Contemporary Justice Review, 2000, Vol. 3(3), pp. 267–289
Reprints available directly from the Publisher
Photocopying permitted by license only

© 2000 OPA (Overseas Publishers Association) N.V.
Published by license under
the Harwood Academic Publishers imprint,
part of The Gordon and Breach Publishing Group.
Printed in Malaysia.

THE VOICES OF PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY: INSIGHTS INTO A PERSPECTIVE WITH AN EYE TOWARD TEACHING

JOHN F. WOZNIAK

Western Illinois University

A number of diverse authors have joined together during the past decade to form a "peacemaking criminology" approach toward the study of crime, punishment, and justice. Based upon a survey of authors who have undertaken early writings within this perspective, this paper examines three main themes. First, the analysis begins by illustrating what is distinctive about peacemaking criminology and how it represents a departure from mainstream criminology. Second, an effort is made to demonstrate how peacemaking criminology can contribute toward a transformation of the policies and practices of the criminal justice system. Finally, the paper concludes with a consideration of how one might teach a course in peacemaking criminology.

KEY WORDS: Criminology, peacemaking, peacemaking criminology, criminal justice, teaching justice, social justice

INTRODUCTION

Growing up in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, I was fortunate to have a supportive family and happy childhood. Still, I had a sense early on in life that something was amiss in my working-class ethnic neighborhood. But I was too young and too restricted in my focus to know what struck me as being wrong. I could not understand how work in the steel mills and in other settings tinged the lives of most adults with a sense of alienation that they struggled to set aside. I could not understand why structures of authority—whether in my family, school, or church—often seemed so disheartening

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

and to induce such pain but were accepted as an inevitable part of life. And most of all, although I sensed that people could be nicer to one another, I did not know how this might be done or that others felt as I did. Yet, I hoped that my studies and work in sociology would enable me to play some part in bettering community relations.

Early in my faculty days, I changed my scholarly interests from the sociology of work to criminology. Faced with a new area to learn about and understand, I searched for a perspective that could guide my efforts. Although aspects of mainstream criminology were useful, I found this approach of limited appeal. Its failure to deal with issues of power and, in particular, with the alienation engendered by the existing socio-economic order left me with a sense that mainstream perspectives were missing something fundamentally important. I was attracted to "critical" criminology for its unmasking of inequalities but, at times, this approach seemed to be overly pessimistic about the possibilities of changing current arrangements, including those in the criminal justice system, for the better. In the end, I found an intellectual home in "humanist" criminology (and sociology), a perspective that seemed in time to merge into "peacemaking" criminology.[1]

The peacemaking perspective has been important to me because it has helped make sense of the confusion I experienced early in life and because it shows how all our lives can be different. It is also why I find my work as a sociology professor meaningful. I see many students enter my classes, and I have found that a goodly number—as was the case when I first entered a sociology class in college—have a sense that things are not right and can be different. I think that for these students, peacemaking ideas provide an understanding and a vision of how to make their lives more meaningful.

Moreover, my commitment to the peacemaking perspective has been not only intellectually invigorating but also important in providing me with a community of scholars that I am a part of. At the same time, being a peacemaking criminologist on a faculty can be a lonely experience. On a daily basis, it means practicing a brand of criminology that is not well understood by one's colleagues and students. Often, it means being asked to explain what peacemaking criminology is. It means being challenged about how a peacemaking approach, often characterized as utopian, has relevance for real-world issues inside and outside the criminal justice system. And it has meant trying to figure out, to date mostly on my own, how the knowledge of the peacemaking criminological perspective can best be transmitted to students. In short, I have been faced with the challenge of telling what made peacemaking criminology distinctive, of telling how it was relevant to criminal justice policy and practice, and of determining what specifically to teach in my course.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

From the outset, I had sensed that a distinctive feature of peacemaking criminology was that its adherents valued connectedness and the sharing, not hoarding, of their knowledge.[2] Although I had the benefit of discussions at conferences with these fellow criminologists, I felt that I could learn more from them about the issues that confronted me. For this reason, in March 1997, I decided that I would contact people who had written in the peacemaking tradition to ask them about their views on the nature, policy relevance, and ways to transmit what they had learned and experienced. Most of those contacted had written essays in the 1991 Pepinsky and Quinney reader *Peacemaking Criminology* but a few were identified from their writings elsewhere. I designed a questionnaire that probed these issues by asking broadly-worded questions to which these peacemaking criminologists could provide, in a semi-structured and largely qualitative way, their answers. Some of the 30 people contacted felt uncomfortable answering a survey of this sort and instead furnished written comments that went beyond what had been asked for, often in considerable depth. In all, 16 peacemaking criminologists responded to the questionnaire I sent.

The results of this inquiry are not to be presented, as one might in positivist criminology, as a "random sample" of peacemaking criminologists, whose ideas are tested with scales with high alphas. Such an approach has its value but, at this stage, I felt that it would be more useful and insightful to gain more qualitative and, at times, personal insights on the issues I faced. It is heartening, I believe, that the responses to the questionnaire have proved to be illuminating and, at least to me, invaluable in my thinking and teaching. My purpose here is to share the knowledge and experiences that these peacemaking criminologists have shared with me.

In doing so, I have divided this essay into three sections. The first examines the question, "What is peacemaking criminology?" Here I made an effort to convey what is distinctive about a peacemaking perspective and, in particular, how it represents a departure from mainstream criminology. I also report on who the respondents to my inquiry believe are the most influential scholars in the peacemaking area. The second section presents the ideas that the respondents have about how peacemaking criminology can contribute toward policies and practices of the criminal justice system. The final section explores the ideas the respondents have on how one might teach a course on peacemaking criminology.

I should note briefly that those who answered my request to offer their views on peacemaking criminology represent, on the surface, a group of people similar to mainstream criminologists. Although the respondents include a few practitioners, most are white, male, middle-aged, and tenured in an academic department (most often sociology). What is distinctive

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

about this group, however, is that unlike many of those in their academic cohort, they chose to take a different road in their careers. Although often schooled in mainstream perspectives, they came to see the need for an alternative vision for what constitutes harm, what alternate responses to harm might be and, how we might live differently to prevent such harms structurally.

