Introduction

Vision brings a new appreciation of what there is. It makes a person see things differently rather than see different things. —Herbert Guenther

Our personal and social values shape and color the way we perceive the world in which we live. While we are concerned with achieving personal goals and ambitions, we also come to realize at a rather early age that the needs and desires of others are also forces to be reckoned with. The question for us then becomes one of reconciling the pursuit of our individual dreams within the context of the larger community. Maintaining our individual integrity, our personal sense of right and wrong, and, at the same time, conforming to what is best for the majority of persons in our society can often become a perplexing challenge. Yet we are all connected to each other in one way or another—parents and children, inmates with correctional staff. We are even connected to our physical environment, as evidenced in the quality of air we
breathe and water we drink. As potential criminal justice practitioners, our professional choices and policies will emanate from our personal beliefs and values—from our personal philosophies. How much do we care about trying to honestly and effectively address the pressing justice issues of the day? Are we truly mindful of the ways we are connected to our problems? Do we have a long-term as well as short-term sense of what the costs of our proposed solutions will be?

Cultivating a greater understanding of our own philosophical perspectives can provide us with a foundation for making more informed decisions about the diverse social issues we face and the way our system of justice responds to such issues.
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The evolution of legal and social justice in the United States often has found itself pulled between the retribution and punishment agendas of such ancient traditions as the law of Moses, the Koran, and the rehabilitation and redemption traditions of New Testament Christianity. The tension between these traditions of retribution and rehabilitation, and punishment and reform, has been substantial.

Peacemaking from a justice and criminology perspective has been heralded in some quarters as a contemporary, “New Age” phenomenon. The New Age movement itself appears to be essentially a middle-class movement that focuses on such issues as metaphysical inquiry, mind control, emotional healing, and financial wellbeing. Although peacemaking concerns may be compatible with some of these issues, they seem more grounded in age-old traditions such as Christianity, Judaism, Islamism, Buddhism, and Hinduism. In particular, these ancient traditions emphasize the value and usefulness of suffering and service to others, which is often deemphasized or nonexistent in New Age movements (Bartollas & Braswell, 1993).

Peacemaking, as evolved from ancient spiritual and wisdom traditions, has included the possibility of mercy and compassion within the framework of justice. To put such thinking in a more personal perspective, we might consider our own experiences—times when we have been the victim and other occasions when we have been the offender. Perhaps we have never committed a crime and, hopefully, most of us have never been harmed by an offender. Yet in our own ways, we have been both victim and offender. We have been betrayed by those we trusted, whether through the heartbreak of a romance gone sour or the cruel gossip of a broken confidence. How did we feel when we were betrayed? What did we want from the one who hurt us? Typically, we wanted to strike back; we wanted revenge,
retribution, our “pound of flesh.” What about the occasions when we have been the offender, when we have committed the betrayal? When our best friend found out that we were the source of the criticism or cruel gossip, what did we want? As the one who offended, what did we hope for? Did we hope for mercy and forgiveness, perhaps another chance? Can we have it both ways? Can we be for revenge and violence when we are the victim and for mercy and peace when we are the offender? Can we expect to have it both ways?

In this chapter, we explore three themes of peacemaking: connectedness, care, and mindfulness. It is our hope that through this exploration we will be able to better understand the possibilities of peacemaking for us as criminal justice professionals as well as on a personal level in our own lives.

CONNECTEDNESS

The first and perhaps most important theme is demonstrated in the dedication to the book *Inner Corrections: Finding Peace and Peace Making*, which says, “to the keeper and the kept, the offender and the victim, the parent and the child, the teacher and the student, and the incarcerator and the liberator that is within each of us” (Lozoff & Braswell, 1989:iii). This simple statement suggests what Eastern philosophers such as Lao-tzu and Western philosophers such as Plato advocated ages ago—that human beings are not simply isolated individuals, but each one of us is integrally “connected” and bonded to other human beings and the environment. This environment includes not only the outer physical environment but our inner psychological and spiritual environment as well. Chief Seattle of the Duwamish tribe, in an 1852 letter to the President of the United States, wrote the following:

*Every part of this earth is sacred to my people. Every shining pine needle, every sandy shore, every mist in the dark woods, every meadow, every humming insect ... We know the sap which courses through the trees as we know the blood that courses through our veins. We are part of the earth and it is part of us. The perfumed flowers are our sisters. The bear, the deer, the great eagle, these are our brothers. The rocky crests, the juices in the meadow, the body heat of the pony, and man, all belong to the same family ... This we know: the earth does not belong to man, man belongs to the earth. All things are connected like the blood that unites us all. Man did not weave the web of life, he is merely a strand in it. Whatever he does to the web, he does to himself.*

