curves. You can either derive those explanations from “the literature” of prior interpretations and impute motives and reasons to actors, or you can interpret what actors to tell you themselves. By definition, peacemaking as praxis defines control as moving from people speaking to or for others, to letting people speak for themselves, giving priority to stories less heard in discourse about a social problem (Wagner-Pacifici 1994; Pepinsky 1998). I depend on stories to understand what moves people to keep forging straight ahead, or to shift course, and of what they tell me what people get for what they do. Without stories to bind data points, curves have no meaning for me, let alone for the people involved.

### You Can Facilitate Peacemaking, but You Can’t Make It Happen

It is the beauty of peacemaking that it can only happen as people volunteer to try, knowing and trusting the promise that they can safely lay themselves open to facing those who have seriously hurt, offended or threatened them—in the pejorative general term for being overpowered, oppressed them. From a social engineering point of view, it is the curse of peacemaking that it cannot be imposed. Nor can it be replicated, for by definition gaining control in the paradigm entails people creating their own meanings of better and worse as they move along. And as I found trying to apply principles of making peace with students in my classes to mediation between victims and “offenders,” the principles apply by analogy rather than by recipe. I find many stories of growing violence instructive, and draw inspiration from elements of stories of peace being made, but when I’m in the process, I seek guidance from others involved, my rules are few and simple, and my objective is to learn new things to talk about and do, rather than to arrive anywhere in particular, as I stopped doing a long time ago in course syllabi.

## Letting the Force of Peacemaking Be with Us

Violence is driven by fear, peacemaking by love and compassion. Every religious and political tradition I know recognizes both forces within and among us. I envision violence and peacemaking as electromagnetic forces that run through and among us. Responding to violence with violence is like trying to hold the same pole of two magnets together; peacemaking is an attractive force that happens as that expressive pole in some actors is attracted by the listening pole of other actors in an alternating current. Neuroscientists have found that the current oriented toward the left brain switches toward circuits oriented to the right during meditation or exercises in mindfulness (Nataraja 2008), manifesting itself in compassion and empathy (Kabat-Zinn 2006). I have also found that being caught up in peacemaking processes spawns compassion and empathy in mediation without conscious awareness, except perhaps in retrospect, even in myself, let alone in other parties. I infer that social circumstance can create mindfulness among people without need for particular training or self-discipline. Indeed, Kabat-Zinn describes mindfulness as letting go of trying to arrive somewhere—of determining one's position relative to others'. The capacity to make peace is at once a matter of social and self-control. In criminology, peacemaking entails letting go of trying to make crime and criminality go away.

## Getting Results

Failures of peacemaking efforts may be immediate as violence escalates and lines of division harden. Transformations of violent relations may never be known. Indications that efforts to make peace have noticeably made differences for the better in parties' social lives may take decades or more to become manifest. So for instance I have found my most compelling evidence of success in teaching students to think and feel for themselves from former students, like some who abandoned dreams of joining federal law enforcement for letting their hearts and talents took them in service to others: to teaching "behavior-disordered" high schoolers in a poor urban school system, to opening an award-winning restaurant featuring locally produced ingredients, or to working in teaching-focused colleges. Looking back at changes in my own journey of learning and living, as I have indicated here, events and people that have shaped and redirected me range from having a pacifist mother in childhood, to being carried safely home in retirement in directions that happened to me rather than having been planned by me. When it comes to changing political cultures like that of enforcing servitude on black residents of the United States, transformation of violence may at best be fitful across generations. Harder still, we humans worldwide today are so much more practiced at conquest and domination than at transforming it, and trust-building is so fragile, that when we risk peacemaking initiatives, they will more times than not be unreciprocated, if not resented and punished. In the final analysis, what works when peacemaking noticeably happens is far more likely to show signs of failure than signs of success, let alone for success to be acknowledged by others. I acknowledge that it is a huge leap of faith for me to think that isolated successes ought to be my guide to building as much social security in my own life, let alone proposing anyone else do likewise. On the other hand, as among the many thinkers I have cited here, I am not alone. In the long run, peacemaking is the only way to transform rather than temporarily containing violence.

I began this review of peacemaking criminology by calling it a self-discipline. It is only now in retirement that I can look back on my career as a criminologist, and say that it has

brought me home to a place of social security, resting content that I have enjoyed more than my share in making other people's lives worthwhile, as they have done in mine. I have come to thank the force of love, and all my relations, for my good fortune.