WHAT IS PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY?

Influential Contributors

If mainstream criminologists were asked what writers most influenced their thinking, they might cite Clifford Shaw, Henry McKay, Edwin Sutherland, and Robert Merton or, more recently, scholars such as Travis Hirschi and Ronald Akers. It is instructive that none of these authors was mentioned by the peacemaking criminologists when they were asked who they would "rate as the five most influential scholars" in their perspective. The respondents mentioned a diversity of influential people—21 in all, including practitioners and non-U.S. scholars.[3] Among the most mentioned were M. Kay Harris, Dennis Sullivan and Larry Tifft. However, two people stood out as doing the most to shape peacemaking criminology, being mentioned by virtually every respondent: Richard Quinney and Hal Pepinsky.

When asked to select one person as the most influential scholar, there was wide consensus among the respondents: Richard Quinney. When asked to explain their choice, they noted that his writings provided the basis for the peacemaking perspective. However, they also stated or implied that his influence extended beyond the potentially sterile realm of ideas. As one person shared, "[Quinney] has been an important source of inspiration for many others and has articulated an especially pure version of peacemaking criminology" (emphasis in the original). In short, it appears that within peacemaking criminology, one's influence extends beyond mere ideas to include the personal and moral dimensions of a scholar.

Defining Peacemaking Criminology

Most of the respondents identified the peacemaking perspective as a variant of "critical criminology." As one person asserted, "peacemaking criminology *is* critical criminology" (emphasis in the original). Still, respondents emphasized that there was something fresh about peacemaking criminology—a

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

perspective that concentrated less on economic determinism and state hegemony and more on the interpersonal and on the possibilities for change from non-state forms of justice. Lloyd Klein noted, for example, that "Critical criminology examines the nature of the state and hegemonic control. Peacemaking sociology differs in offering interpersonal alternatives in claiming that change occurs as individuals realize their focal positions and seek out humanist alternatives." Dennis Sullivan saw the distinction similarly:

> Most critical criminologists begin their analysis of social institutions in terms of the impact that economics has on social life, particularly the economics of capitalism. While they might show interests in the workings of power, the accumulation, exercise, and legitimation of power are not their central concern. And so, the alternative social arrangements that are offered as amelioratives are grounded in a justice as defined and administered by the state. It is a justice defined as equal distribution according to the right of each citizen. Hence, the analysis of most critical criminologists is never quite able to escape from hierarchy and power-exercise because the state is an instrument of both. And the alternative social arrangements offered are rarely based in a needs-based economy.
>
> Peacemaking criminology offers, on the other hand, a needs-based alternative to the prevailing deserts-based market economy and an alternative to the state where needs are defined in terms of equal distribution or equal rights. Peacemaking criminologists offer a conception of justice defined in terms of equal well-being for all, where the needs of all are met equally but differentially, that is, according to the unique needs of each. Hence, peacemaking criminologists talk of justice defined as equal well-being and of creating social arrangements in which all are treated equally not only in terms of the results achieved but also in terms of the means. All are encouraged to enjoy full participation in the design of the social arrangements that affect one's life, in the definition of one's needs, in the production of goods and services to satisfy those needs, and in the evaluation of the satisfaction of those needs. Included in the participatory model is also the definition and design of the restorative justice methods used to bring about the restoration of relationships when they become broken. This means that those who have harmed and those who have been harmed by another are an integral part of the reconciliation process where apology and forgiveness are key processes in restoration, as opposed to punishment.

Other scholars in the field have also attempted to discern what is unique about peacemaking criminology—that is, what are its distinguishing

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

characteristics. John Fuller (1998, p. 41), for example, notes that the "peacemaking perspective" operates on multiple levels. At the "international/global" level, the perspective "envisions the interconnectedness of all living things." At "institutional/societal" level, the perspective examines how central political and social institutions "develop and implement rules, policies, and norms which structure the interactions among citizens." At the "interpersonal" level, the perspective "looks at how individuals treat each other in resolving conflicts and dispensing power and privilege," encouraging interactions based on the "Golden Rule." And at the "intrapersonal" level, the perspective "considers how we treat ourselves."

Many of the themes identified by John Fuller (1998) were echoed by the respondents who addressed the question, "How do you define peacemaking criminology?" They offered diverse definitions, but it was possible to distill the core themes and to present them in Table 1. Although the table is largely self-explanatory, it is worthwhile to note that the perspective, at its core, rejects a "making war" approach to crime. But if not war, then what? In its place, peacemaking criminologists, as the survey respondents noted, must take seriously the need to illuminate the reality that we are all interconnected and that the way to a better society is through using compassion and empathy to build stronger ties. Part of this process involves respecting the dignity and understanding the needs of all people, not just those with power and privilege. It also involves, however, an understanding of how existing structural conditions not only are harmful to people but differentially unresponsive to the needs of people. That is, we need to focus on how

Table 1 Descriptions of peacemaking criminology

- It offers a global critique of the entire criminal justice system and its warlike history.
- It shows how everything is connected.
- It turns the premises of traditional criminology upside down.
- It seeks to preserve the dignity of the individual.
- It focuses on what actually works to create a safe community of goodwill and respect for all human beings.
- It concentrates on building rather than severing social ties.
- It is a criminology of compassion for and of empathy with all who suffer.
- It defines the role of police as peace officer rather than as crime fighter.
- It is interested in avoiding structural conditions that exclude people from having their needs met and defines such unresponsiveness as a form of structural violence.
- It attempts to negate power relations in all its forms and seeks ways to structurally and interpersonally minimize violence, harm, and the negation of democracy.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

inequality inhibits our ability to connect with each other. Finally, the respondents suggest that the goal of peacemaking criminology is not only to identify the conditions that separate us, harm us, and foster crime but also to change those conditions through acts of interpersonal kindness and by participating in broader movements of criminal justice and social reform.

