Chapter 7
Toward a Psychology of Nonviolence

Harry Murray, Mikhail Lyubansky, Kit Miller and Lilyana Ortega

> *Violence as a way of achieving racial justice is both impractical and immoral. I am not unmindful of the fact that violence often brings about momentary results…. But in spite of temporary victories, violence never brings permanent peace. It solves no social problem: it merely creates new and more complicated ones. Violence is impractical because it is a descending spiral ending in destruction for all. It is immoral because it seeks to humiliate the opponent rather than win his understanding: it seeks to annihilate rather than convert. Violence is immoral because it thrives on hatred rather than love. It destroys community and makes brotherhood impossible. It leaves society in monologue rather than dialogue. Violence ends up defeating itself. It creates bitterness in the survivors and brutality in the destroyers.*
>
> Martin Luther King

In 1964, Martin Luther King concluded his first book, *Stride Toward Freedom*, by proclaiming: "Today, the choice is no longer between violence and nonviolence. It is either nonviolence or nonexistence." Although many would take comfort in the fact that global civilization has survived nearly half a century since those words were written, others (e.g., Bodley 2008) fear that our culture has developed so

Part of King's Nobel Lecture delivered December 11, 1964. See http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-lecture.html

H. Murray
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Nazareth College, 4245 East Ave, Rochester, NY 14618, USA
e-mail: hmurray9@naz.edu

M. Lyubansky (✉)
Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 603 E. Daniel St, Champaign, IL 61820, USA
e-mail: Lyubanskym@gmail.com

K. Miller
Gandhi Institute for Nonviolence, 929 S. Plymouth Avenue, Rochester, NY 14608, USA
e-mail: kmiller@admin.rochester.edu

L. Ortega
College of Education, 220A Education Bldg. 1310 S. Sixth St, Champaign, IL 61820, USA
e-mail: lortega2@illinois.edu

E. Mustakova-Possardt et al. (eds.), *Toward a Socially Responsible Psychology for a Global Era*, International and Cultural Psychology, DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4614-7391-6_7,
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2014

many possibilities of self-extermination that we have indeed chosen nonexistence. We write this chapter in the conviction that King's words were prophetic, in the hope that there is still time to choose nonviolence, and in the firm belief that psychology can contribute to that choice.

We begin, therefore, with a discussion of the nature of violence and nonviolence, followed by a critique of psychologists' involvement in torture and war. We then use a framework developed by the eco-philosopher Joanna Macy (Macy and Brown 1998) to organize nonviolent actions into three types of practices, which we encourage psychologists to embrace and engage: holding actions; alternative structures; and the fostering of a new consciousness. Throughout the chapter, we intersperse our personal stories to illustrate aspects of nonviolence.

7.1 Definitions

What did King mean by nonviolence? The confusion which surrounds the term is illustrated by a conversation Harry had with a "street tough" named Gary in the 1970s. The conversation concerned Henry Nicolella, one of the directors of Unity Kitchen, which provided free meals and shelter to homeless persons in Syracuse, New York. Henry was, and is, one of the most gentle, nonviolent souls imaginable. Gary, a young man who frequented the Kitchen and had a well-deserved reputation for violence, stated, "You know, there's only one person in this joint I'm afraid of, and that's Henry. The rest of you fools, I've seen you get mad lots of times. But I've never seen Henry get angry. So I figure—when he blows, he's gonna BLOW!" Gary's interpretation of Henry's nonviolent nature reflected the popular "hydraulic" (or pop-Freudian) theory of anger as a force which builds up and can explode if it's restricted. Such a view entails a fundamental misunderstanding of nonviolence and points to the need for a clear definition.

Many conceive of nonviolence simply as the renunciation of violence. The Hindu principle *ahimsa* (literally, not harming) was a great influence on Mohandas Gandhi, who dedicated himself to applying it to all spheres of his life, including politics. This approach leads to the question of what constitutes violence—an elusive concept, particularly when considered in a cross-cultural context (Eller 2006). Holmes (1990) distinguishes between physical and psychological violence and states that unqualified nonviolence involves the renunciation of both forms of violence. Scheper-Hughes and Bourgois (2004) argue that "violence can never be understood solely in terms of its physicality—force, assault, or the infliction of pain—alone. Violence also includes assaults on the personhood, dignity, sense of worth or value of the victim." Moreover, violence can also be structural and even unintentional, as for example when social structures (e.g., public education) create or maintain poverty, racism, and sexism, which produce suffering. When one has spent years working with homeless persons, watching hundreds die at unacceptably young ages, it becomes difficult to characterize the huge inequalities generated by unequal access to education and jobs as anything except violence.

The hydraulic theory conceives of violence as primarily affective—the outpouring of emotions such as anger and frustration. However, it is important to realize that violence can also be instrumental—a rationally calculated means to achieve one's goal—and that emotion—such as love or compassion—can be a barrier to violence.

The approach we will tentatively adopt is to define violence as the knowing (not necessarily intentional) infliction of harm on beings, which are capable of suffering. This definition, as any other, creates spaces of ambiguity. For example, how do we think about harmful actions that are not only unintended but unknown to the beneficiaries and how do we consider actions (like a surgical procedure) that knowingly cause suffering for the purpose of healing and positive change? We might agree that a surgical procedure is not violence, but wars and torture are frequently justified using this very argument.

Our definition of violence, then, is not definitive. We offer it as a reference point, with the understanding that what one considers "violence" is related to knowledge, intention, outcomes, process, and emotional state but cannot be reduced to any one (or two) of these. What is violent is often a matter of perspective.

Nonviolence, in turn, can be considered as the renunciation of all forms of violence—the refusal to employ either physical or psychological violence and withdrawal as far as possible from the sources of structural violence. In this context, nonviolent action is, therefore, the pursuit of social justice through the use of various nonviolent methods rather than either passive acceptance or violent struggle. As with violence, how we think about nonviolence and nonviolent action is also subjective.

7.2 Ontological Assumptions

Although nonviolence is often thought of simply as the renunciation of violence, the foremost theorists and practitioners of nonviolence have linked it to five ontological assumptions about (1) the nature of truth, (2) the nature of authority, (3) the nature of being, (4) the nature of compassion, and (5) the nature of ends and means. These assumptions all appear in the thoughts of almost every major nonviolent writer; however, individual thinkers often tend to emphasize one over the others.[1]

[1] Gene Sharp is the outlier here. His depiction of nonviolence, entirely from a social science perspective, emphasizes the theory of authority and rarely entails any of the other assumptions. The other proponents, more concerned with spirituality, do not ignore authority, but couch it within other assumptions about the world.

7.2.1 Truth

Mohandas Gandhi focused on the relationship between nonviolence and truth, preferring the neologism satyagraha (truth force or soul force) to the traditional term ahimsa (not hurting). Briefly, he argued that Truth is the most powerful force in the universe, or, as he often put it, Truth is God. Each person possesses a part of the truth, but no one possesses the whole truth. Therefore, no one can legitimately use violence to force the other to adopt his or her truth. We can only use persuasion or, that failing, our willingness to suffer in order to influence the opponent.

7.2.2 Authority

In the first volume of his classic trilogy, *The Politics of Nonviolent Action*, political scientist Gene Sharp defined power as—"the capacity to control the behavior of others, directly or indirectly, through action by groups of people" (1973, p. 7). Sharp contrasted two views of power: (1) the standard, monolithic view in which power is an attribute possessed by an individual or group and in which people depend on the good will of the ruler, and (2) a grassroots view in which the power of an individual or government rests on the cooperation of a multitude of people and institutions. This latter view underlies nonviolent action, such that freedom is not something a ruler "gives" his or her subjects but is the outcome of "the relative desire of the populace to control the [ruler's] power, the relative strength of the subjects' independent organizations and institutions and the subjects' relative ability to withhold their consent and assistance" (Sharp 1973, p. 29). Thus, according to Sharp, all authority rests on the obedience of subordinates. If subordinates are willing to disobey and to face the consequences of disobedience, authority evaporates.

7.2.3 Being

Thich Nhat Hanh, a Vietnamese Buddhist monk who worked with American antiwar activists during the Vietnam War, emphasized Interbeing (the interdependence of all beings), as the foundation of nonviolence. In the preface to his poem *Call Me By My True Names*, after recounting a story of a young girl who threw herself into the ocean after being raped by a pirate, Hanh (1987, p. 62) states:

> When you first learn of something like that, you get angry at the pirate. You naturally take the side of the girl. As you look more deeply you will see it differently. If you take the side of the little girl, then it is easy. You only have to take a gun and shoot the pirate. But we cannot do that. In my meditation I saw that if I had been born in the village of the pirate

> and raised in the same conditions as he was, there is a great likelihood that I would become a pirate. I cannot condemn myself so easily…. If you or I were born today in those fishing villages, we may become sea pirates in twenty-five years. If you take a gun and shoot the pirate, you shoot all of us, because all of us are to some extent responsible for this state of affairs.

Martin Luther King expressed a similar notion in *Letter from Birmingham Jail:* “Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly affects all indirectly” (King 1986, p. 290).

7.2.4 Compassion

For Hanh, nonviolence is linked not only to interbeing, but also to compassion (Hanh 1998). Similarly, compassion, or love, is also the foundational concept for Christian approaches to nonviolence. King spoked repeatedly about the virtue of agape, which he defined as “understanding, redeeming good will for all …It is an overflowing love which seeks nothing in return” (King 1986, p. 140). For both King and Hanh, love and understanding are intimately linked—to love is to seek to understand; to understand is to begin to love.

7.2.5 Ends and Means

For almost all advocates of nonviolence, means and ends are inseparable. It is impossible to achieve good ends through evil means. Gandhi wrote: “The means may be likened to a seed; the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree. I am not likely to obtain the result flowing from the worship of God by laying myself prostrate before Satan” (Ghandi 1951, p. 10). Hanh agrees: “Means and ends cannot be separated. Bodhisattvas are careful about causes, while ordinary people care more about effects, because bodhisattvas see that cause and effect are one. Means are ends in themselves. An enlightened person never says, ‘This is only a means’” (Hanh 1998).