## References

- Bateson, G. (2002). *Mind and Nature: A necessary unity (Advances in systems theory, complexity, and the human sciences)*. New York: Hampton Press.
- Bianchi, H. (1994). *Justice as sanctuary: Toward a new system of crime control*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Boyes-Watson, C. (2008). *Peacemaking circles and urban youth: bringing justice home*. St. Paul: Living Justice Press.
- Braswell, M., Fuller, J., & Lozoff, B. (2001). *Corrections, peacemaking, and restorative justice: Transforming individuals and institutions*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology*, 17(1), 1–19.
- Christie, N. (1981). *Limits to pain*. Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- Eglash, A. (1958). Creative restitution: A broader meaning of an old term. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 48, 619–622.
- Eglash, A. (1977). Beyond restitution: Creative restitution. In J. Hudson & B. Galaway (Eds.), *Restitution in criminal justice*. Lexington: D. C. Heath.
- “Facing the Demons” and Commentary. (1999). Available for purchase, and free study guide, at [http://www.iirp.edu/oscommerce-2.3.1/catalog/product\\_info.php?cPath=61&products\\_id=141](http://www.iirp.edu/oscommerce-2.3.1/catalog/product_info.php?cPath=61&products_id=141).
- Felstiner, W. L. F. (1975). Avoidance as dispute processing: An elaboration. *Law and society review*, 9(4), 695–706.
- Fisher, R., Ury, W. L. & Patton, B. (2011 [1991]). *Getting to yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. New York: Penguin.
- Fuller, J. (1988). *Criminal justice: A peacemaking perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hulsman, L. (1986). Critical criminology and the concept of crime. *Contemporary Crises*, 10(2), 62–80.
- Kabat-Zinn, J. (2006). *Coming to our senses: Healing ourselves and the world through mindfulness*. New York: Hyperion.
- Knopp, F. H., Boward, B., Brach, M. J., Christianson, S., Largen, M. A., Lewin, J., et al. (1976). *Instead of prisons: A handbook for abolitionists*. Syracuse, NY: Prison Research Education Project. Scanned at [http://www.prisonpolicy.org/scans/instead\\_of\\_prisons/](http://www.prisonpolicy.org/scans/instead_of_prisons/). Accessed on February 18, 2003.
- Kohn, A. (1986). *No contest: The case against competition—why we lose in the race to win*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Mathiesen, T. (1990). *Prison on trial*. London: Sage.
- Morris, R. (1994). *A practical path to transformative justice*. Toronto: Rittenhouse.
- Morris, R. (1995). *Penal abolition, the practical choice: A practical manual on penal abolition*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Morris, R., & West, W. G. (2000). *The case for penal abolition*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Nataraja, S. (2008). *The blissful brain: Neuroscience and proof of the power of meditation*. London: Gaia Books Ltd.
- New Zealand. (1989). *Children, Young Persons, and Their Families Act 1989*. Public Act 1989 no. 24 (27 May).
- “On Being.” (November 29, 2012). No more taking sides. <http://www.onbeing.org/program/no-more-taking-sides/134>. Accessed on February 15, 2013.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1976). Police patrolmen's offense-reporting behavior. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 13(1), 33–47.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1978). Communist anarchism as an alternative to the rule of criminal law. *Contemporary Crises*, 2(2), 315–334.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1980). *Crime control strategies: An introduction to the study of crime*. New York: Oxford.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1987a). Explaining police-recorded crime trends in Sheffield. *Contemporary Crises*, 11(1), 59–73.
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1987b). Justice as information sharing. In J. Lowman, R. J. Menzies, & T. S. Palys (Eds.), *Transcarceration: Essays in the sociology of social control* (pp. 76–88). Aldershot: Gower (Cambridge Series in Criminology).
- Pepinsky, H. E. (1987c). Information sharing as a human right. *Humanity and Society*, 11(2), 189–211.

- Pepinsky, H. E. (1988). Violence as unresponsiveness. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(4), 539–563. Revised and reprinted in H. E. Pepinsky. *The geometry of violence and democracy*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Pepinsky, H. (1998). Transcending literatyranny. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 1(2), 198–212. Revised and reprinted in H. Pepinsky. (2001). *A criminologist's quest for peace*. <http://www.critcrim.org/pepinsky>.
- Pepinsky, H. (2000a). Educating for peace. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 567, 158–170. Revised and reprinted in H. Pepinsky. (2001). *A criminologist's quest for peace*. <http://www.critcrim.org/pepinsky>.
- Pepinsky, H. (2000b). Cultivating community in conversational circles. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 2(3), 175–186. Revised and reprinted in H. Pepinsky. (2001). *A criminologist's quest for peace*. <http://critcrim.org/pepinsky>.
- Pepinsky, H. (2006a). *Peacemaking: Reflections of a radical criminologist*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press. Final page proofs available for free download at [http://critcrim.org/sites/default/files/Pepinsky\\_proofs\\_0.pdf](http://critcrim.org/sites/default/files/Pepinsky_proofs_0.pdf).
- Pepinsky, H. (2006b). Peacemaking in the classroom. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 9(4), 427–442.
- Pepinsky, H. E. & Jesilow, P. D. (1992, updated ed.). *Myths that cause crime*. Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks Press. Free download at <http://www.critcrim.org/node/337>. Accessed on February 15, 2013.
- Pepinsky, H. E., & Quinney, R. (Eds.). (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Intercourse: Good Books.
- Pranis, K., Stuart, B., & Wedge, M. (2003). *Peacemaking circles: From crime to community*. St. Paul: Living Press.
- Selke, W. L., & Pepinsky, H. E. (1982). Police reporting in Indianapolis, 1948–1978. *Law and Human Behavior*, 6(3/4), 327–342.
- Tiftt, L., & Sullivan, D. (1980). *The struggle to be human: Crime, criminology and anarchism*. Over the Water, Sanday, Orkney, UK: Cienfuegos Press.
- Van Ness, D. W., & Strong, K. H. (4th ed.). (2010). *Restoring justice: An introduction to restorative justice*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Wagner-Pacifci, R. (1994). *Discourse and destruction: The city of Philadelphia versus MOVE*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilkins, L. T. (1967). *Social policy, action and research*. London: Tavistock.
- Yazzie, R., & Zion, J. W. (1996). Navajo restorative justice: The law of equality and justice. In B. Galloway & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative justice: International perspectives* (pp. 157–173). Monsey: Criminal Justice Press.
- Zehr, H. (2005). *The little book of restorative justice: A bestselling book by of the founders of the movement*. Intercourse: Good Books.