Rejecting Mainstream Criminology

As we might surmise, a personalist perspective on social harm and restoration as peacemaking criminology clearly distinguishes itself from mainstream perspectives which assume the state and power-based economies not only as necessary givens but also as benevolent. Consequently, one respondent noted that the peacemaking perspective "turns the premises of traditional criminology upside down." In a sense, then, peacemaking criminology is a reaction to—and thus in part defined by—the ways in which it rejects traditional mainstream criminology. In the eyes of the respondents, how do the perspectives differ?

Table 2 presents the views of the peacemaking criminologists in this regard. Although a number of points were conveyed, it is possible to group the differences between peacemaking and mainstream criminologies into three categories. First, peacemaking criminology begins with the premise that existing political, economic, and social structures and their underlying ideologies, that is, the status quo, should be questioned, not accepted as legitimate. Mainstream criminology is prone to ignore how structural injustices and definitions of "crime" are rooted in power and not somehow natural manifestations of the social order. A task of peacemaking criminology is thus to articulate how existing arrangements are the source of harm in society and to show how much of this harm, which serves the interests of the rich and powerful, is potentially avoidable.

Second, mainstream criminologists accept existing legal categories and then seek to use the scientific method to define, oversee, study, and control the "criminals" specified by law and to explore the cause of crime within that framework. Peacemaking criminology is less interested in such a narrow view of the etiology of "crime." Such inquiry, inevitably value-laden, must start by asking not what is "crime" but what is social harm and what are the political, economic, and social arrangements that bring about such harm. Ultimately, the peacemaking perspective maintains there is limited value in accumulating "causes of crime" that focus on individual failings and ignore the larger structures of power in which we are all enmeshed.[4]

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Table 2 Contrasting peacemaking and mainstream criminologies

- Peacemaking challenges the status quo.
- Peacemaking challenges inequality in society and illuminates structurally-based injustices. It questions the acceptability of existing social arrangements.
- Peacemaking questions state definitions of "who is the criminal," especially as these definitions ignore the harms and violations of human rights perpetrated by the powerful. Mainstream criminology accepts existing legal categories as real and focus more on the "causes" of "criminal" behavior.
- Peacemaking examines the world in a power-reflexive modality, taking into account how power shapes and penetrates virtually all aspects of social life, including the work of criminologists. Mainstream scholars assume that criminology can escape the influence of power and ideology, and that knowledge is best understood through a "value-free" scientific method.
- Peacemaking conceptualizes social change through liberation and change in the oppressive criminal justice system. Mainstream criminology emphasizes social control and mechanisms instrumental in sustaining ongoing criminal justice processes.
- Peacemaking focuses on change from the inside out; from the one to the many rather than a grand design, from the top down. The focus is on individual and community empowerment.
- Peacemaking emphasizes social justice rather than criminal justice. There is a desire for a better society—one that is socialist, not a capitalist.
- Peacemaking includes a spiritual perspective. It is more about connections than dissection. It concentrates on building rather than severing social ties, on what to do rather than whom to blame, on positive empowerment rather than negative disaffection. It is concerned with the resolution of conflict, not the identification and processing of "criminals." It emphasizes healing.
- Peacemaking emphasizes nonviolence and peace instead of violence, law, and order. It is critical of the entire criminal justice system, especially its warlike history and profit structure.
- Peacemaking has a great sympathy for the needs of all involved in a harm situation.

Third, the tendency of mainstream criminologists is to seek solutions to crime within the confines of the existing criminal justice system. Their goal, so to speak, is to act as mechanics who operate and fix the machinery of the system so that it can run more efficiently and effectively. Peacemaking criminology, in contrast, believes that the answers to violence and social harm, and the injustices that are associated with such harm, lie largely outside the criminal justice system or, at least, in a justice system whose structures and processes are radically transformed. Solutions to the harms we do to each other are to be found in restorative processes that help heal those who have been hurt and thereby foster community. The alternative, which involves making war on those who have harmed another and disre-

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

garding the concerns of the person who was harmed, disconnects all from community and is a continuing part of the violence.[5] When we respond to the needs of all in such very painful circumstances, we not only enrich the lives of those immediately affected by the harm but also strengthen the foundations of community.

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Many of the comments expressed above convey the commitment of peacemaking criminologists to address the problem of social harm in very different ways. Indeed, the respondents recognized the need for peacemaking ideas to penetrate more fully-existing practices of justice in the United States.[6] When asked, for example, What should be the next step in the development of peacemaking criminology?", one person highlighted the need to have "peacemaking play a larger role in the . . . approaches utilized by the criminal justice system, practitioners, and policy makers." Similarly, another respondent urged the "development of protocols or strategies that demonstrate in some convincing way the superior 'effectiveness'—in human terms—of peacemaking approaches." In this regard, the questionnaire asked the respondents to comment on "the primary contributions that peacemaking criminology can make toward policies and practices of the 'police,' 'courts,' and 'corrections.'"

Some respondents addressed this question in a broad way. They suggested that peacemaking criminology could open up to criminal justice workers the possibility that society could be organized differently—including their places of work—and that human relations could be conducted in a different, more humane way. This new vision might involve forfeiting the idea that a military-like approach is, in the long and short run, able to reduce the harms of we do to each other. It might involve as well the idea that criminal justice must be non-adversarial and community-based. And it might involve a willingness of criminal justice personnel to enter into genuine conversations with people in the community on how to respond to violence in a restorative way.[7] Of course, such a conversation is premised on the notion that the main objects of criminal justice attention—the poor and minority groups—are not a "dangerous class" but have dignity and must be regarded as partners who need to participate in improving the peace in their community.[8] In a particularly eloquent response to this question, Dennis Sullivan relayed the following:

> Within the context of peacemaking, efforts are made not to recreate the acts and the conditions of violence and thereby further the cycle of

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

> violence that was engendered in the first place, but to bring together the harming person and the person who was harmed for purposes of reconciliation. Peacemaking criminologists believe that when the offending person tenders an apology to the person he or she harmed, then the first steps of a truly corrective or healing process have been taken. This process fosters or at least makes possible, on the part of the person who was hurt, a response of forgiveness. It is believed that this kind of exchange, one that transcends the initial unresponsiveness to the needs of others and reactive retribution as a response to such unresponsiveness, not only restores (to the extent possible) the relationship between the parties involved in the correcting process but also helps to restore the bonds of the community that were fractured by the initial harm and retribution response.