In the midst of the Birmingham campaign, before Bull Connor turned the police dogs on demonstrators, King (1986, p. 301) wrote:

> So I have tried to make it clear that it is wrong to use immoral means to attain moral ends. But now I must affirm that it is just as wrong, or even more so, to use moral means to preserve immoral ends. Maybe Mr. Connor and his policemen have been rather publicly nonviolent, as Chief Pritchett was in Albany, Georgia, but they have used the moral means of nonviolence to maintain the immoral end of flagrant racial injustice (p. 301).

A. J. Muste, a twentieth century American pacifist, said it this way: “There is no way to peace; peace is the way” (quoted in Zinn 2003, p. 159). Not only do the ends never justify the means, then—the very attempt to separate means and ends is illusory and leads to violence.

In sum, nonviolence is an approach to life which assumes that truth and love are the most powerful forces in the universe, that all reality is interdependent, that authority depends on the obedience of those who acknowledge authority, and that means and ends are inseparable. These assumptions run counter to many of the underlying assumptions of modernity, and therefore tend to inspire skepticism from academics and activists alike.

7.3 Effectiveness Versus Fruitfulness of Nonviolent Civil Resistance

One of the great debates among social scientists has been whether nonviolence is effective, particularly at the community and national levels. Perhaps since the dawn of civilization, the nearly unanimous consensus has been that nonviolence is a wonderful ideal, but that if one wants to achieve results, violence is the means to choose. Nonviolence, it is said, is the weapon of the weak, to be employed only when violent options seem totally out of reach. Advocates of nonviolence have responded in two ways.

From a social science perspective, evidence has been mounting over the last century that nonviolence may be more effective than violence. Aldous Huxley made this argument as early as 1937 in his book *Ends and Means*. Gene Sharp and his associates amassed hundreds of historical examples of effective nonviolent action against authority and have, as noted previously, laid out a theoretical explanation for the effectiveness of nonviolent resistance. For a more popular audience, Peter Ackerman and Jack Duvall (2000) documented the history of twentieth century nonviolence in a PBS series and accompanying book, entitled *A Force More Powerful*. Their subsequent DVD, *Bringing Down a Dictator*, tells the story of the overthrow of Serbian dictator Slobodan Milosevic, by a nonviolent campaign led by the group “Otpor![2]” many of those leaders had been trained in Gene Sharp’s techniques.

Perhaps the most convincing study to date is that of Chenoweth and Stephan (2011), who assembled a comprehensive data set of 323 violent and nonviolent campaigns between 1900 and 2006. They found that nonviolent campaigns were nearly twice as likely to achieve full or partial success as were violent campaigns and that the advantage for violent campaigns held even when controlling for the authoritarianism of the regime. Nonviolent campaigns turned out to be more effective for both regime change and resistance to foreign occupation. The only

[2] Serbian Cyrillic: Отпор! The English translation is Resistance!

purpose for which nonviolent campaigns were not more successful than violent ones was political secession (notably, the secession analysis included only four nonviolent campaigns). Chenoweth and Stephan concluded that nonviolent campaigns were more successful, because the costs of participating in them were lower than for violent campaigns (e.g., taking up arms or supporting rebels), and therefore participation was higher and from a broader range of people, leading to more diverse strategies. They also concluded that defections from the regime were more likely in the face of nonviolent campaigns because of regime participants' perceptions that they would be more likely to be welcomed and less likely to be subject to reprisals in nonviolent campaigns. Notably, they conclude from their data that "nonviolent campaigns succeed against democracies and nondemocracies, weak and powerful opponents, conciliatory and repressive regimes. Thus, conditions shape—but do not predetermine—the capacity for a nonviolent resistance to adapt and gain advantage under even the direst of circumstances" (p. 221).

A second response to the question of effectiveness, common among nonviolence advocates with a spiritual perspective, is to challenge the very notion of effectiveness as rooted in an industrial mindset. The very notion of effectiveness is seen as a sort of hubris. Opposed to effectiveness is the idea of fruitfulness, drawn from an agricultural metaphor. Here, one's duty is not to "be effective," but to be faithful, to plant seeds. How those seeds may develop is largely outside of one's control—in God's hands, many would say.

A common illustration of fruitfulness is the story of Franz Jagerstatter, an Austrian peasant who was imprisoned and eventually executed for refusing induction into Hitler's army during World War II. His efforts were utterly ineffective—he did not save a single victim of the Nazis. His story would have been utterly forgotten had it not been for Gordon Zahn, an American WWII conscientious objector turned sociologist, who chanced upon it while doing research for another book. Zahn published a biography of Jagerstatter, entitled *In Solitary Witness* in 1964. The book eventually came into the hands of Robert Ellsberg, influencing him to release what became known as *The Pentagon Papers*. Thus, a nonviolent action which had no discernible effect at the time it was performed played a role in shaping the course of the Vietnam War two decades later.

Another example, which combines effectiveness and fruitfulness, is the story of Le Chambon, a primarily Huguenot village in Vichy France, which, under the leadership of pastor Andre Trocme and his wife Magda, sheltered hundreds of Jewish refugees under the eyes of the Vichy police and later the Nazis. They were effective in saving hundreds of lives, but they were also fruitful. As the story became known, largely through Philip Hallie's book *Lest Innocent Blood Be Shed* (1979), their example inspired many faith communities during the 1980s to shelter Central American refugees who were being deported (sometimes resulting in their death) by the Reagan Administration's Immigration and Naturalization Service (Davidson 1998; Golden and McConnell 1986).

7.4 Psychology and the Military

The question of effectiveness of violence versus nonviolence comes up in a very different way when we consider psychologists' participation in two different U.S. military initiatives: the use of what has come to be euphemistically called 'enhanced interrogations' and a program designed to improve soldier resilience called Comprehensive Soldier Fitness. Because of psychologists' direct involvement in these actions, we want to discuss both in some depth.

7.4.1 Torture

As psychologists, we are professionally bound to protect and promote the psychological health and wellbeing of those we serve, to avoid knowingly doing harm, and to apply our knowledge base and scholarship toward promoting the greater good. This professional ethos is clearly challenged when psychologists become involved in the activity of torture.

The international community has reached a moral consensus, as reflected in the UDHR and other international treaties to which the United States is a signatory, that torture is cruel, inhumane, and degrading treatment and thus represents a violation of international law. Further, empirical research suggests that not only is torture psychologically brutalizing, but it is not even an effective technique for ascertaining truth (e.g., Alexander and Bruning 2008).

This is why the leadership of virtually every other related professional discipline, including psychiatry, social work, and medicine, has deemed it unethical for its members to participate or assist in the process of torture. However, in the United States the discipline of psychology, through the leadership of the American Psychological Association (APA), has stood alone in its refusal to firmly acknowledge the ethical incompatibility of its mission to promote human mental health and healing and its members' involvement in the military's and the CIA's abusive interrogation and detention practices. While we are not privy to APA's reasons for this choice, we believe that in part it is rooted in the troubling history of APA's relationship with the military.

More so than with other practice and research disciplines, the impressive growth of professional psychology in the United States can be directly tied to its relationship with the U.S. military and related agencies. During World War I, psychologists, under the leadership of Robert Yerkes, sought to aid the war effort by creating and administering a test of intelligence to military recruits in order to both identify those who were intellectually inferior (who may then be recommended for discharge) and those whose intellect suggested that they would most benefit from specialized training and assignment. So enthusiastic was the military to make use of this new psychological tool, that more than 1.7 million men were tested using either the Army Alpha or the Army Beta, the alternative test

developed for those who were deemed to not be sufficiently literate to take the Alpha (Gould 1982). Notably, while the actual impact on military functioning appears to have been minimal, the social impact of these tests was devastating. Not only was the average overall mental age of the recruits a shocking 13, but the average "Negro" mental age was reported to be 10.41, a difference that Yerkes and his disciple Carl Brigham attributed to innate differences in intelligence, despite the fact that Black recruits had access to less education and were almost all illiterate (Gould 1982). These data and their racist interpretations were widely publicized and were used to promote various racist policies, including the Immigration Act of 1924, which restricted the immigration of Jews and Slavs and prohibited the immigration of Middle Easterners, East Asians, and Indians.

Thanks to Yerkes and his colleagues, psychologists became a fixture in the military, with the Department of Defense continually playing a critical role in providing jobs for psychologists as clinicians and funds for psychologists as researchers. While these strong bonds have been highly beneficial for building the profession's reach and influence, they have also come to pose difficult, complex, and unresolved challenges to psychology's core "do-no-harm" ethical foundation (Eidelson et al. 2011). The nature of these challenges are well illuminated by two examples: (1) psychologists' involvement in the post-9/11 interrogation and detention of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay, CIA "black sites," and elsewhere, and (2) American psychology's embrace of military programs designed to create more effective and less psychologically vulnerable soldiers.

There is now irrefutable evidence that U.S. psychologists were actively involved in the design, implementation, research on, and oversight of abusive and torturous "war on terror" interrogation practices and confinement conditions (ACLU 2008; Olson et al. 2008). One of these practices included the misguided reverse engineering of the military's torturous Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape (SERE) program. In many other cases, psychologists' involvement in interrogation methods—which included deception, fear escalation, ego harm, extended isolation, sleep deprivation, temperature extremes, snarling dogs, sexual humiliation, and waterboarding (Flaherty 2008; Olson et al. 2008)—conflicted with a range of professional ethics standards. Yet the leadership of the APA, the largest professional organization of psychologists in the world, repeatedly emphasized that psychologists played a crucial role in keeping prisoner interrogations safe, legal, ethical, and effective. This stance conformed precisely to the position already adopted by the Department of Defense—and it stood in direct opposition to all other major healthcare professions, as well as to psychologists' own professional ethos.