In that letter, Chief Seattle emphasizes our connection to the natural world. One can find a similar position in several different Eastern philosophies. Bo Lozoff (1987:11), articulating the position found in Yoga, states: “In Truth, we (everybody and everything in the Universe) are all connected; most of us just can’t see the glue.”
The idea that we “just can’t see the glue” (i.e., we can’t see the connection linking ourselves to others) is the Hindu concept that we misperceive ourselves as isolated and disconnected from one another and the world. As we become more aware of how we are connected to all that we are a part of, we are encouraged to take more personal responsibility to do the best we can. Wendell Berry, a noted conservationist, writes, “A man who is willing to undertake the discipline and the difficulty of mending his own ways is worth more to the conservation movement than a hundred who are insisting merely that the government and industries mend their ways” (in Safransky, 1990:51). Thomas Merton suggests that “instead of hating the people you think are war makers, hate the appetites and the disorder in your own soul, which are the causes of war” (in Safransky, 1990:115). Insofar as we see ourselves as apart from nature rather than a part of nature, we end up with pollution, acid rain, destruction of forests, and the depletion of the earth’s ozone layer. As Berry and Merton indicate, an important aspect of connectedness is looking within, taking personal responsibility, and acting in a more responsible way so that we contribute as little as possible to these ills.

In this regard, it is interesting to contrast two metaphors concerning the earth. The older metaphor of “Mother Earth” contrasts dramatically with the contemporary metaphor of the earth as a collection of natural resources. A mother is someone to whom we feel connected and bound. To perceive the earth as one’s mother is to see oneself as coming out of the earth. The connection could not be any more intimate. To perceive the earth as an assortment of natural resources is another matter entirely. To conceive of the earth as merely a provider of goods for our own purposes is, to borrow Kant’s expression, to see the earth as merely a means of our own ends. The danger in that attitude is now obvious. Insofar as we do not consider the earth to be sacred or precious (as Chief Seattle did) but instead see it as a commodity with no intrinsic worth, we find ourselves in a world with poisoned places like Prince William Sound, Three Mile Island, Love Canal, and Chernobyl. To put such thinking in a Judeo-Christian context, does “dominion over the earth” refer to our being responsible stewards of the earth and its resources, or does it allow us to attempt to dominate the earth, exploiting its resources for profit and convenience, with little or no regard for breaking environmental laws or for our children’s future?

Once we accept the assumption that we are connected to everyone and everything around us, it becomes clear that our actions do not take place in a vacuum but within a complex web of interconnected people and things. Whatever I do has an impact on those around me. My actions have consequences. This is the Hindu and Buddhist concept of karma. The law of karma is the law of cause and effect. All actions have effects or consequences. The law of karma is neither good nor bad. It simply is what it is.

When we integrate the notion of karma (lawful consequences) with the notion of connectedness, it becomes clear that, since we are connected to everyone around us, our actions affect those who are connected to us, even when we cannot see the
connections. Insofar as we have an impact on someone we are connected with, we have an impact on ourselves. In other words, our actions ultimately come back to us. What goes around comes around. What we do to others, in one way or another, we also do to ourselves. It is the biblical idea that we reap what we sow. It is Chief Seattle’s idea that “Man did not weave the web of life, he is merely a strand in it. Whatever he does to the web, he does to himself. Plant seeds of violence and reap violent fruits. Plant seeds of compassion and reap compassionate fruits.” Bo Lozoff (1987:9) states: “Every thought, word, and deed is a seed we plant in the world. All our lives, we harvest the fruits of those seeds. If we plant desire, greed, fear, anger and doubt, then that’s what will fill our lives. Plant love, courage, understanding, good humor, and that’s what we get back. This isn’t negotiable; it’s a law of energy, just like gravity.”

When we speak of karma, we are not talking about retribution, revenge, or punishment. Rather, we are speaking of the consequences of actions. We do not say of someone who jumps from a third-story window that his broken leg is a punishment for jumping. It is simply a consequence. Rather than thinking of karma as retribution, it is better to think of it as the principle, “You’ve made your bed, now you must lie in it.” We must inhabit the world we create. If we pollute the world, we must live in a polluted world. If we act violently or choose to ignore violence and injustice, we must live in a violent and unjust world.