As might be anticipated, this vision informed the specific ideas that the peacemaking criminologists voiced for improving policing, the courts, and corrections. In the area of law enforcement, the respondents noted the need to transform the police from "crime fighters" to "peace officers." As peacemakers, the police would be trained more in human relations than in how to enforce laws. Their goal would be to do "*real* community policing" (emphasis in the original). This would involve, on a broad level, trying to "enhance the harmony in the community and lives of people." The goal would not be to arrest offenders but to find non-formal means to resolve disputes. Officers also would focus much of their effort on preventing crime—of being strong advocates of programs that reach into schools and homes to attack the root causes of problem behaviors.

In a similar way, the peacemaking criminologists reject the idea that courts have to be instruments of adversarial justice. Instead, they endorse the alternative vision that courts should be places devoted to conflict resolution through processes such as peer mediation and victim-offender reconciliation. Most importantly, however, they supported the need for courts to embrace the philosophy of restorative justice—to become instruments for reducing harms by restoring offenders, victims, and the community from the pain and suffering caused by unresponsive behaviors on the part of offenders.

Corrections seems to pose a more daunting challenge to the peacemaking criminologists. One of the respondents referred to corrections as being the "greatest despair." Still, they recognized the need to abandon ill-advised policies rooted in punitiveness. Inflicting more harm—not doing peace—is counterproductive. The challenge, the say, is to humanize the prison environment. This goal might be enhanced through rehabilitation programs. Other respondents advised following the insights conveyed in the writings of Bo Lozoff and Mickey Braswell (1989), *Inner Corrections:*

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Finding Peace and Peacemaking and of Dennis Sullivan (1980), The *Mask of Love: Corrections in America, Toward a Mutual Aid Alternative.*

TEACHING PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY

As noted previously, the underlying purpose of this "conversation" with peacemaking criminologists was not simply to learn about their views on peacemaking as a scholarly perspective but also to gain insights into how these ideas can be communicated most effectively to students. The challenge for peacemaking criminologists is not merely to "talk amongst themselves"—to preach to the choir, so to speak—but to find ways to share this perspective with those who will enter the larger society after graduation often as workers in the criminal justice system. As a criminologist open to the peacemaking perspective, however, I struggled to find models for teaching these ideas to my students. Again, a very important value of my exchange with peacemaking criminologists is that they shared their thoughts on what a course on the perspective might look like.

Sharing a Dominant Theme with Students

As a first step, I asked in my questionnaire, "What is the central theme that you want your students to know at the end of a course on peacemaking criminology?" In a very real sense, this question elicited from the respondents their ideas on what makes such a course distinctive and special—what makes it a "peacemaking" as opposed to a mainstream or militaristic perspective. One respondent stated that his goal in such courses was generally to have students be "able to see crime and justice in a wholly new light, at odds with conventional thought." Across all the respondents, three themes emerged as central to what they hoped to share with their students.

First, the peacemaking criminologists wanted students to confront the reality that the existing approach to crime and its control has been and is likely to remain a failure. One respondent said that, "the 'war on crime' may be as misguided and ineffective and brutal as the war between the states." Another warned that "unless we begin to construct social life with far less violence and separation," the quality of life in the United States "shall decrease even further." In the end, traditional approaches to crime control are doomed to failure because they omit a fundamental understanding of why harmful behavior persists: "crime is a reflection of the lack of peace and social justice" in the nation. Respondents agreed that students need

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Table 3 Suggestions for teaching a peacemaking criminology course: topics, books, and films

Topics Related to Teaching a Course on Peacemaking Criminology

- Peacemaking Frameworks
- Peacemaking of Police, Courts, Corrections, and Treatment
- Peacemaking as an Alternative to Mainstream Positivism
- Peacemaking as the Link to Human Suffering
- Peacemaking Alternatives to Prison
- Peacemaking and Conflict Resolution
- Peacemaking and Human Needs
- Peacemaking and Community Organizing
- Peacemaking and Gender Relationships
- Peacemaking and the Rise of Urban Violence
- Peacemaking and Child Abuse
- Peacemaking and the Spiritual View of Goodwill and Tolerance
- Peacemaking Views of Social Problems
- Peacemaking Views of Capitalism and Socialism
- Peacemaking Views of Power Relationships Versus Equality Relationships
- Peacemaking Views of the Connection between Cultural Ideas and Social Organization
- Peacemaking Views of the Roots and Prevention of Harms
- Peacemaking and Educating for Peace: Becoming a "Peacemaker" on Crime

Books Related to Teaching a Course on Peacemaking Criminology

DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. D. (1996). *Contemporary criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Galaway, B. & Hudson, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Restorative justice: International perspectives*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Hanh, T. N. (1991). *Peace is every step: The path of mindfulness in everyday life*. New York: Bantam.

Holmes, R. L. (1990). *Nonviolence in theory and practice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Lozoff, B. & Braswell, M. (1989). *Inner corrections: Finding peace and peacemaking*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

MacLean, B. D. and Milovanovic, D. (1996). *Thinking critically about crime*. Vancouver: Collective Press.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1991a). *The geometry of violence and democracy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pepinsky, H. E. & Quinney, R. (Eds.) (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Piercy, M. (1983). *Woman on the edge of time*. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Sullivan, D. (1980). *The mask of love: Corrections in America toward a mutual aid alternative*. Port Washington: Kennikat.

Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (1998). Criminology as peacemaking: A peace-oriented perspective on crime, punishment, and justice that takes into account the needs of all. *The Justice Professional*, 11, 5–34.

Tifft, L. (1993). *Battering of women: The failure of intervention and the case for prevention*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Tifft, L. & Sullivan, D. (1980). *The struggle to be human: Crime, criminology, and anarchism*. Sanday, Orkney: Cienfuegos Press.
Wright, R. (1966). *Native son*. New York: Harper and Row.
Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Films Related to Teaching a Course on Peacemaking Criminology

- *American Dream*
- *Apocalypse Now*
- *Attica Prison Riot*
- *Business of America*
- *Civil Rights Documentaries*
- *Cry Freedom*
- *Dead Man Walking*
- *Do the Right Thing*
- *Gandhi*
- *Glengarry Glen Ross*
- *Mediation Films*
- *Metropolitan Avenue*
- *Mother Teresa (by Richard Attenborough)*
- *My Brother's Keeper*
- *Night and Fog*
- *Places in the Heart*
- *Roger and Me*
- *Schindler's List*
- *Shawshank Redemption*
- *The Verdict*
- *Victim Offender Reconciliation Program (VORP) Film*
- *Zimbardo*

---

to come to the realization that, until this truth is addressed, crime will not meaningfully subside.

Second, our peacemaking criminologists also want students to see—indeed, to believe—that there is a different way of organizing social life and practices of justice. Peacemaking offers a way to achieve less harm in the world, including harm from crime and violence. As one respondent expressed, "there are alternative philosophies and approaches to reducing crime and producing justice to the repressive responses and violent reactions commonly practiced in the USA." It is not utopian but possible for students to believe "that human suffering can be curtailed appreciably"—that there "are ways of choosing, acting, feeling that transcend power relations." This involves seeing, as another respondent put it, the "potential for change through understanding and challenging the criminal justice system." Indeed, rather than view crime as an unfortunate fact of modern life, proponents

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

of a peacemaking perspective want students to understand that "every crime is an opportunity for social transformation and peacemaking."[9] This is because, in the end, "human beings"—including those of us who have at one time or another harmed another—"share more similarities than differences. Everyone has a decent soul. It's never too late for prevention and rehabilitation."

Third, respondents said that students should also understand that peacemaking not only offers a different way of thinking but a challenge for them to pursue a different life—to take a road not commonly chosen: to be a peacemaker. "Students need to know that, "Peacemaking is not a system. It's a personal process; not simply an intellectual approach to think about, but also a process to experience and share." Peacemaking thus is built on the "importance of each individual choosing to make a difference." We should thus encourage students to "think for yourself—follow your own heart." They should be urged, as well, to assume "personal responsibility" and to practice "responsiveness."[10] In the end, peacemaking is not something that emerges after some kind of gigantic social transformation has taken place but is a means to such transformation. It must be pursued by people—including students—"wherever they are—one person at a time."

Peacemaking Teaching Materials: Topics, Books, and Films

To get some sense of the tools that teachers use in their classes on peacemaking criminology, I asked the respondents what "essential topics," readings, and films/documentaries they would use in a course on peacemaking criminology. Table 3 illustrates their suggestions. The results in the table are largely self-explanatory. Still, it seems useful to note how few of the materials listed would likely appear in courses or a curriculum based on mainstream criminological ideas. Instead—and consistent with the dominant themes the respondents want their students to embrace—virtually all of the teaching suggestions focused on providing students with a different way of envisioning the world and, more specifically, what is done about social harm in the United States. The focus should be on moving students to see that the greatest harms are rooted in and derive from existing structures of power and inequality, how people have struggled against these harm-inducing arrangements, and how it might be possible to attend more genuinely to human needs and thereby create a society that is less harmful and thus less prone to generate criminal harms.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Table 4 Outline to teach a peacemaking criminology course

A. THE NATURE OF PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY
1. Peacemaking Criminology Frameworks (Richard Quinney, Hal Pepinsky, Dennis Sullivan, Larry Tifft, Kay Harris, Kevin Anderson, John Fuller)
2. Peacemaking and Human Needs (Sullivan & Tifft, Criminology as Peace- making; Fromm, *The sane society*)
3. Peacemaking as the Link to Human Suffering (Quinney, The way of peace; Quinney and Wildeman, Peace and social justice)
4. Peacemaking Views of the Roots and Prevention of Harms (Tifft & Sullivan, *The struggle to be human*; Scimecca, *Society and freedom*; Simon, *Elite deviance*)
5. Peacemaking and the Spiritual View of Goodwill and Tolerance (Lozoff & Braswell, *Innerconnections*; Quinney, *Providence* and *Social existence*)

B. PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY IN THE CONTEXT OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE
1. Peacemaking Views of Capitalism and Socialism (Quinney & Wildeman, *The problem of crime*; Quinney, Socialist humanism and the problem of crime: Thinking about Erich Fromm in the development of critical/peacemaking criminology)
2. Peacemaking Views of Social Problems (Fuller, Chapters 8 to 13; Simon, *Social problems and the sociological imagination*)
3. Peacemaking and Gender Relationships (Quinney & Pepinsky, Chapters Six to Nine; Tifft, *Battering of women*; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, British left realism and Abuse of women)
4. Peacemaking and the Rise of Urban Violence (Pepinsky, *The geometry of violence and democracy*; Caulfield, The Perpetuation of violence through criminology theory; Holmes, *Nonviolence in theory and practice*)

C. PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY PERSPECTIVES ON THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM
1. Peacemaking as an Alternative to Mainstream Positivism (Quinney & Wildeman, The study of crime; Friedrichs, Crime wars and peacemaking criminology)
2. Peacemaking of Police, Courts, Corrections, and Treatment (Fuller, Chapters 5 to 7; Sullivan, *The mask of love: Corrections in America; Toward a mutual aid alternative*)
3. Peacemaking Alternatives To Prison (Rucker, Peacemaking in prisons; Knopp, Community solutions to sexual violence: Feminist/abolitionist perspectives)
4. Peacemaking and Community Organizing (David Gil, *Beyond the jungle*; Cordella, Reconciliation and the mutualist model of community; Klein et al., Taking a bite of social injustice)