To take such a stand, the APA had to change some of its own existing policies. After 9/11, when it became clear that the U.S. military was going to engage in a "war on terror," the APA created a task force on Psychological Ethics and National Security (PENS), to determine the ethical implications of psychologists' role in national security operations. This task force has been criticized on a number of grounds, including the secrecy of the process, the "emergency" bypassing of the APA's standard approval process, and the fact that the majority of the task

force members were in some significant capacity tied to the department of defense and the intelligence community (Olson et al. 2008).

The PENS report also relied upon the 2002 revision of Ethics Standard 1.02 (APA 2002). In its revised form, this standard made it permissible, when an irreconcilable conflict arose, for psychologists to "to adhere to the requirements of the law, regulations, or other governing legal authority" rather than to the APA Ethics Code itself (Pope and Gutheil 2008). More specifically, it encouraged psychologists involved in national security settings to adopt the broadly discredited Nuremberg defense—"I was just following orders"—when their involvement in detention or interrogation operations violated their professional ethics (Olson et al. 2008). The PENS report argued that such activities were necessary because psychologists were essential in making interrogations safe, legal, and effective (Pope 2011). In reality, however, psychologists are often unable to determine if detainees are reluctant to give information or if they simply do not have any information to give. Research reveals high rates of error in trained interviewers detecting deception (Olson et al. 2008).

Overall, the "do no harm" professional ethos combined with the lack of evidence of actual benefit to national security both point to the need for APA to adopt clear, firm ethical guidelines for psychologist involvement in military activities. With respect to the interrogation of war prisoners, psychologists with appropriate expertise could ethically play a role in teaching intelligence personnel how to build rapport and noncoercive relationships—as long as the prisoners' capture and ongoing confinement are deemed legitimate, humane, and legal under international law. Such honest relationship building has been found to be the most effective means for ascertaining accurate information that can help to keep other people safe (Alexander and Bruning 2008). However, there is no legitimate, ethical, or socially responsible role for psychologists to play in the process of designing, implementing, overseeing, or observing torture or 'enhanced interrogation' procedures.

7.4.2 Soldier Resilience

Psychologists have also been actively involved in efforts to address the distressing levels of suicide and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among soldiers and veterans (see also Chap. 4). But it is important to distinguish between clinical and research initiatives that aim to provide returning soldiers with the best psychological care possible on the one hand, and experimental projects that have as their primary goal making soldiers more resilient to the inevitable horrors of war on the other.

For example, collaboration between the U.S. Army and psychologists to improve troop resilience resulted in the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (CSF) program. CSF focuses on developing five dimensions (physical, social, emotional, spiritual, and family) for the purpose of building psychological resilience and includes several components, including training Army leaders as master resilience

trainers and mandatory resilience training at Army leader development schools (Casey 2011). It is commendable to use psychologists' expertise to improve the wellbeing and psychological health of the U.S. troops. However, the CSF program was launched and made mandatory for all soldiers without appropriate pilot testing and without substantial empirical support documenting the likelihood of its effectiveness (Eidelson et al. 2011). Moreover, CSF aims to reduce and prevent the adverse psychological consequences of combat but offers no examination of the program's potential negative effects. Developers of the program state, without providing any empirical evidence, that the good done by building soldiers' physical and mental fitness outweighs any harm (Seligman and Fowler 2011). However, given the potential long-term harm of what may be short-term resilience, we believe that greater care in the form of ethics review and preliminary research should be taken when developing and implementing such a sweeping, mandatory program.

The Army's CSF program also raises important philosophical questions for psychologists. To what extent should the profession embrace the goal, as described by psychologist Martin Seligman, of "creating an indomitable Army"? If psychologists assist soldiers in becoming invincible, are we helping to diminish natural, psychologically healthy, and morally appropriate human reactions to violence and killing? Similarly, from an ethical perspective, what does it mean for us to make soldiers less susceptible to the experience of "moral injury" (Litz et al. 2009) resulting from harm they themselves cause, or the acts they witness that profoundly conflict with their deeply held values? And to what extent should psychologists prioritize what is best for the military mission, rather than focusing foremost on the welfare of the individual soldier, which may mean resisting the institutional pressures to repair young men and women as quickly as possible so that they may be sent back into combat? Each of these questions, and many others also linked to programs like CSF, demand full and careful consideration by our profession.

All this is not to suggest that psychologists cannot meaningfully contribute toward sustaining and enhancing our globe's collective security. We believe that psychologists can most appropriately and effectively fulfill this objective through offering psychologically informed consultation on matters such as:

- Assessing psycho-socio-cultural roots and motivations underlying the emergence of individual, small group, and national group violence.
- Diminishing such hostility—through national policy, public diplomacy, and cross-cultural engagement.
- Building sustainable relationships across cultures.
- Facilitating nonviolent processes for engaging conflict and enhancing mutual understanding and trust.
- Attending to the mental health needs of active duty military personnel, veterans, and civilian populations.

Altogether, our position is that the most effective role psychologists can play in protecting our collective security would be to carry out much more active research, study, and advocacy of policies and attitudes that best care for and protect the needs of all human beings and of our planet. Thus, in our view, *mainstream clinical training and practice have inadvertently enabled, and certainly failed to confront, what appears to be a pervasive and increasingly perilous weakening of shared and collective moral standards in Western society.* Given the concerns with regard to the moral compass of psychology itself, we recognize a clear need to systemically rethink how the aspirations of our helping profession—to foster human compassion, wellbeing, and emancipation—can best be realized in this global age.

7.5 A Conceptual Framework

Thus far, we have defined violence and nonviolence and briefly discussed the effectiveness of nonviolence in overthrowing regimes, resisting foreign occupation, and intelligence gathering. But what does nonviolence actually look like, what kind of impact might it achieve, and what role might psychologists play in nonviolent actions? Because of the enormity of the subject, we choose to highlight the key aspects of nonviolence using a conceptual framework developed by eco-philosopher Joanna Macy.

Macy, who refers to our current period in human history as the Great Turning, names three simultaneous, distinct, yet connected groups of activities as the ones most likely to lead to a world that works for all (Macy and Brown 1998). The three components are (1) holding actions-activism that includes civil disobedience, protests, political campaigns, and lawsuits to slow the damage to earth and its beings; (2) creation of structural alternatives; and (3) fundamental shifts in worldview and values. In the remainder of this chapter, we discuss nonviolence in each of these three domains.

7.5.1 Holding Actions

Macy defines holding actions as "actions to slow the damage to Earth and its beings" (1998, p. 17) including legal and political work as well as the type of direct action analyzed by Sharp (1973), who enumerated and described 198 types of nonviolent direct action, divided into four major types: boycotts, strikes, political noncooperation (including civil disobedience of illegitimate laws), and nonviolent intervention (including civil disobedience of "neutral" laws). When one adds in the more institutionalized methods included by Macy, the variety of holding actions become almost infinite. Due to space limitations, we will focus on

just two specific direct actions—civil disobedience and hospitality—but recognize the potential benefits of all varieties of direct nonviolent action.

7.5.1.1 Civil Disobedience

Accounts of civil disobedience go back nearly as far as recorded history—perhaps not coincidentally, since the origin of writing is usually connected with the establishment of state-level government based on a claim to a monopoly on violence. In the Hebrew scriptures, three young men—Shadrach, Meshach, and A-bednego—defied the king's orders and were thrown into a fiery furnace, but were saved by the power of Yahweh. Many of the Hebrew prophets were persecuted for their criticism of the established order. Sophocles' play *Antigone* tells the story of a young woman who disobeyed the king's prohibition on burying her brother. Jesus' cleansing of the Temple in Jerusalem is often cited as an act of civil disobedience.

Mohandas Gandhi developed what might be termed classical civil disobedience, which involves openly breaking an unjust law in a nonviolent and symbolic manner, claiming responsibility for the act, pleading guilty when brought to court, and asking for the maximum penalty. Gandhi believed that civil disobedience should be conducted openly, without secrecy, even announced in advance to the authorities. The law to be broken should be an unjust law, as elucidated by Martin Luther King in Letter from Birmingham Jail: "An unjust law is one that is out of harmony with the moral law. … Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality" (King 1986, p. 293). The claim that a law is unjust differs from a claim that the law is unconstitutional or otherwise illegal. Thus, civil disobedience differs in rationale (although not always in substance) from breaking a law which one believes is unconstitutional in the hope that courts will affirm your interpretation.

King extended the notion of civil disobedience to include violation of laws which are not themselves unjust: "There are some instances when a law is just on its face and unjust in its application. For instance, I was arrested Friday on a charge of parading without a permit. Now there is nothing wrong with an ordinance which requires a permit for a parade, but when the ordinance is used to preserve segregation and to deny citizens the First Amendment privilege of peaceful assembly and peaceful protest, then it becomes unjust" (King 1986).

In the course of anti-Vietnam War resistance, many activists, particularly Daniel and Phillip Berrigan and Liz McAllister, conceptualized their civil disobedience in these broader terms—protesting not the application of an unjust law but the injustice of the Vietnam War. The Catonsville Nine action, in which nine persons broke into a local draft office and burned draft records, catapulted the Berrigan brothers into the leadership of the Catholic anti-war movement and raised the issue of whether actions which involved damage to property could be considered nonviolent. The Berrigans chose to plead not guilty, leading to a trial in which they tried

to invoke legal principles such as necessity and international law (e.g., the UN Charter, the Nuremberg Principles) to justify their action. In the process of invoking these international laws, they began to make a distinction between civil disobedience and civil resistance, which involves a claim that one's action is legal.