According to proponents of the idea of karma (the idea that each one of us reaps what he or she sows), no one can ever get away with one’s actions. Perhaps we won’t get caught by the police, but the action still has an impact on our own life. For a philosopher like Plato, the consequences are consequences for our own psyche. In Plato’s Gorgias, Socrates compares physical health with psychological health. To understand this comparison, consider the following example. I live a sedentary life, eat a diet of junk food and soda pop, smoke cigarettes, and drink alcohol excessively. This life of no exercise, poor nutrition, cigarettes, and alcohol will eventually catch up with me. After I become adjusted and acclimated to it, I may believe that I feel just fine. But from the fact that I believe that I feel fine, it does not follow that I am in an optimal state of physical health. The reason that I believe that I feel fine is precisely because I no longer even know what it is like to feel healthy. It is like a severely nearsighted boy who has never worn glasses. He will not know that his sight is not optimal; he will think the world is supposed to look the way he sees it. He will not know that there is a better way to see. Similarly, I, as the person who lives a sedentary life and eats exclusively at fast food restaurants, may not know that there is a better way to feel. But the fact that I do not know it does not stop the junk food and cigarettes from continuing to affect my physical condition. One simply cannot avoid the consequences of an unhealthy diet and lifestyle.

This is also a useful analogy for understanding suffering and violence within families. There is often a sense of disconnectedness, inconsistency, and neglect.
regarding relationships in unhealthy and abusive families. Over a period of years, trust becomes nonexistent, and feelings of anger and unhappiness begin to appear normal to such families. They forget how it felt to be happy and at peace (if they ever experienced such feelings). When children grow up full of pain and inconsistencies, they, along with their families, often reap a harvest of drug abuse, spousal battering, and other forms of criminality—even suicide or homicide. They did not realize things had gotten so bad. In a sense, the connections, both hidden and obvious, that animate the consequences of our actions are like a dance (and there are no spectators in the dance of life). “The flailing arms of the abusive parent and the contortions of the victim-child are locked in a dance of pain and sorrow no less significant than the dance of joy experienced by the loving elderly couple” (Braswell, 1990b:87).

In Gorgias, Plato argues that the same is true with injustice and psychological health. One can never escape the consequences of injustice. One may escape detection by the police, one may never be brought to trial, one may never go to prison—but injustice continues to affect one’s psyche, whether we know it or not. We must inhabit the unjust world that we have created. According to Plato, injustice brings strife, disharmony, and conflict. There will be strife and conflict in an unjust city. Similarly, there will be strife and conflict in an unjust individual (a lack of psychic health and wholeness). Just as the physically unhealthy man may not know he is unhealthy and the nearsighted child may not know his eyesight is poor, the unjust man may not know that he is in a state of psychic disharmony and imbalance. That is because he has become adjusted and acclimated to an unjust and violent life. He simply doesn’t know what it is like to feel balanced, harmonious, and whole. Of course, consequences of poor physical or psychic health may also offer a person opportunity to learn and grow from his or her experience. For example, what does it mean when a person who ridicules and feels prejudice toward disabled persons finds himself or herself the parent of a disabled child? Some people might suggest that such a consequence is a form of punishment. Perhaps on a deeper level, the consequence is also an opportunity—another chance for the disconnected person to see and experience the connection that his or her disabled child is lovable and an important part of the web of life. The same can be said of the harsh, uncaressing critic of the drug addict, who comes to find that his own daughter or son suffers from such an affliction.

To summarize, according to what we are calling theories of connectedness, people are not isolated, disconnected beings. Rather, we are earthly beings and social beings; that is, we are creatures integrally connected to the earth and to other people on the earth. What we do has direct consequence for those to whom we are connected, whether or not we see the connection. Our actions directly affect the world in which we live. We must live in the world created by our own actions. If we act violently, cruelly, and unjustly, we will live in a world filled with violence, cruelty, and injustice. If we act compassionately and benevolently, we will live in a world that is more compassionate and benevolent.
This metaphysical view naturally leads to an ethics of nonviolence. The Sanskrit word *ahimsa*, meaning nonviolence, is a fundamental concept in Hinduism and Buddhism. Mahatma Gandhi, who advocated an ethic of nonviolence, is a contemporary representative of that idea. A Christian representative is Martin Luther King, Jr. Both believed in changing the world and rectifying the injustices they saw, but both insisted on using nonviolent strategies. Martin Luther King, Jr., accepting the Nobel Peace Prize, said, “The nonviolent resisters can summarize their message in the following simple terms: We will not obey unjust laws or submit to unjust practices. We will do this peacefully, openly, cheerfully, because our aim is to persuade. We adopt the means of nonviolence because our end is a community at peace with itself” (Cohen, 1971:40). The idea is that violence breeds violence. You don’t fight fire with fire, rather you put out fire with water. You don’t end violence by violently resisting it. Perhaps that is what Jesus meant by “resist not evil” (Matthew 5:39). You don’t end violence by creating more of it. If we must inhabit the world we create and we want to live in a world that is just and peaceful, we ought to act in just and peaceful ways. Richard Quinney (1993) writes, “Instead of a war on crime (“on criminals”) we need to be waging peace on the economy, in the society, and within ourselves.” In other words, we need to wage peace, not war.