D. PEACEMAKING CRIMINOLOGY SOLUTIONS
1. Conflict Resolution (Scimecca, Conflict resolution and a critique of alternative dispute resolution; Volpe, Mediation in the criminal justice system; Immarigeon, Beyond the fear of crime)

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Table 4 (*Continued*)

2. Restorative/Transformative Justice (Braithwaite, *Crime, shame and reintegration*; Zehr, *Changing lenses*; Umbreit, *Victim meets offender*; Van Ness and Strong, *Restorative justice*; Galaway and Hudson, *Restorative justice: International perspectives*)
3. Educating for Peace: Becoming a Peacemaker of Crime (Pepinsky, Peacemaking in criminology and criminal justice; Sanzen, The role of education in peacemaking; Brock-Utne, *Educating for peace: A Feminist perspective*; Debenedetti, *Peace heroes in twentieth-century America*)

Note: Each topic was suggested by respondents to the Peacemaking Criminology Survey. Readings appearing next to a topic are selected examples and are certainly not exhaustive in scope. Other possible topics suggested in the Peacemaking Criminology Survey include Peacemaking and Child Abuse, Views of Power Relationships Versus Equality Relationships, Peacemaking Views of the Connection Between Cultural Ideas and Social Organization.

A Proposed Course Outline

After reviewing the many responses to the questionnaire related to course syllabus, I believe it is possible to begin to map out what a course on peacemaking criminology might look like. Undoubtedly, there are many viable ways to organize such a course so that students can grasp the essence of the peacemaking criminological perspective.[11] Accordingly, the course outline presented in Table 4 is presented as just one approach to teaching about peacemaking criminology. In any case, the outline suggests how topics might be organized and what readings might be drawn upon to illustrate the salient aspects of each of those topics.

Generally, the peacemaking criminologists who responded to the questionnaire focused on four important concerns each of which is reflected in the course outline I have offered. First, it is necessary to begin the course by identifying clearly what is distinctive about peacemaking criminology. Beyond recommending general readings, the teacher can help students familiarize themselves with the major aspects of the peacemaking perspective: being sensitive to all peoples' human needs; recognizing the importance of ameliorating human suffering; understanding the roots of social harm; and preventing harm by social structural change.

In the second section of the course it is possible to play off of these broad themes and show how they apply to specific historical and social contexts. Fundamental to understanding the nature and persistence of social harms, for example, is to recognize how they are inextricably rooted in structures of inequality.[12] Thus, in the second section, attention might be paid to the role of racial, class, and gender structures of inequality—all exacerbated by

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

capitalism—and how these inequities are themselves a form of social harm as well as a conductor of them. It is important to help students see how social harms and other social problems are not only a matter of individual defects but also of social arrangements that fail to take into account human needs at the most elemental levels.

The third section of the outline asks students to consider why traditional responses to crime in the criminal justice system will continue to prove counterproductive. The key to this section is helping students to understand the limits of traditional ways of "fighting crime" and to see the futility of a "justice" rooted in vengeance and punitiveness. The challenge here is to show students how a peacemaking criminology allows all of us to envision different ways of reducing the harms we do to each other, that is, develop responses that do not aggravate problems by meeting violence with violence. Our aim is to transform those who do violence through programs of peace and restorative justice, through a broader vision of social life that helps us prevent social harms from emerging in the first place.[13]

The fourth section is even more concrete by allowing students to see peacemaking criminology solutions, many of which are already used successfully in "real-world" situations to respond to harms-done. Two sub-sections could focus, for example, on conflict resolution and on restorative/transformative justice. The final sub-section would extend to students an invitation to become part of a peacemaking response to social harms by becoming a peacemaker in their daily lives.

CONCLUSION

At its core, peacemaking criminology reveals that, instead of waging a war on crime, we can create social arrangements in which the needs of all are taken into account. In particular, peacemaking criminology calls upon us to refuse to invest in a social ethic that separates us from one another and instead to visualize all people—including those responsible for serious harms—as being connected. Clearly, this message is absent from mainstream analyses of crime, punishment, and justice where criminologists and their students accept existing political, economic, and social realities as inevitable as well as the ideological boundaries they allow us to think within. Mainstream criminologists focus, usually in highly technical ways, on how to make the existing criminal justice system more effective and efficient in its processing of offenders.

On the other hand, peacemaking criminology alerts us to the importance of *not* accepting existing realities as immutable and to understand that

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

social arrangements are *changeable*. It is a perspective that, although critical of what exists, embraces an abiding optimism about the human spirit, that we are good, not bad, at heart and that peace, not violence, can be achieved when we attend to each other's needs.

This message—expressed through the diverse voices of the peacemaking criminologists who responded to my questionnaire—is important for our students to hear. The peacemaking perspective offers these students, as Richard Quinney (1991, pp. 11–12) notes, "a criminology that seeks to alleviate suffering and thereby to eliminate crime." While such a journey is replete with difficult challenges, it opens up to students the possibility of joining a movement that is both personally and socially transformative. In short, it calls students to be among society's peacemakers.

How best to issue this call, how best to make this invitation, is a decision that each peacemaking criminologist, who teaches within a college or university, must decide for him- or herself. If only in a preliminary way, I hope that this paper will help criminologists find a peaceful voice that their students can hear, a voice that can move their students to see the harmfulness and injustices of power-based social arrangements and the humane possibilities that we all can realize when we base our relationships in peace.