The Berrigans also articulated a view of civil disobedience as symbolic action, where the point of the action was to present a symbol that might awaken the conscience. Thus, it was explained to Harry in 1980 that pouring [human] blood on the Pentagon was not really pouring blood on the Pentagon—it was revealing the blood that was already there. Similarly, burning draft cards with homemade napalm, as was done in the 1968 Catonsville Nine action, was meant to bring out the contrast between burning paper and burning human flesh. When what one is trying to accomplish is a change in people's worldview, sometimes the juxtaposition of disparate symbols may be fruitful in ways that rationally presented argument and evidence cannot.[3]

Most acts of civil disobedience have been reactive—raising a protest against government sponsored injustice or violence which has already occurred. There have, however, been organized attempts at proactive civil disobedience—breaking the law in an attempt to deter government violence. The most successful was the Pledge of Resistance of the 1980s, in which thousands of citizens signed and delivered to Congress pledges to commit civil disobedience if the Reagan Administration invaded Nicaragua (Smith 1996).

Harry's Story: Fingerprinting the Welfare Office

In 1995, the Monroe County (NY) Department of Social Services instituted a policy which required all welfare applicants and recipients to be electronically fingerprinted. Officially, this policy was enacted to control "double-dipping"—situations in which a single person received multiple welfare checks under various identities. As the evidence did not indicate that a "double dipping" problem actually existed, I joined with two other local Catholic Workers and decided to protest the new policy by placing our inky fingerprints on the walls of the main welfare office waiting room. I had "cased" the joint before the action and, observing that a sheriff's deputy was usually present, urged us to agree that we would continue fingerprinting the wall until we were arrested—which I assumed would be in a matter of minutes. Big mistake. Unknown to me, the office was just within the city limits, which meant that the sheriff had no authority to arrest us and had to call the Rochester city police. That meant we had over half an hour of fingerprinting, during which time we covered a lot of wall space. My friend Eric LeComte got creative, inking slogans like "Food Not Fingerprints" on the walls. The action turned the waiting room into a wonderfully democratic space, as welfare applicants began to discuss our action, which then led to discussion of whether the finger-imaging policy was just.

We were eventually charged with a misdemeanor. However, after three Catholic nuns were arrested for trespass in a protest at the same location a few weeks later, our charges were increased to a felony and we were rearrested, with police officers coming to our homes or workplaces. I was lucky—I was home watching my preschool son when a police officer knocked at the door. It was a Nazareth College graduate, who began by saying

[3] This way of thinking bears similarities to the arguments of Thomas Kuhn (1996) in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* concerning how a scientific paradigm changes.

"Hi Doctor Murray." I said hi, and he went on "You may not be so happy to see me. I'm here to arrest you." He was very gentle, allowing me to take my son over to a neighbor rather than sending him to Child Protective Services and not handcuffing me in front of my son. We were held without bail until a lawyer appeared, contacted by my frantic wife who had come home to a note which read "Colin is at the neighbor's. I'm in the public safety building downtown. See you sometime."

We had originally planned the action to illustrate the value Americans place on property as opposed to persons. Would people be more upset about the fingerprinting of property than the fingerprinting of persons? We soon found that we had severely underestimated the relative value of property versus persons in American law. We were charged with a Class D felony—the same level of crime as some child abusers receive. Abuse a child, dirty up a wall—these are equivalent harms in American law. As we were sitting in the cell, we discussed our experiences with other prisoners. I remember one young man in particular, who had been arrested for attacking his girlfriend. He responded "Man, you guys are in trouble. I've just got a little misdemeanor. You guys are felons."

Although as we have documented here, civil disobedience has been an important historical practice, one that played an important role in the U.S. Civil Rights Movement; to date, psychologists have mostly focused their attention elsewhere. A PsycINFO search yielded just 53 publications on this topic (27 in peer-reviewed journals), but some of these are important contributions that could provide models for further inquiry. For example, Dillard (2002, p. 47) found that "civil disobedience is more persuasive when enacted in clearly non-violent/non-threatening ways and when participants demonstrate not only a willingness to suffer for their beliefs but also an interest in communicating that suffering to onlookers."

7.5.1.2 Hospitality

Macy includes "providing shelter and food to the poor and homeless" in her list of holding actions. Feeding and sheltering the victims of systemic violence is an imperative of nonviolence; however, the relationship between nonviolence and hospitality begins at a deeper level.

In requesting hospitality, the stranger makes him/herself vulnerable, dependent on the protection of the host. In granting hospitality, the host in turn makes him/herself vulnerable, inviting the stranger into his/her home and life. Hospitality is an embodiment of nonviolence—a practice which involves not only sharing one's home, food, and clothing with others at no charge, but also being open to the story of the other, being willing to allow one's home, even one's self to be transformed by the encounter with the unexpected guest. The host has a responsibility to protect the guest; perhaps as importantly, the host has a responsibility to listen to the guest's story—listen not in order to diagnose him/her with some pathology but to try to understand the world from the other's perspective. In hospitality, one does not seek to change the other, but allows the other to enter into, and possibly change, one's own world, one's own self. Such openness is deeply connected not only to compassion but to Gandhi's approach to truth.

Perhaps few have lived out nonviolent hospitality as has Dorothy Day and those who have followed her example in the Catholic Worker Movement (Murray 1990; Day 1997; Forest 2011). In 1933, just having returned from covering an anti-hunger March in Washington DC, Day, a left wing journalist who had recently converted to Catholicism, met up with Peter Maurin, an itinerant French immigrant. Together, they launched a newspaper, *The Catholic Worker,* in which they wrote of the duty of hospitality—that Christians have the responsibility to take homeless persons into their homes, providing food and shelter without cost or attempts at "rehabilitation." As the story goes, persons began to appear at Dorothy's door asking for some of that hospitality. Soon, her apartment became overcrowded and, with supporters, she rented a flat down the street, which became her first "house of hospitality" for women. Thanks primarily to her own reports of this experiment in *The Catholic Worker*, Catholics in other cities started their own houses of hospitality, and a small movement was born.

Notably, civil disobedience has been interwoven with hospitality almost since the movement's inception. During World War II, for example, Day's New York City house sheltered conscientious objectors as well as homeless persons and Workers' opposition to war has been reinforced by their work with generations of homeless veterans.

Though space restrictions prevent us from describing other types of direct nonviolent action, our hope is that psychologists will turn their attention to the broad range of nonviolent actions. In particular, we urgently need scholars, especially political and social psychologists, to methodically examine which direct nonviolent strategies are most effective with which particular aims and within which social contexts.

Direct actions play a vital role in nonviolent social movements, but they are often strategies for creating social change, specifically new social structures and new worldviews and values. It is to this part of Macy's conceptual framework that we now turn.

7.5.2 Alternative Structures

Nonviolent activists have been involved in building alternative structures at least since the time of Gandhi. Even while he was in South Africa, Gandhi established ashrams as alternative structures in which he and his followers lived together in a community whose rules and rituals were in opposition to the dominant culture. In 1909, while on a return voyage from England to South Africa, he penned *Hind Swaraj,* an alternative vision for a free India—a vision which rejected much of Western technology, including medicine and railroads. In India, he launched the swadeshi movement, calling on Indians to spin their own cloth and leading by example. Martin Luther King called for a Beloved Community, and, in Montgomery, organized an alternative transportation system to get bus boycotters to and from work.

Day conceived of the Catholic Worker Movement as an attempt to create a society in which it is easier to be good, by creating a "new society within the shell of the old"[4]. The Houses of Hospitality, described previously, constituted a key alternative structure, as did the Catholic Worker farming communities.

Nonviolence, in short, is not concerned simply with resisting injustice or with personal consciousness. For all major practitioners, it has involved building communities and movements with alternative cultures and social structures—structures which reveal and illustrate alternatives to global capitalism, militarism, patriarchy, and institutional racism. Such communities and practices, with all their flaws, serve as vital reminders that materialism and militarism are not inevitable outcomes in the age of globalization.

What are the structures and systems that will enable humanity to move toward a world of increasing balance, and fewer resources allocated to war, incarceration, security and defense? We will briefly describe two: one, permaculture, in brief and another, restorative justice, in greater depth:

7.5.2.1 Permaculture

Bill Mollison, a biologist who studied in the Australian outback for years, created this concept in the mid1970s with David Holmgren through a close and careful study of natural ecosystems. Though most often applied to the design of housing and landscaping, permaculture is a set of 12 principles derived from nature that can be used to design and build systems of any size from a backyard garden to a city. A few examples include: (1) collecting resources during times of abundance and using them in times of need; (2) eliminating or reducing waste by using all of the resources available; (3) putting the right things in the right place, so that relationships develop between those things and so that they work together to support each other; and (4) recognizing and valuing that which is at the edge or margin, the space where the most interesting, valuable, diverse, and productive elements in the system are often located. In part, because scientific data are so scarce—our literature search revealed just three peer-reviewed articles about permaculture—psychologists, with their wide scope of methodological tools, can play an important role by systematically investigating the different permaculture principles and documenting their impact on individuals and communities. In many ways, psychologists have been engaged in this kind of work for decades, especially in the subdisciplines of ecological psychology, conservation psychology, community psychology, and even industrial/organizational psychology. We recognize and value these contributions, yet also wish to see more attention paid specifically to Holmgren's 12 principles, as each of them has direct application to human systems and relationships (Mannen et al. 2012).

[4] Quote originally from the Preamble of the Constitution of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), an international union that takes the position that the wage system should be abolished.

It occurs to us that it might not be obvious why permaculture is even included in a chapter on nonviolence. To our thinking, in a world of burgeoning populations and shrinking natural resources, living sustainably is a social justice practice. Moreover, though they did not always utilize modern permaculture techniques, many of the major practitioners of nonviolence advocated and established farms utilizing natural methods. As far back as 1920, Gandhi warned that people must learn to live harmoniously within natural constraints or be at risk of perishing from the earth. He predicted that western nations would never allow peoples of the southern hemisphere to enjoy a similar standard of living as the west, because that would exceed planetary carrying capacity. Western insistence on its right to a disproportionate share of resources has led to the use of military might to protect the lifestyle of some at the expense of all.