An example of the relevance of this philosophy to criminal justice can be found in our contemporary prisons. Contemporary prisons are typically violent institutions that tend to perpetuate rather than diminish violence. According to the theories presented in this section, we must begin to treat criminals in less violent and more compassionate ways. We must stop thinking in terms of revenge, retribution, and recrimination and begin to think in terms of reconciliation, compassion, and forgiveness. In recent years, there have been innovations and increasing numbers of alternative programs on mediation, conflict resolution, restitution, and community action. They are a part of an emerging criminology of peacemaking, a criminology that seeks to end suffering and reduce crime (Quinney, 1993). This approach to corrections is not a weak, “bleeding heart” approach. Sometimes love may have to be firm love. Still, if we choose to acknowledge our connectedness and desire to be peacemakers, we will insist on treating people as a part of our humanity, whether they deserve such treatment or not.

The following Zen story presents this philosophy in its most radical form:

*One evening as Shichiri Kojun was reciting sutras a thief with a sharp sword entered, demanding either his money or his life. Shichiri told him: “Do not disturb me. You can find the money in that drawer.” Then he resumed his recitation. A little while afterwards he stopped and called: “Don’t take it all. I need some to pay taxes with tomorrow.” The intruder gathered up most of the money and started to leave.” The man thanked him and made off. A few days afterwards the fellow was caught and confessed, among others, the offence against Shichiri. When Shichiri*
was called as a witness he said: “This man is no thief, at least as far as I am concerned. I gave him the money and he thanked me for it.” After he had finished his prison term, the man went to Shichiri and became his disciple. (Reps, 1919:41)

Along the same lines, Jesus teaches that if anyone sues you for your coat, let him also have your cloak (Matthew 5:40). He goes on to say: “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you, and persecute you” (Matthew 5:44). The radical message of these philosophies is that we should cease to repay violence with violence, whether that repayment be called “retribution” or “just desserts.” Instead, we must learn to, as Paul puts it, “overcome evil with good” (Romans 12:21). Jesus also reminds us that whatever we do to the “least of those” in our society, we do to him. In terms of criminal justice, that would involve a complete reform of what we now call corrections. See Box 3.1.

**BOX 3.1 PEACEMAKING PRACTICE**

- Life is short
- Make a difference
- Perseverance more than ability is key
- Keep trying
- Even when you are the victim of injustice
- Even when you yourself are unjust
- Keep trying
- Be kind to those around you
- Be kind to yourself as well
- And when you are not
- Keep trying
- And be encouraging
- Especially when there is no reason to be
- Seek completion not perfection
- Seek truth not power
- Sooner or later the truth will set you free
- But not before it beats the hell out of you
- Keep trying
- Answers long forgotten, the question remains: when will the peace that passes understanding come?
- Not at the end of conflict but in its midst
- Peace is a longshot
- Justice even more so
- Sometimes longshots come in
- Believe that they will
- From peace within to peace without
- From being just to justice for all

*Source: Braswell (2004)*
CARING

In the previous chapter, we presented reasons in support of the utilitarian version of the fundamental rule of morality, namely, that we ought to produce the greatest good for the greatest number. We advanced Kant’s arguments for what he considers to be the basic moral principle: that we ought to treat others as ends in themselves and not as mere means. We have just explored how theories of connectedness defend the moral absolute of nonviolence. Though the three theories differ from one another, all share a similarity of approach. All attempt to prove, by means of argument, justification, and reason, a specific moral rule or principle. According to Nel Noddings (1986), proving, justifying, and arguing for rules and principles is a masculine approach to ethics. In Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics & Moral Education, she outlines an alternative. Noddings claims that:

> Ethics, the philosophical study of morality, has concentrated for the most part on moral reasoning … Even though careful philosophers have recognized the difference between “pure” or logical reason and “practical” or moral reason, ethical argumentation has frequently proceeded as if it were governed by the logical necessity characteristic of geometry. It has concentrated on the establishment of principles and that which can be logically derived from them. One might say that ethics has been discussed largely in the language of the father: in principles and propositions, in terms such as justification, fairness, justice. The mother’s voice has been silent. Human caring and the memory of caring and being cared for, which I shall argue form the foundation of ethical response, have not received attention except as outcomes of ethical behavior. One is tempted to say that ethics has so far been guided by Logos, the masculine spirit, whereas the more natural and perhaps stronger approach would be through Eros, the feminine spirit. (p. 1)