Notes

1. Regarding "critical criminology," see, for example: Groves and Sampson (1986), Henry and Milovanovic (1991), MacLean and Milovanovic (1991), Thomas and O'Maolchatha (1989). Examples of "humanist criminology" include: Friedrichs (1982), Hartjen (1985), Kramer (1985), Pfohl (1985). In respect to "humanist sociology," see, for example, Scimecca (1995), Lee (1973), and Fishman and Benello (1986). Concerning "peacemaking criminology," see for example: Braswell (1990), Friedrichs (1991), Lozoff and Braswell (1989), Pepinsky (1988, 1989), Pepinsky and Quinney (1991), Quinney (1988a, 1988b, 1993), Quinney and Wildeman (1991).
2. In fact, Braswell (1990, pp. 3–4) maintains that the three principal themes of peacemaking criminology are connectedness, caring, and mindfulness.
3. These 21 influential people are Kevin Anderson, David Barash, Birgit Brock-Utne, Susan Caulfield, Nils Christie, J. Peter Cordella, Robert Elias, David Gil, M. Kay Harris, Luk Hulsman, Russ Immarigeon, Fay Honey Knopp, Peter Kropotkin, Lyn Markham, Tom Mathieson, Harold E. (Hal) Pepinsky, Marge Piercy, Richard Quinney, Dennis Sullivan, Larry Tifft, and Howard Zehr.
4. For further discussions of peacemaking criminology on this point see, for example, Friedrichs (1996, pp. 34–38) and Pepinsky and Wildeman (1991, pp. 106–119).
5. The limitations of the "war on crime" perspective in comparison to the "peacemaking criminology" perspective are discussed in detail by Fuller (1998), Harris (1991), and Elias (1993, Chapter 7).
6. Similarly this theme receives extensive attention in the peacemaking criminology analyses of Fuller (1998) and Quinney and Wildeman (1991).

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

7. Likewise Pepinsky (1999 and in press) emphasizes such conversations among people in the community about violence as a prime aspect underlying the peacemaking criminology approach.
8. For further exploration of this theme, see Sullivan and Tifft (1998) and Marcus (1996).
9. This theme of social transformation in relation to peacemaking criminology is broadly addressed in Quinney and Wildeman (1991, pp. 110–119), Morris (1994), and Sullivan and Tifft (1998).
10. The practice of "responsiveness" and its counterpart, "unresponsiveness" are key concepts in Pepinsky's (1988, 1991a) peacemaking approach toward violence.
11. One such approach, for example, would be to adopt Fuller's (1998) peacemaking criminology textbook as the main required reading. In this light, the course outline might be designed as follows:

    A. Introduction to Peacemaking Criminology
        1. Peacemaking Analysis of Current Crime Trends (Chapter 1)
        2. Making Peace on the "War on Crime" (Chapter 2)
        3. Peacemaking Criminology Traditions (Chapter 3)

    B. Peacemaking and the Criminal Justice System
        1. Peacemaking Views of the Making and Enforcement of Laws (Chapter 4)
        2. Peacemaking Views of Policing (Chapter 5)
        3. Peacemaking Views of the Criminal Court Process (Chapter 6)
        4. Peacemaking and the Principles and Forms of Corrections (Chapter 7)

    C. Peacemaking and Social Problems
        1. Making Peace on the "War on Drugs" (Chapter 8)
        2. Peacemaking and Patterns of Violence (Chapter 9)
        3. Peacemaking Perspectives on Gun Control (Chapter 10)
        4. Peacemaking Challenges of Capital Punishment (Chapter 11)
        5. Making Peace on Youth and Gangs (Chapter 12)
        6. Peacemaking Perspectives on Crime in Other Countries (Chapter 13)
12. For further discussion concerning the issue of social harms, see, for example, Wozniak (in press).
13. Along these lines, see, for example, Currie (1998) about such prevention programs showing evidence of effectiveness.

References

Anderson, K. (1991). Radical criminology and the overcoming of alienation: Perspectives from Marxian and Gandhian humanism." In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 14–29). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Braswell, M. C. (1990, May–June). Peacemaking: A missing link in criminology. *The Criminologist*, 15, 3–5.

Brock-Utne, B. (1985). *Educating for peace: A feminist perspective*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Caulfield, S. L. (1991). The perpetuation of violence through criminological theory: The ideological role of subculture theory. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 228–244). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Cordella, J. P. (1991). Reconciliation and the mutualist model of a community. In H. E. Pepinsky and R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 30–46). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Currie, E. (1998). *Crime and punishment in America*. New York: Henry Holt.

DeBenedetti, C. (Ed.) (1986). *Peace heroes in twentieth-century America*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. D. (1991). British left realism on the abuse of women: A critical appraisal. In H. E. Pepinsky and R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 154–171). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. D. (1996). *Contemporary criminology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Elias, R. (1993). *Victims still: The political manipulation of crime victims*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fishman, W. K. & Benello, C. G. (Eds.) (1986). *Readings in humanist sociology: Social criticism and social change*. Bayside, NY: General Hall.

Friedrichs, D. O. (1982, August). Crime, deviance and criminal justice: In search of a radical humanistic perspective. *Humanity and Society*, 6, 200–226.

Friedrichs, D. O. (1991). Introduction: Peacemaking criminology. In B. D. MacLean & D. Milovanovic (Eds.), *New directions in critical criminology* (pp. 101–106). Vancouver: Collective Press.

Friedrichs, D. O. (1994, Summer). Crime wars and peacemaking criminology. *Peace Review*, 6, 159–164.

Friedrichs, D. O. (1996). Peacemaking criminology and the punitive conundrum: A new foundation for social control in the twenty-first century. In C. T. Sistare (Ed.), *Punishment: Social control and coercion* (pp. 29–54). New York: Peter Lang.

Fromm, E. (1955). *The sane society*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fuller, J. R. (1998). *Criminal justice: A peacemaking perspective*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Galaway, B. & Hudson, J. (Eds.) (1996). *Restorative justice: International perspectives*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Gil, D. G. (1979). *Beyond the jungle: Essays on human possibilities, social alternatives, and radical practice*. Boston: G. K. Hall.

Groves, W. B. & Sampson, R. J. (1986, December). Critical theory and criminology. *Social Problems*, 33, S58–80.