Permaculture is also inherently nonviolent because one of its foundational understandings is that all life forms within a system are important. None can be exploited or ignored over time without the overall system losing balance, disintegrating, and collapsing. Some systems, of course, are already in disrepair. We now turn to one such system—the justice system—and present a structural, nonviolent alternative. Because of the complexity of both the current system and the proposed alternative and because this system provides one of society's primary responses to violence, we have chosen to engage with this topic in considerable depth.

7.5.2.2 Restorative Justice[5]

In Chap. 8, we will use various kinds of data to demonstrate a few of the ways in which our mainstream justice system is unjust in practice. For now, we ask a more philosophical question: What is it that we really want when we say we want justice? For many reformers, the answer is some version of "true equality under the law." While hardly a profound goal, such an outcome would be a far cry from the racial and socioeconomic inequities that characterize our current justice system.[6] A call for justice, thus, is not just a call for the punishment of the guilty but also a demand that the determination of guilt and the administration of punishment not be correlated to race, class, or any other demographic characteristic.

Like many justice activists, we are outraged at the racial and class biases in the system. We, too, want to see such bias eliminated but would nevertheless feel

[5] Portions of this section were previously published in Lyubansky (in press). Restorative justice for Trayvon Martin. *Journal for Social Action in Counseling and Psychology* and in Rosenberg, R. S. (2011). *The Psychology of the Girl with the Dragon Tattoo: Understanding Lisbeth Salander and Stieg Larsson's Millennium Trilogy*. BenBella Books.

[6] See Chap. 8 for a brief description of how racial bias operates in the criminal justice system. For an elaboration of socioeconomic bias, we recommend J. Reiman, & P. Leighton's 2010 book: *The Rich Get Richer and the Poor Get Prison*.

disappointed if the reform went no further. Indeed, we believe the current system is entirely inadequate for both the task of dealing with criminal conduct and for dealing with conflict, more broadly. As such, we would not only take down and rebuild the entire system but replace as well the ideologies that produced the current system in the first place. As Robert Pirsig wrote in *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*

> …to tear down a factory or to revolt against a government or to avoid repair of a motorcycle because it is a system is to attack effects rather than causes; and as long as the attack is upon effects only, no change is possible. The true system, the real system, is our present construction of systematic thought itself, rationality itself, and if a factory is torn down but the rationality which produced it is left standing, then that rationality will simply produce another factory. If a revolution destroys a systematic government, but the systematic patterns of thought that produced that government are left intact, then those patterns will repeat themselves in the succeeding government. There's so much talk about the system. And so little understanding. (Pirsig 1974, p. 98)

In our view, reforming the present-day criminal justice system would be, as Pirsig so aptly describes, to address effects rather than causes. What we need is not reform of the current system but an entirely new paradigm for "doing justice."

Our dictionary defined justice as "the quality of…righteousness, equitableness, or moral rightness," while "doing justice" was defined as "acting or treating fairly." This intertwining of the concepts of fairness, moral rightness, and deserved punishment is at the heart of what is most problematic about the idea of justice: Who gets to decide what is fair? What moral principles determine what is right? And which criteria will be used to determine what is deserved?

The implied answer to all these questions is "the laws of the land." Indeed, in democratic states like Norway[7] and the United States, the country's laws are considered to constitute a social contract in which the people select representatives (i.e., legislators) to make the law and then are morally and legally bound to follow it. In this context, justice becomes equated with compliance with the law and "doing justice" becomes operationalized as the legal process of determining who broke the law and then administering the appropriate punitive action.

In this way, the concepts of justice and punishment are so thoroughly intertwined that it might initially be difficult to even conceive of the former without the latter. We may not literally follow the Biblical edict of "an eye for an eye," but

[7] Norway is technically a constitutional monarchy, with King Harald V as the head of state, but, as in most contemporary constitutional monarchies, royal power in Norway is limited to ceremonial functions. Notably, Norway is currently ranked 1st on the Democracy Index (9.8 on the 10-point scale), an index compiled by the Economist Intelligence Unit that claims to measure the state of democracy in 167 countries. The United States, with a score of 8.11, is ranked 19th.

justice in the U.S. society (and in Western society more broadly) is generally based on the notion that the punishment must fit the crime.[8]

Yet there are, in fact, other legitimate answers to the questions above besides "the laws of the land." Religious teachings (which vary according to the religion in question), philosophical ideas (e.g., Kant's categorical imperative), political ideologies, and cultural frameworks all influence both individual and community notions of justice and the justice systems[9] that result. While a comprehensive review of such systems is beyond the scope of this chapter, a brief summary of some ways in which they differ will help us better understand restorative practices and how they differ from dominant approaches to justice.

One way of looking at justice systems is to examine where they may land on the "punitive" to "restorative" continuum. Generally speaking, the more punitive a justice system, the more it is concerned with what rule was broken, who is to blame, and what punishment would best match the severity of the rule breaking. Examples of punishment-oriented justice systems include Old Testament justice ("an eye for an eye") and vigilante justice[10], as well as what we typically see in the formal, Western criminal justice system, as represented by police, attorneys, judges, and mandatory sentencing laws that treat crimes as having been committed not against individuals or communities but against the state. As Norwegian criminologist Nils Christie noted in his comparative studies of penal systems (2004; 2007), the huge disparity in rates of imprisonment among countries cannot be explained by the relative amount of crime and must be attributable, in large part, to the cultural willingness to inflict pain.

Harry's Story: Doing Jail Time

Civil Disobedience carries the risk of jail time, an experience which can serve to deepen one's commitment to nonviolence as one explores the structural violence of the criminal justice system from the inside. The first time I served out a sentence was in the mid-1980s as

---

[8] As just one illustration of the dominance of the punitive paradigm in the U.S. culture, consider the 1954 Comics Code which, at the time, had to be followed in order to sell comics. This Code had all of the following statutes, which not only served to reinforce the punitive paradigm but essentially criminalized alternative approaches to justice—in fiction:

- Crimes shall never be presented in such a way as to create sympathy for the criminal, to promote distrust of the forces of law and justice, or to inspire others with a desire to imitate criminals.
- If crime is depicted it shall be as a sordid and unpleasant activity.
- In every instance good shall triumph over evil and the criminal punished for his misdeeds.

[9] We use "justice system" to refer to an institutionalized process for dealing with rule violations and/or conflict in a given community.

[10] We are most familiar with vigilante justice in the form of fictional heroes and heroines, such as Batman and Lisbeth Salendar (The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo), who take the law into their own capable hands, but real-world examples of vigilantism also exist. Consider, for instance, the case of Kimberly Cunningham. In 2003, she learned that her then 14-year-old daughter Amanda was (at age nine) raped on two occasions by the girl's uncle, Coy Hundley. Cunningham bought a gun and confronted Hundley at his place of work. When Hundley did not deny the allegations, Cunningham shot him five times, reloaded the weapon, and fired five more rounds, killing him.

part of the Pledge of Resistance. We blocked a street in downtown Albany to express outrage at an upcoming Congressional vote on aid to the Contra rebels/terrorists in Nicaragua. I was given the choice between a $200 fine and fifteen days in Albany County Jail. Following Gandhian principles, I chose the jail time. A number of professors at Union College, where I had a visiting position, felt this decision a sure sign of insanity—why not just pay the $200? But as I sat in jail, I experienced a different perspective. Inmates spend a fair amount of time discussing their experiences in court, and, when I told about my choice, the most common response was: "$200 or fifteen days? Yeah, I'd have taken the fifteen days too." My choice was seen, not as an act of Gandhian heroism, but as a rational economic calculation—two weeks in jail was worth less than $200 in terms of earning power. The experience impressed upon me the truth of sociologist John Irwin's (1985) claim that American jails are designed to control "the rabble," the disreputable poor. Subsequent jail experiences have served to confirm the need for a restorative justice approach as a nonviolent alternative to the class and race-based biases in the existing criminal justice system.

On the other end of this spectrum, the more restorative a justice system, the more it is concerned with what harm was done, who was impacted by the harm, and what action would best address (i.e., restore, repair) the harm to all parties (Zehr 2002). Examples of such systems include victim-offender mediation,[11] family group conferencing,[12] and Restorative Circles.[13]

We all operate under some form of justice systems—in our families, workplaces, relationships, and communities—even if we are not fully aware of these systems (many of which we have simply inherited without examination) because they operate behind closed doors. Thus, one of the benefits of examining justice systems this way is to make visible that which is often invisible. Doing so allows communities (and the individuals in those communities), the possibility of choosing a way of doing justice that is more closely aligned with its values, rather than merely going along with a system that may not actually be serving those values.[14]

Despite the mainstream justice system's hegemony in the United States and elsewhere, the alternatives are real, not hypothetical. This is most obvious in the

[11] A process in which the victim of a crime and the person who has taken responsibility for committing that crime have an opportunity to talk to each other (usually face to face) with the help of a trained mediator. In the meeting, the offender and victim typically talk about what happened and the impact the event had on their lives. Sometimes there is also the additional step of agreeing on a plan to repair some or all of the damages.

[12] A restorative approach that is designed to have child and adult family members solve their own conflicts, instead of involving courts or other professionals.

[13] A restorative practice developed in Brazil that seeks to engage conflict without pre-identifying offenders and victims (because those roles are seen as dynamic) and that involves both those who directly participated in the conflict and the community members who are impacted.