According to Noddings (1986:2), the masculine approach (the approach of the father) is a detached perspective that focuses on law and principle, whereas the feminine approach (the approach of the mother) is rooted in receptivity, relatedness, and responsiveness. Noddings advocates the feminine perspective. She goes on to point out that “this does not imply that all women will accept it [the feminine perspective] or that men will reject it; indeed, there is no reason why men should not embrace it” (Noddings, 1986:2).

The masculine perspective is an approach to ethics, an approach through justification and argument. The feminine perspective, on the other hand, “shall locate the very wellspring of ethical behavior in human affective response” (Noddings, 1986:3). Noddings’s point is that ethical caring is ultimately grounded in natural caring—for example, the natural caring of a mother for her child. Noddings’s emphasis on natural caring leads her to the conclusion “that in truth, the moral
viewpoint is prior to any notion of justification” (Noddings, 1986:95). In other words, rather than viewing reason and justification as the process by which one comes to the moral perspective, Noddings indicates that the moral perspective is a natural perspective, as natural as a mother caring for her infant.

An ancient Chinese philosophy, Taoism, advocates a position that is similar to the one we find in Noddings. The two major Taoist philosophers, Lao-tzu and Chuang-tzu, suggest that not only is natural caring prior to reason, justification, and principle, but it is also superior to those activities. In fact, the Taoists claim that principles of ethics actually interfere with caring. Just as Nel Noddings is responding to a particular masculine tradition in Western ethics, the Taoists are responding to a particular tradition in Chinese ethics, namely, Confucianism. The Confucianists were very rule- and principle-oriented—rules for filial piety, rules for those who govern, rules for those who are governed. The Taoists responded by claiming that those rules, because of their artificiality, destroyed true, natural caring and replaced it with forced or legislated “caring.”

From the Taoist perspective, the danger of advocating ethical rules and principles is that they will replace something far superior to those principles, namely, natural caring. Chuang-tzu (1964) says: “Because [the doctrine of] right and wrong appeared, the Way was injured” (p. 37).

Lao-tzu (1963) makes a similar claim. Lao-tzu doesn’t make the strong claim that the doctrine of right and wrong destroyed the Way (the Tao). However, he does claim that only in unnatural states does the doctrine of right and wrong arise. In the Tao Te Ching, Lao-tzu says:

*Therefore, when Tao [the natural Way] is lost, only then does the doctrine of virtue arise.*
*When virtue is lost, only then does the doctrine of humanity arise.*
*When humanity is lost, only then does the doctrine of righteousness arise.*
*When righteousness is lost, only then does the doctrine of propriety arise.*

*Now, propriety is a superficial expression of loyalty and faithfulness, and the beginning of disorder.* (p. 167)

Notice how Lao-tzu concludes by discussing the superficiality of notions of propriety and how such notions are the beginning of disorder. In another section of the Tao Te Ching, Lao-tzu summarizes the preceding by saying, “When the great Tao [Natural Way] declined, the doctrine of humanity and righteousness arose” (p. 131). Lao-tzu is saying that artificial doctrines of virtue, humanity, and righteousness, doctrines that tell us how we ought to behave, arise only in unhealthy situations. Something is already terribly wrong when we tell a mother she ought to feed her child or that she has a duty to feed her child. Feeding one’s child is a natural, caring response. Lao-tzu says: “When the six family relationships are not in harmony, there will be the advocacy of filial piety and deep love to children” (p. 131).
Given that we live in and are inculcated into a patriarchal society, a society of rules, principles, and laws, do the Taoists have any suggestions as to how to break free from patriarchal modes of thought and return to a more natural and caring way of living in the world? As you might expect, the answer to this question is yes. The Taoist position can be put in the following way: Moral reasoning is the product of a mind that discriminates and draws distinctions (between right and wrong, good and bad, just and unjust). According to Taoism, these categories and distinctions are artificial and conventional, not natural. To put oneself into a more natural state—which, according to the Taoist view on human nature, would be a more caring state—one must undo, erase, or transcend all the conventional, artificial dualisms that have been inculcated into us. We perceive the world the way we have been taught to perceive the world. So, we must begin to unlearn the categories that have been programmed into us.