Hanh, T. N. (1991). *Peace is every step: The path of mindfulness in everyday life*. New York: Bantam.

Hartjen, C. A. (1985, September). Humanistic criminology: Is it possible? *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 12, 444–468.

Harris, M. K. (1991). Moving into the new millennium: Toward a feminist vision of justice. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 83–97). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Henry, S. & Milovanovic, D. (1991, May). Constitutive criminology: The maturation of critical theory. *Criminology*, 29, 293–316.

Holmes, R. L. (1990). *Nonviolence in theory and practice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Immarigeon, R. (1991). Beyond the fear of crime: Reconciliation as the basis for criminal justice policy. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 69–80). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Klein, L., Luxenburg, J. & Gunther, J. (1991). Taking a bite out of social injustice: Crime-control ideology and its peacemaking potential. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 280–296). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Knopp, F. H. (1991). Community solutions to sexual violence: Feminist/abolitionist perspectives. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 181–193). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kramer, R. C. (1985, September). Defining the concept of crime: A humanistic perspective. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 12, 469–487.

Lee, A. M. (1973). *Toward humanist sociology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Lozoff, B. & Braswell, M. (1989). *Inner corrections: Finding peace and peacemaking*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

MacLean, B. D. & Milovanovic, D. (Eds.) (1991). *New directions in critical criminology*. Vancouver: Collective Press.

MacLean, B. D. & Milovanovic, D. (1996). *Thinking critically about crime*. Vancouver: Collective Press.

Marcus, M. (1996). Creating peaceful communities. In B. Galaway & J. Hudson (Eds.), *Restorative justice: International perspectives* (pp. 103–115). Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Morris, R. (1994). *A practical guide to transformative justice*. Toronto: Rittenhouse.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1988, December). Violence as unresponsiveness: Toward a new conception of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 5, 539–587.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1989, Summer). Peacemaking in criminology. *Critical Criminologist*, 1, 6–10.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1991a). *The geometry of violence and democracy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1991b). Peacemaking in criminology and criminal justice. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 299–327). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pepinsky, H. E. (1999). Peacemaking Primer. In B. A. Arrigo (Ed.), *Social justice/Criminal Justice: The maturation of critical theory in law, crime, and deviance* (pp. 52–70). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Pepinsky, H. E. (in press). Safety from personal violence. *Humanity and Society*.

Pepinsky, H. E. & Quinney, R. (Eds.) (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Pfuhl, E. (1985, September). Humanistic criminology: Future prospects. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 12, 604–638.

Piercy, M. (1983). *Woman on the edge of time*. New York: Fawcett Crest.

Quinney, R. (1980). *Providence: The reconstruction of social and moral order*. New York: Longman.

Quinney, R. (1982). *Social existence: Metaphysics, Marxism and the social sciences*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Quinney, R. (1988a, Winter). Crime, suffering, service: Toward a criminology of peacemaking. *The Quest*, 66–75.

Quinney, R. (1988b, November). The theory and practice of peacemaking in the development of radical criminology. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Chicago.

Quinney, R. (1991). The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 3–13). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Quinney, R. (1993). A life of crime: Criminology and public policy as peacemaking. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 16(2), 3–9.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Quinney, R. (1995). Socialist humanism and the problem of crime: Thinking about Erich Fromm in the development of critical/peacemaking criminology. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 23(2), 147–156.

Quinney, R. & Wildeman, J. (1991). *The problem of crime: A peace and social justice perspective*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Rucker, L. (1991). Peacemaking in prisons: A process. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 172–180). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Sanzen, P. L. (1991). The role of education in peacemaking. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 239–244). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Scimecca, J. A. (1991). Conflict resolution and a critique of 'alternative dispute resolution.' In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 172–180). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Scimecca, J. A. *Society and freedom: An introduction to humanist sociology*. 2nd ed. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

Simon, D. R. (1995). *Social problems and the sociological imagination*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Simon, D. R. (1996). *Elite deviance* 5th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sullivan, D. (1980). *The mask of love: Corrections in America toward a mutual aid alternative*. Port Washington: Kennikat.

Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (1998, February). The transformative and economic dimensions of restorative justice. *Humanity and Society*, 22, 38–54.

Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (1998). Criminology as peacemaking: A peace-oriented perspective on crime, punishment, and justice that takes into account the needs of all. *The Justice Professional*, 11(1–2), 5–34.

Sullivan, D. & Tifft, L. (1998). *Restorative justice as a transformative process: The application of restorative justice principles to our everyday lives*. Voorheesville: Mutual Aid Press.

Thomas, J. & O'Maolchatha, A. (1989, June). Reassessing the critical metaphor: An optimistic revisionist view. *Justice Quarterly*, 6, 143–172.

Tifft, L. (1993). *Battering of women: The failure of intervention and the case for prevention*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Tifft, L. & Sullivan, D. (1980). *The struggle to be human: Crime, criminology, and anarchism*. Sanday, Orkney: Cienfuegos Press.

Umbreit, M. S. (1994). *Victim meets offender: The impact of restorative justice and mediation*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Van Ness, D. & Strong, K. H. (1997). *Restoring justice*. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Volpe, M. R. (1991). Mediation in the criminal justice system: Process, promises, problems. In H. E. Pepinsky & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 194–205). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wozniak, J. F. (2000). Alienation and crime: Lessons from Erich Fromm. In K. Anderson & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Erich Fromm and critical criminology: Beyond the punitive society*. Champaign: University of Illinois Press.

Wright, R. (1966). *Native son*. New York: Harper and Row.

Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing lenses: A new focus for crime and justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.

Biography

John F. Wozniak is an associate professor of sociology and chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Western Illinois University. He earned a Ph.D. in sociology at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. His research in criminology has led to articles on the seriousness of crime, public attitudes toward crime, elderly offenders, correctional policy, stress and social supports among police, and rural police functions in journals such as *Criminology, Journal of Criminal Justice, Crime and Social Justice, Federal Probation*, and *Police Studies*.

Copyright ©2000. All Rights Reserved.