[14] The possibility of choosing how to do justice comes from the work of Dominic Barter, who, with his associates, developed the Restorative Circles process. See http://www.restorativecircles.org

[15] A tort is a common law term used to describe a breach of any civil duty (other than a contractual duty) owed to someone else. It is differentiated from a crime, which involves a breach of a duty owed to society in general. Examples of torts include auto accidents, defamation, product liability, environmental pollution, and any intentional act that could reasonably be predicted to result in harm to an individual.

U.S. tort law,[15] where the individual harmed has the choice of addressing the harm by filing a lawsuit (i.e., engaging the mainstream justice system) or engaging an alternative justice system such as mediation, arbitration, or a restorative process. However, even in criminal law, in which the breach of a duty is considered to be against the state rather than an individual,[16] those involved in or impacted by the alleged criminal behavior have the option of asking the District Attorney not to file criminal charges (though the D.A. may file them anyway), as well as engaging an alternative justice system (e.g., a restorative system) that would operate in parallel to—and often independent of—the criminal proceedings.

The reasons for supplementing and, in some cases, replacing the dominant justice system with restorative approaches are many and cover multiple disciplines. Although the voluntary nature of participating in restorative practices makes experimental evaluation challenging (randomly assigning either victims or offenders to a restorative/punitive condition would require the State's cooperation), there is, nevertheless, a growing body of literature documenting how (and to what degree) restorative practices reduce criminal behavior of offenders, improve the wellbeing of victims and increase safety for the community, at a fraction of the costs of criminal trials and incarceration (see Braithwaite 1999; Sherman and Strang 2007; Hudson 2003). Moreover, some restorative practices, like Restorative Circles, have been shown to reduce police contact in schools (Gillinson et al. 2010), thereby interrupting the often-lamented "school to prison pipeline." These are all important considerations that deserve more extensive treatment, but given our limited space and this chapter's focus, we will suffice with a philosophical argument based on nonviolence.

In Satyagraha Leaflet No. 13, Gandhi (1919) wrote: "Victory attained by violence is tantamount to a defeat, for it is momentary." Gandhi was not speaking out of a starry-eyed idealism, but out of the conviction that violence would continue to beget a further and escalating cycle of violence, and that the de-escalation of this cycle begins with individual acts of *Satyagraha*-a refusal to either bend to the violence of the other or bend to the idea that the other is less human than we are. In this vision shared by other spiritual leaders, sung and unsung-it is the ability to see one's "enemy" as human that allows us to become more human ourselves, for one of the costs of living only with hatred and fear is a blunting of our own sense of humanity and life force. The idea here is not to forgive the person who did the harm but rather to find a way to meet this person's possible lack of compassion (the harm may have been unintentional) with an inner compassion born not of fear or weakness but of the strength it takes to see all human life-even life that has done monstrous things-as sacred.

[16] Thus, if John brutally beats Nathan, who dies from the injuries, John's crime, according to criminal law, is against the state (for violating the state's prohibition against battery and homicide) not against Nathan. The implication of this distinction is that the wishes and needs of the so-called "victim" are not prioritized and sometimes completely ignored. Thus, in a homicide case, the District Attorney may ask for the death penalty (and the judge may grant it), even against the wishes of the victim's family.

The above is not to imply that restorative justice is the opposite of retributive justice. As Zehr (2002, p. 58) writes, “A primary goal of retributive theory and restorative theory is to vindicate through reciprocity, by evening the score.” Consequently, Zehr explains, in the event of a crime, “the victim deserves something and the offender owes something” (p. 59). Where the two systems differ is in what each suggests will effectively right the balance. Punitive systems seek to even the score by punishing the offender. In contrast, restorative systems attempt to repair the harm done, both to the so-called victim and to other community members who were impacted by what happened. That said, repairing the harm is not necessarily the primary goal. As their name implies, restorative practices also offer to all who participate the possibility of restoration. Lyubansky and Barter elaborate on the distinction:

> Words and expressions of emotion can be deeply symbolic and meaningful in … [restorative] encounters. It is action that brings long-term relief, however, both to those who have borne the sometimes deep pain of another’s choices and to those who have acted that way, or stood silent while others did. Reparative action (mending that which is broken or replacing that which is lost) can make a significant difference to people’s lives. It is restorative action—acts that symbolize our renewed understanding of the sanctity of life, or our willingness to co-exist with each other—that brings lasting change and safer communities (Lyubansky and Barter 2011, pp. 39–40).

In other words, restorative systems attempt to create the conditions not just for the acceptance of self-responsibility and the repair of harm but for the mutual rehumanizing of both the so-called offender and the so-called victim, as well as for the healing of those harmed and the reintegration of those that did the harm back into the fabric of community life.

Mikhail’s Story: A Marital Argument

In the past few years, I have facilitated Circles involving sex crimes, shootings, and gang affiliation. However, my most memorable Circles are those that have taken place within my own family. Like every other family I know, ours has relatively frequent conflict and I am often directly involved in it, as when my romantic partner and I have a misunderstanding or when I am upset with one of our kids (or they with me). Because our kids are still young, my wife and I have been facilitating our family conflicts with our kids and trying to engage our own conflicts restoratively without the support of facilitation. A few months ago, however, our then 9-year-old interrupted one of our marital disagreements (I think my partner was upset with me because we were having dinner later than we agreed) with a surprise offer:

“Would you like me to facilitate a micro-circle?[17]”

“No,” I heard myself saying reflexively, having deeply internalized our society’s norm that conflict is private in general and that kids should not be involved in marital conflict in particular.

“Thank you, though” I added, in order to sound less gruff. Then, I looked back at my wife. She was giving me a puzzled, disapproving look.

[17] This is the name given by my partner, Elaine Shpungin, to an abbreviated RC process that we developed for little conflicts and little people. It is described in detail here: http://www.improvecommunication.net/2010/10/3-steps-that-transform-sibling-conflict.html

> "He's trying to do something restorative," she said. "Why would you say 'no'?"
>
> Indeed, why would I? The argument was neither especially private (we were having it in front of him anyway) nor particularly painful for either of us, though the fact that we were having the same argument that we had had multiple times previously was a sure sign that there was something deeper underneath.
>
> "Sure, go ahead," I said.
>
> And he did, asking the questions, reminding us to reflect what we were hearing, and more generally creating and holding the space for each of us to feel understood. I remember the tone of the argument changing almost instantly. The two of us stopped attacking (and being defensive) and started to listen to the deeper meaning underneath each other's words. Sure, there was a bit of pride in our progeny, but the "softening" I felt in my heart that moment was familiar. I had felt it countless times previously when a restorative process created the conditions for me to hear beneath the criticisms and judgments and connect to the universal feelings and needs that underlie our shared humanity.

A comprehensive review of the many existing restorative practices is well beyond the scope of this chapter, but two of us (Lyubansky and Miller) have, for several years now, been intrigued by the potential of one particular restorative practice, Restorative Circles (RC), a system developed by Dominic Barter and his associates in the Brazilian favelas. A detailed description of a Restorative Circle that occurred after a racialized homicide can be found in Chap. 8. Here we want to briefly review the three central concepts or pillars of restorative justice, as described by Zehr (2002): (1) harms and needs, (2) obligations, and (3) community engagement.

Viewed through a restorative lens, crime is essentially understood as harm done to people and communities. While this may seem obvious, as discussed earlier, laws in the United States and many other countries are written with the view that the state is the victim. The focus on harm means that instead of blame and punishment, the goal of many restorative practices is to, as much as possible, repair the harm and restore the relationships, usually by attempting to create a space where truth can be spoken, mutual understanding can occur, and self-responsibility and obligations can be voluntarily undertaken.

In the criminal justice system, holding individuals responsible is done almost exclusively through punishment. As a result, conventional justice systems create a disincentive for those whose behavior was contrary to societal laws or community rules to take responsibility for their actions. Indeed, those who are accused of breaking a law are typically advised by their counsel (and sometimes by the judge) to not incriminate themselves. Thus, unless it is done as part of a plea bargain, taking responsibility is typically viewed by those accused of wrong doing as being contrary to self-interest because responsibility is equated with culpability, which in turn is associated with punishment.

Because restorative practices focus on restoring rather than punishing, self-responsibility typically requires a full understanding of the harm done and usually involves one or more strategies to repair the harm, both literally and symbolically (e.g., through expressions of regret and remorse). Some types of harm, like murder, can never be repaired, but even in such cases, the acceptance of responsibility, the expression of remorse, and a willingness to take steps to reduce the

future likelihood of similar harm to others are often helpful to victims and their families. Moreover, while the criminal justice system focuses exclusively on the responsibility of the so-called "offender," many restorative practices also include self-responsibility and obligations for other participants. This is done not to decrease the accountability of the person who did the harm but to acknowledge that other people often create the conditions for the harm to occur, and similarly can often create the conditions for restorative acts to happen. Furthermore, there is in many restorative practices an explicit goal of reintegrating offenders back into community, a process that requires the active engagement of multiple community members. Ideally, a restorative process is experienced as restorative, not only by those harmed but also by those that did the harm and others in the community who feel impacted by what happened.

Our justice systems (including those in schools and workplaces) professionalize the handling of conflict. They identify individuals who are authorized to decide who is right and wrong and what needs to happen next. There are benefits to such an approach, but there are costs too, and one of these is that those directly involved in the conflict and those who are most impacted by it do not typically have the opportunity (or even permission) to work things out for themselves. The restorative principle of engagement is that the "offender(s)," the "victim(s)" and both everyone directly involved in the harm and those impacted by what happened are jointly responsible for figuring out what is required for justice in that particular case. This typically involves some kind of dialog process where all of these parties have the opportunity to speak in their own words and have a say in how justice is done. The Restorative Circle process puts an especially high premium on community engagement, even compared to other restorative practices. It places the responsibility back into the hands of those who are actually part of the conflict, rather than some supposedly objective, well-trained outsider. Moreover, it explicitly removes professional roles from the process. Facilitation is offered by community members who offer facilitation to others one day and participate in a Circle facilitated by someone else on another.