In a more contemporary vein, Myers and Chiang (1993) also compared the prevailing legalistic, masculine approach to law enforcement—which focuses on analysis, rationalization, and punishment—with the feminine perspective of nurturing, care, and treatment.

Martin (1993) examined the usefulness of incorporating transpersonal psychology into the justice and corrections process. This discipline integrates Western scientific and Eastern and Western spiritual traditions, which could open a fresh way to develop policy and treatment strategies that are more positive and growth oriented.

An ancient story involving the teacher, Ryokan, and his delinquent nephew offers another interesting, if unorthodox, approach to utilizing the ethic of care:

Once his brother asked Ryokan to visit his house and speak to his delinquent son. Ryokan came but did not say a word of admonition to the boy. He stayed overnight and prepared to leave the next morning. As the wayward nephew was lacing up Ryokan’s sandals, he felt a drop of warm water. Glancing up, he saw Ryokan looking down at him, his eyes full of tears. Ryokan then returned home, and the nephew changed for the better. (in Safransky, 1990:115-116)

It goes without saying that caring is not the exclusive property of Taoism or Yoga. Mother Teresa, a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize, encompassed this ethic of caring from a Christian perspective. She started her work as a one-woman mission in Calcutta, India, ministering to and caring for the dying. Generally speaking, in some ways we might consider the dying poor even more undesirable than incarcerated offenders. Yet Mother Teresa’s Missionaries of Charity grew from a one-woman operation to a group of active missions all over the world. When asked how she could emotionally handle constantly being around so many dying people, she responded that when she looked into the eyes of the dying she saw “Christ in a distressing disguise.”
MINDFULNESS

Mother Teresa is perhaps the embodiment of the ethic of care. Internalizing such an approach requires that one develops a compassionate vision through mindfulness. The following example from one of her public addresses demonstrates such a vision in action:

A gentleman came to our house and he told me, “There is a Hindu family with about eight children who have not eaten for a long time.” So I took some rice quickly and went to their family and I could see real hunger on the small faces of these children and yet the mother had the courage to divide the rice into two and she went out. When she came back, I asked her, “Where did you go? What did you do?” And she said: “They are hungry also.” “Who are they?” “The Muslim family next door with as many children.” She knew that they were hungry. What struck me most was that she knew and because she knew she gave until it hurt. I did not bring more rice that night because I wanted them to enjoy the joy of giving, of sharing. You should have seen the faces of those little ones. They just understood what their mother did. Their faces were brightened with smiles. When I came in they looked hungry, they looked so miserable. But the act of their mother taught them what true love was. (de Bertodano, 1993:53)

Mindfulness allows us to experience a more transcendent sense of awareness. It allows us to be fully present, aware of what is immediate, yet also at the same time to become more aware of the larger picture in terms of both needs and possibilities. Mindfulness allowed the Hindu mother not only to receive the rice from Mother Teresa with gratitude but also allowed her to see how she was connected to the hungry Muslim family and how to have the courage to care enough to share her meager resources, thus teaching her own children one of life’s greatest lessons.

Mindfulness can encourage us to move from the passion of single-minded self-interest to a growing sense of compassion that includes others and their needs. We often wring our hands about those who are victims of physical abuse and the homeless, yet how often do we volunteer to help (Braswell, 1990a)? Mindfulness can help us, like the Hindu mother, to act on our concerns. As Wang Yang Ming states, “To know and not to do is in fact, not to know” (Lozoff and Braswell, 1989:63). Developing wholesight can help us to become more mindful in turning our knowing into doing. As mentioned in Chapter 1, Parker Palmer (1983) suggests that wholesight includes both the heart and the head in one’s decision making.

A strategy or process that can help us to become more mindful is meditation. Meditation is a practice through which the meditator quiets or stills the contents of the mind: the thoughts, the emotions, the desires, the inner chatter. Successful meditation culminates in the cessation of mental activity, a profound inner stillness. (See Box 3.2.)

Recall that Taoism teaches us to return to a more natural state, a state in which we are not controlled by the artificial modes of thought that have been inculcated
into us by our society. The practice of meditation can teach us to control and still those modes of thought. By freeing ourselves from conventional ways of thinking, we return to a more natural state, a more connected and caring state. Some people are concerned that emptying the mind meditatively could lead to some form of mind control. The truth of the matter is that meditation is more likely to lead to a greater sense of self-control, because most of us stay preoccupied with thoughts of things to do or things left undone. Busy, noisy minds often result in confused and unclear thoughts. We are less likely to be misled or do something we regret if our minds are quiet, strong, and clear.

Lozoff (1987:29) describes meditation as “sitting perfectly still—silence of body, silence of speech, and silence of mind. The Buddha called this ‘The Noble Silence.’ It’s just a matter of stopping.” To connect this with Taoism, we might say that by achieving a state of inner silence in which we stop all the conventional modes of thinking and reasoning that have been inculcated into us, we return to a more natural state, a more caring state. And from this caring and compassionate state, we can become more mindful of how our inner and outer experiences are connected to those around us, even to our physical environment. This awareness can become a kind of awakening, encouraging us to make more informed and ethical decisions about the way we live our lives.

### BOX 3.2 A GUIDE FOR A SIMPLE MEDITATION

1. Find a quiet, special place in which to meditate.
2. Find a time to practice meditation when the area is quiet and there are no distractions, preferably twice daily. Many people practice meditation at the beginning of the day and at the end of the day.
3. Try to meditate for a designated period of time during each meditation experience, usually at least 10 min and preferably 20 min.
4. Sit in a straight-backed chair, keeping the spine as straight as possible.
5. For the designated period of time, practice the following sequence:
   a. Sit silently for a few moments and become aware of how you are breathing.
   b. Gently and gradually begin to breathe more smoothly.
   c. Now begin to breathe a little more deeply, gradually increasing the depth of your breathing.
   d. Finally, begin to slow the rate of your breathing.
   e. No matter what distractions or thoughts may occur, simply acknowledge them and let them pass, then return to breathing smoothly, deeply, and slowly for the designated period of time.

The relevance of this approach in ethics to criminal justice can be seen in the work of Bo Lozoff, director of the Prison Ashram Project. Lozoff works with prisoners, teaching them techniques of meditation. Lozoff (1987:xvii) is “helping prisoners to use their cells as ashrams [places of spiritual growth], and do their time as ‘prison monks’ rather than convicts.” In his book *We’re All Doing Time*, Lozoff has a chapter on meditation in which he describes and teaches a number of meditation techniques. Much of his work in prisons involves teaching these techniques to convicts.
CONCLUSION

If we choose to develop a greater capacity for the transformative potential of peacemaking through connectedness, care, and mindfulness, it should follow that as people and criminal justice professionals, we will act more morally and ethically (Wozniak, Braswell, Vogel, & Blevins, 2008). In addition, we are more likely to teach offenders such values from the inside out, because we will be living that way ourselves. For peacemaking to work, we have to take it personally first. We have to be grounded in the reality of where we are in terms of criminal justice problems, but at the same time peacemaking encourages us to have a vision of what we can become. Peacemaking offers us a vision of hope grounded in the reality of which we are a part. John Gibbs (1993:2) suggests that “the best strategy for individual peacemakers is to adopt one which emphasizes personal transformation, has a spiritual base, and avoids ideology.” Mother Teresa writes, “There can be no peace in the world, including peace in the streets and peace in the home, without peace in our mind. What happens within us, happens outside us. The inner and outer are one” (de Bertodano, 1993:7).

If we choose to try to become peacemakers, it does not necessarily follow that our lives will be less difficult. As Frederick Buechner (1973:39) suggests in discussing the teachings of Jesus, “peace seems to have meant not the absence of struggle but the presence of love.” Bo Lozoff (1994), who, with his wife, Sita, has dedicated his life to teaching offenders peacemaking, writes in response to an inmate’s letter:

*Life is funny that way. We tend to expect a nice, easy, smooth life as a result of prayer and meditation. But more often than not, our spiritual practice seems to create more problems instead of fewer. And then we often freak out and miss the point entirely.*

*Pain, separation, misfortune are a part of human life . . . . Did the martyrs of every religion avoid being tortured for their beliefs? Divine beings, saints and sages have come into this world to show us how to respond to pain, separation, misfortune, and death—not how to escape them. By their example, they have shown us the humility, patience, forgiveness, courage, compassion, and ultimate freedom which are our own divine nature. (p. 5)*

Peacemaking acknowledges that although we do not control what life brings us, we do have a choice in how to respond to whatever life brings us. Through connectedness, care, and mindfulness, we can begin to change ourselves first, then others by our example, and finally our system of justice—from the inside out. (See Box 3.3.)
Learn More on the Internet

Go to www.justicestudies.org for information on an academic and professional organization dedicated to progressive activism, restorative justice, and peacemaking.

See www.humankindness.org for information on a nonprofit foundation that focuses on helping prison inmates on their inner journey.

Check out www.peacemakingandcrime.blogspot.com, a website/blog dedicated to cutting-edge issues in peacemaking criminology.