Taken together, restorative principles (and the restorative practices that they inspire) provide a more appealing moral alternative, a way of doing justice that embodies interbeing, compassion, and the inseparability of ends and means. In Chap. 8, we will discuss specific ways psychologists might contribute to restorative practices as both scholars and practitioners. Among the more obvious relevant topics for psychological study are empathy, forgiveness, and healing from trauma, topics that are also highly applicable to developing a nonviolent consciousness, the third and final domain in Macy's framework.

7.5.3 Changes in Consciousness

Earlier in this chapter we looked at the differentiation between strategic nonviolence and principled nonviolence that has developed over the last decades.

The final section highlights consciousness transformation modalities which support a lifestyle of principled nonviolence, or consciousness transformation. Gandhi strongly espoused principled nonviolence. “Non-violence is not a garment to be put on and off at will. Its seat is in the heart, and it must be an inseparable part of our very being.” His autobiography, *Experiments with Truth* (1983), and other writings offer a view to his lifelong pursuit of spiritual perfection and its relevance to nonviolence, which Gandhi called ‘love in action’. One reputed conversation between a British cleric who supported British imperial policies and Gandhi illustrates the centrality of spiritual transformation to Gandhi. After a difficult exchange, the cleric said to Gandhi ‘Well, we’re both men of God, Mr. Gandhi, aren’t we?” Gandhi replied, “You are a politician disguised as a man of God, I am a man of God disguised as a politician” (Gandhi 2009).

Gandhi’s commitment to transformation, which for him was a journey of seeking God through truth, cannot be disentangled from his extraordinary achievements. His personal power, shrewd political and economic insights and towering accomplishments occurred, he said repeatedly, because of his devotion to seeking truth and applying it, with relentless discipline, to his own life.

In this final section, we will highlight a process called Nonviolent Communication and a handful of nonviolent habits of mind as a sampling of potential vehicles for consciousness transformation.

A particular gift of Gandhi’s was his ability to love and reach out to the humanity of his political opponents, including those who initiated and supported repressive policies in South Africa and India. He was able to, as he put it, “hate the sin and not the sinner.” A method for learning and practicing this extraordinary skill, called Nonviolent Communication (NVC), was developed by American psychologist Marshall Rosenberg (2003) in the early 1960s. Rosenberg developed NVC while working with civil rights activists and with communities working to desegregate schools and other public institutions. A particular contribution that this body of work makes to nonviolence relates to the principles regarding human needs.

1. Human needs are universal.
2. All thoughts, words, and actions are attempts to meet one’s needs.
3. The final authority on each person’s needs is that individual.

Rosenberg’s model offers those interested in internalizing these principles a set of training wheels, a communication method consisting of four components: (1) Observations free of evaluations; (2) Feelings straight from the heart; (3) Needs, values and longings; and (4) Requests expressed clearly in positive action language. Thus, a parent frustrated by his teen-aged son staying out late at night might respond to the son in the following way:

> I noticed that you came home at 11 pm and didn’t call to let me know you’d be two hours late. When you didn’t come home on time [observation], I was worried [feeling] about your safety [need] and also frustrated and angry [more feelings] because it didn’t seem to me that you cared about how your lateness might impact me [the need here is

consideration]. I really want to know that you're safe and to trust that you are thinking about others, as well as yourself [all the needs restated]. Are you willing to talk with me about how we might be able to work it out so that when you go out in the future, both of us are satisfied with what happens [request]?

While the model primarily offers a structural approach to language, it requires practitioners to gain greater awareness of both their own feelings and needs and the feelings and needs of others. Deceptively simple, these principles are challenging to practice, as words do not feel "real" to those who hear them unless they are congruent with the speaker's actual feelings and consciousness. Yet, as long as such congruence is pursued, an NVC practice supports nonviolence in word and deed, because it offers a way to melt judgments and to see into the hearts of others. As Richard Rohr wrote in *Everything Belongs* (2003, p. 79), "We cannot live a disconnected life with negative judgmental and violent thoughts in our hearts. We protest that we never do anything dangerous with these thoughts. But the trouble is that they do something with us."

Kit's Story: Dissolving Labels

Several years ago, I was asked to present some conflict resolution principles to a sixth grade classroom in a local city school. Teachers had been having problems with outbursts in the class. When I arrived, they warned me about one student in particular, Melissa (not her real name!) who they described as disruptive and unruly. As I began my presentation, I understood the teachers' frustration. Melissa talked over other students and spoke several times while I was speaking. She was in the back of the group, clearly not a favorite with the other students either. After listening to her two or three times, when she next spoke I said to her 'hey Melissa, I'm feeling torn here. I want to hear what you have to say and I want to make space for me and others to speak too. Can you hang in here with me and listen for the rest of our short time together?" I asked her this as a real question, not as a polite shut down. I think she realized my intention was sincere, because she nodded and watched me curiously for the rest of the time. As I left the classroom and headed out into the hallway, she followed me.

My guess is that most children and teens are continuously starved for choice and autonomy in their lives. Later, they become hungry for empathy and understanding, often for the destructive choices they have made while trying to get the choice/autonomy needs met. That day Melissa was no exception. I asked her, "Melissa, would you like to have way more control over your time than you have and be able to have more choice in your own life?" She looked at me with such relief and gratitude that I remember it clearly years later. She then asked, "Can you call my mom [to tell her]?" The printed words on this page cannot convey the power that simple exchange had for either of us. The ability to see into the hearts of others and to regard our own heart with equal compassion is a critical aspect of consciousness transformation. In that moment, we were two human beings joined in understanding.

Almost all of us had our inner landscapes about conflict formed very early on, which shapes our ability to relate to ourselves and others in critical yet mainly unconscious ways. Under stress, it is difficult not to revert to our oldest and most habitual strategies. Knowing this, we can better understand conflict aversion, an almost universal ailment that leads to loss of connection and loss of creativity at lower levels and to violence of all kinds at higher levels. Since human conflict is so stressful that even our brain chemistry has evolved to deal with it, it is extremely

useful to build self-awareness in relation to our own internal beliefs about conflict. In so doing, we can learn to excavate our own fears and internal fixed stories about conflict and violence in order to move toward nonviolence. NVC provides one model for such an inner journey, but it is far from the only path.

In her book *A Helping Hand,* Swedish author and mediator Larsson (2011) suggests starting with the following questions (p 79):

- What does the word 'conflict' mean to you?
- When do you start calling something a conflict, and when do you choose to call it something else?
- Describe what happens in the language of observations: what you actually see and hear that you call a conflict?
- How would you describe your conflict history? How has conflict been part of your life?

Stop for a moment and think about the last time you had an issue or problem with someone. What did you do? Many of us avoid speaking about a topic that troubles us, or we avoid the person, or we speak about the issue or person to others in ways that become more likely to fuel the creation of prejudice, labels and stories about the other. Other common strategies are to wait until we are at a breaking point to speak so that anger fuels our courage, or until the problem has become so extreme that it can no longer be ignored. No doubt these dynamics sound familiar, but we join other students of conflict in asserting that none of them actually reduce violence.

Rather than avoiding conflict, as many of us have learned to do, Barter, whose work in restorative justice was discussed earlier in this chapter, specifically recommends that we instead walk toward conflict, if possible, right when it begins to happen.[18] Such an orientation has multiple benefits, including lowering the likelihood that the conflict will escalate into violence and strengthening our individual sense of integrity and empowering, thereby reducing our fear and aversion of others when they are caught up in conflict.

Kit's Story: Moving Toward Conflict

Recently I was driving through a (seeming all-white) suburban area when I noticed a young African–American man running to catch a bus. It was the end of the day and the buses don't run in the evening, so I assumed he was desperate to get on that bus, which had passed him at the stop. I was in traffic just ahead and watched through my rear view mirror as the White bus driver shook his head (indicating "no") when the young man caught up to the bus at the stoplight and knocked on the door, gesturing to be let in. After seeing the head shake, the young man moved to the front of the bus and began pounding on the windshield. I was alarmed seeing this, worried that he was heading for serious trouble if someone didn't step in. The Trayvon Martin shooting in Florida had occurred just a few weeks before and was also on my mind. I was just ahead of the bus and, rolling down my window, called out that I would give him a ride. He didn't hear and continued to pound on

[18] Violence, of course, is also a way of walking toward conflict. Barter's suggestion is that people walk toward conflict with the goal of understanding, rather than the goal of hurting or even the goal of being understood.

> the bus and yell at the driver. I jumped from the car (blocking traffic) and went to stand next to him. "Hey" I shouted to get his attention, which was entirely fixed in that moment on the driver," Get in my car, you are in trouble here!" After a moment, he followed me to the car. He took several minutes to vent many strong feelings and then we were able to talk about what had happened with the bus and about life in general during our long rush hour ride home together. I would not have had the courage to approach and help out in this situation had I not done the work I had to reduce conflict aversion in myself.

Unlike the rest of this chapter, the consciousness shifts that Rosenberg and Barter try to create fall squarely within psychology's comfort zone. Indeed, they both come out of the humanistic tradition of believing in the human potential and extoll the Rogerian value of empathic human connection.[19] In the sense that cognitive approaches to psychotherapy also focus on shifting values and beliefs, this particular dimension of nonviolence has probably received more attention than the rest. Yet, here too, there is remarkably little peer-reviewed scholarship that focuses directly on either NVC or other strategies for developing a nonviolent consciousness. With that in mind, we end this chapter with some thoughts about how psychology can contribute to nonviolent movements.

7.6 Future Psychological Directions

Although there have been some efforts to develop a psychology of nonviolence (e.g., Kool 2008), and the APA has had a division of peace psychology since 1988, the potential for contributions of psychology to the study and practice of nonviolence has been largely untapped. The possibilities, however, are exciting. We have only enough space to make a few suggestions. Kool (2008) gives a far more extensive discussion.

First, psychologists could fruitfully study and incorporate the ideas and experiences of nonviolent practitioners and theorists such as Gandhi, King, Sharp, Day, and Nhat Hanh. Although few such figures were trained as psychologists, all were profoundly insightful "amateur" social scientists who spent decades observing and reflecting on the human psyche. Moreover, all engaged in what Gandhi called "experiments with truth," testing out nonviolent approaches in a variety of situations. As we have illustrated, such experiments can be classified into holding actions, creation of alternative structures, and changing consciousness. While not classical laboratory experiments, their analyses of their life experiences might be thought of as a type of quasi experiment (Campbell and Stanley 1963). This is particularly true given the fact that most were leaders of social movements, and therefore often received first-hand reports of the campaigns and activities of their followers, giving them a large "database" from which to draw inferences.

[19] These similarities are not coincidental. Barter spent time studying NVC with Rosenberg, who, in turn, was a student of Rogers.

Nonviolent insights into the workings of power, compassion, empathy, and altruism could stimulate psychology in fruitful new directions.

Psychologists can also address nonviolence through the synthesis and continuation of many related areas that have long been a part of the discipline (e.g., aggression, obedience, altruism, empathy, attribution, moral development, and self-actualization) to address questions related to nonviolent consciousness and practice. Generally, such efforts could be grouped into: (1) individual traits that correlate with nonviolence in the individual (e.g., Kool 2008), (2) interpersonal approaches which tend to lead to peaceful outcomes (e.g. Goleman 2006), and (3) social contexts which contribute to peaceful outcomes (e.g., Sherif et al. 1961).

Such approaches would be enhanced by incorporating many of the suggestions for moving psychological inquiry away from the positivist/empiricist approach and toward a more social constructionist approach, as argued in Chap. 3 of this volume. Incorporation of Foucault's analysis of the relationship between knowledge and power, of the social constructionist approach to knowledge articulated by Berger and Luckmann, among others, of the communicative ethics approach of Habermas, and of the liberation psychology of Martin-Baro would do much to create an authentic, mutually informative relationship between psychology and nonviolence.

Over the course of this chapter, we have tried to offer a sampling of the diverse ways in which nonviolence has manifested over the last decades as well as within our own lives. This is badly needed intervention. Those of us who live in the United States are presently living in the most violent society in human history in terms of the use of resources for military buildup, the numbers of people incarcerated and by the number of images of violence in the popular media. In closing, we refer to Martin Luther King who once again offers a prescription for the illness of pervasive violence. In an address to students on June 4, 1957, King called on each of us to become maladjusted to the problems of society. He said: "I never intend to adjust myself to the tragic effects of the methods of physical violence and to tragic militarism. I call upon you to be maladjusted to such things… God grant that we will be so maladjusted that we will be able to go out and change our world and our civilization."

References

Ackerman, P., & Duvall, J. (2000). *A force more powerful: A century of nonviolent conflict*. New York: Palgrave.

Alexander, M., & Bruning, J. (2008). How to break a terrorist: The US interrogators who used brains, not brutality, to take down the deadliest man in Iraq. Free Press

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) (2008). *Newly unredacted report confirms psychologists supported illegal interrogations in Iraq and Afghanistan.* Press Release. Retrieved April 30, from http://bit.ly/97hxR4

American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist, 57*, 1060–1073.

Bodley, J. (2008). *Anthropology and contemporary human problems* (5th ed.). Lanham: Alta Mira.
Braithwaite, J. (1999). Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. In M. Tonry (ed.). *Crime and justice*: A review of research, Vol. 25. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Campbell, D. T., & Stanley, J. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
Casey, G. W. (2011). Comprehensive soldier fitness: A vision for psychological resilience in the U.S. Army. *American Psychologist, 66*, 1–3.
Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict*. New York: Columbia.
Christie, N. (2004). *A suitable amount of crime*. New York: Routledge.
Christie, N. (2007). *Limits to pain: The role of punishment in penal policy*. New York: Wipf & Stock Publishers.
Davidson, M. (1998). *Convictions of the heart: Jim Corbett and the sanctuary movement*. Arizona: University of Arizona Press.
Day, D. (1997). *Loaves and fishes*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
Dillard, C. L. (2002). Civil disobedience: A case study in factors of effectiveness. *Society and Animals, 10*, 47–62.
Eidelson, R., Pilisuk, M., & Soldz, S. (2011). *The dark side of Comprehensive Soldier Fitness*. Retrieved from http://www.zcommunications.org/the-dark-side-of-comprehensive-soldier-fitness-by-roy-eidelson
Eller, J. (2006). *Violence and culture: A cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approach*. Australia: Wadsworh.
Flaherty, A., (2008). Probe: Officials warn about harsh interrogations. USA Today. Retrieved February, 24, 2013 from http://bit.ly/9N63Rc
Forest, J. (2011). *All is grace: A biography of Dorothy day*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
Gandhi, M. K. (1919). *Satyagraha leaflet no. 13*. Retrieved December, 22, 2012 from http://ltrc.iiit.ac.in/gwiki/index.php/Collected_Works/Volume_18/Satyagraha_Leaflet_No_13_%283rd_May_1919%29
Gandhi, M. K. (1951). *Non-violent resistance*. New York: Schocken.
Gandhi, M. K. (1983). *Autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. New York: Dover Publications.
Gandhi, M. (2009). *The way to God: Selected writings from Mahatma Gandhi*. Berkeley: North Atlantic Books.
Gillinson, S., Horne, M., & Baeck, P. (2010). *Radical efficiency: Different, better, lower cost public services*. London: NESTA.
Golden, R., & McConnell, M. (1986). *Sanctuary: The new underground railroad*. Maryknoll: Orbis.
Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The revolutionary new science of human relationships*. New York: Bantam.
Gould, S. J. (1982). A nation of morons. *New Scientist, 6*, 349–352.
Hallie, P. (1979). *Lest innocent blood be shed*. New York: Harper.
Hanh, T. N. (1987). *Being peace*. Berkeley: Parallax Press.
Hanh, T. N. (1998). *Interbeing* (3rd ed.). Berkeley: Parallax Press.
Holmes, R. (1990). *Nonviolence in theory and practice*. Prospect Heights: Waveland.
Hudson, B. (2003). *Justice in the risk society: Challenging and re-affirming justice in late modernity*. London: Sage Publications Limited.
Huxley, A. (1937). *Ends and means: An inquiry into the nature of ideals and into the methods employed for their realization*. New York: Harper and Brothers.
Irwin, J. (1985). *The jail: Managing the underclass in American society*. Berkeley: California.
King, M. L. (1957). *The power of nonviolence*. Berkeley: University of California.
King, M. L. (1964). *Stride toward freedom: The Montgomery story*. New York: Harper and Row.

King, M. L. (1986). *A testament of hope: The essential writings and speeches of Martin Luther King, jr.* (J.M. Washington, Ed.). San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Kool, V. K. (2008). *The psychology of nonviolence and aggression*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Kuhn, T. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3rd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Larsson, L. (2011). *A helping hand: Mediation with nonviolent communication*. Svensbyn, Sweden: Friare Liv Konsult.

Litz, B. T., Stein, N., Delaney, E., Lebowitz, L., Nash, W. P., Silva, C., et al. (2009). Moral injury and moral repair in war veterans: A preliminary model and intervention strategy. *Clinical Psychology Review, 29*, 695–706.

Lyubansky, M., & Barter, D. (2011). A restorative approach to interpersonal racial conflict. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice, 23*(1), 37–44.

Macy, J. R., & Brown, M. Y. (1998). *Coming back to life: Practices to reconnect our lives, our world*. Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers.

Murray, H. (1990). *Do not neglect hospitality: The catholic worker and the homeless*. Philadelphia: Temple.

Mannen, D., Hinton, S., Kuijper, T., & Porter, T. (2012). Sustainable Organizing: A Multiparadigm Perspective of Organizational Development and Permaculture Gardening. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*.

Olson, B., Soldz, S., & Davis, M. (2008). The ethics of interrogation and the American Psychological Association: A critique of policy and process. *Philosophy, Ethics, and Humanities in Medicine*, *3*, 2–8.

Pirsig, R. (1974). *Zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance*. New York: William Morrow.

Pope, K. S. (2011). Psychologists and detainee interrogations: Key decisions, opportunities lost, and lessons learned. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 7*, 459–481.

Pope, K. S., & Gutheil, T. G. (2008). The American Psychological Association and detainee interrogations: Unanswered questions. *Psychiatric Times, 25*, 16–17.

Reiman, J., & Leighton, P. (2010). *The rich get richer and the poor get prison: Ideology, class, and criminal justice* (9th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rohr, R. (2003). *Everything belongs: The gift of contemplative prayer*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company.

Rosenberg, M. B. (2003). *Nonviolent communication: A language of life: Create your life, your relationships, and your world in harmony with your values*. Encinitas, CA: PuddleDancer Press.

Scheper-Hughes, N., & Bourgois, P. (2004). *Violence in war and peace: An anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Fowler, R. D. (2011). Comprehensive soldier fitness and the future of psychology. *American Psychologist, 66*, 82–86.

Sharp, G. (1973). *The politics of nonviolent action: Part one: Power and struggle*. Boston: Porter-Sargent.

Sherif, M., Harvey, O. H., White, B. J., Hood, W. B., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robber's cave experiment*. Norman: University of Oklahoma.

Sherman, L. W., & Strang, H. (2007). *Restorative justice: The evidence* (p. 2007). London: The Smith Institute.

Smith, C. (1996). *Resisting Reagan: The U.S. Central America peace movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zahn, Gordon. (1964). *In solitary witness: The life and death of Franz Jaggerstatter*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice*. Intercourse: Good Books.

Zinn, H. (2003). *The twentieth century: A people's history*. New York: Harper Collins.