---

**BOX 3.3 THOUGHTS ON PEACEMAKING**

I have decided to stick with love. Hate is too great a burden to bear.

—Martin Luther King Jr.

Love cures people—both the ones who give it and the ones who receive it.

—Karl Menninger

The love we give away is the only love we keep.

—Elbert Hubbard

In all conflict with evil, the method to be used is love and not force. When we use evil methods to defeat evil, it is evil that wins.

—Sri Rodhakrishnan

The inner ear of each man’s soul hears the voice of life (find your work, and do it!). Only by obedience to this command can he find peace.

—Frank Crane

If you do your work with complete faithfulness ... you are making as genuine a contribution to the substance of the universal good as is the most brilliant worker whom the world contains.

—Phillips Brooks

The vocation of every man and woman is to serve other people.

—Leo Tolstoy

In real love you want the other person’s good. In romantic love you want the other person.

—Margaret Anderson

Once we learn to touch this peace, we will be healed and transformed. It is not a matter of fact; it is a matter of practice.

—Thich Nhat Hanh

He who knows when enough is enough will always have enough.

—Lao-tzu

We must be the change we wish to see in the world.

—Mahatma Gandhi
Notes

3. This quotation is from the documentary film Mother Teresa, directed by Richard Attenborough.

References

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. List and discuss the three themes of peacemaking, and explain the impact they have on traditional police or corrections values.

2. In your opinion, can peacemaking, justice, and ethics ever become fully realized? Why or why not?

3. Choose one theme of peacemaking and explain why you think it would have the greater impact on justice and ethics.

Case Study 3–1 To Help or Not to Help?

To help or not to help? At 8:15 p.m., a criminal justice professor had just arrived in his home city on a flight from Albuquerque, where he had lectured the previous day at the International Academy in Roswell.

After picking up his luggage, the professor exited the airport gate and stood in line with the other passengers who were waiting for the next shuttle bus. A few minutes later, a young couple who appeared to be married arrived and elbowed their way in line, ahead of the professor and others. The professor politely called the matter to their attention, asking them to observe the social principle of “first come, first served.” The couple ignored the professor’s remark. When the professor repeated his request that they move to the end of the line, the husband became hostile, accusing the professor of being rude. Rather than escalate the conflict, the professor said nothing more. He and the other passengers were tired and the hour was late. When the shuttle finally arrived, everyone got on board and remained silent.

On reaching his car, the professor packed his luggage in the trunk and drove toward the parking lot exit. As he approached the exit, he noticed two persons flagging the passing cars for assistance, to no avail. Taking a closer look at the two stranded individuals, the professor was surprised to find that they were the same two people who had broken into line, and the man was the one who had insulted the professor 25 min earlier. Although he was tempted to continue driving, he stopped and, after rolling down his window, asked the couple what kind of assistance they needed. When they realized who he was, the man and woman were clearly both surprised and embarrassed. They were unable to look the professor in the eye as they explained their predicament. In response, the professor procured a jumper cable from the trunk of his car. Within 5 min he had brought their dead battery back to life. During that time, not a word was spoken. As the couple prepared to drive off, they finally looked at the professor and thanked him. The wife added, “We are sorry.”

Questions:

1. Would it have been just for the professor to have driven past the stranded couple, given their previous behavior? Why or why not?

2. Evaluate this incident and the professor’s response from utilitarian, deontological, and peacemaking ethical models. Which model fits best?

From a conversation with Professor Sam Souryal, Sam Houston State University.
EXERCISE I–1  YOUR PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY
What is your personal/professional philosophy? The most important aspect of our personal and professional growth involves the values and beliefs that we hold dear. Now that you have covered the first three chapters, with which theories and ideas do you agree or disagree? What are your personal values, and on what beliefs are they based? How do you plan to put these values and beliefs into practice in the work environment of your chosen profession?

EXERCISE I–2  THE ETHICS OF DRUG CONTROL POLICY
The United States continues to confront a drug crisis. While drug use in the general population seems to be declining, drug use and sales among criminals are continuing to increase. Some citizens are calling for stiffer penalties for illegal drug use, while others are calling for decriminalization, a greater emphasis on treatment, and even legalization of certain drugs, especially those associated with the management of pain.

Suppose you were a staff assistant to a congressperson whose committee was investigating the ethics of drug control policy.
1. What issues would be relevant to this assessment?
2. How could a morally correct approach to drug/crime policy be developed?
3. Whose rights would have to be protected?
4. What societal benefits and deficits would you consider?
5. How could this policy be developed in a way that promoted caring and concern for all in society?