# The Synergy and Substance of Organizational and Community Change in the Response to Crime and Conflict: The Emergence and Potential of Restorative Justice

GORDON BAZEMORE                                    bazemor@fau.edu
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Florida Atlantic University, 111 East Los Olas Blvd., Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301, USA

SANDRA O'BRIEN                                    sobrien@fgcu.edu
Division of Public Affairs, Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Blvd., S. Ft. Myers, FL 33965, USA

MARK CAREY                                    mcarey.tcg@charter.net
The Carey Group, 545 Summit Ave., St. Paul, MN 555102, USA

**Key words:**    organizational reform, justice system, restorative justice, community involvement one hundredth monkey

*Abstract*

The story of the one-hundredth monkey has generated new ways of thinking about cultural transformation. Different experiences and new understandings of justice have emerged in a variety of cultural contexts and led to a rather sudden multi-national shift in thinking about the collective response to crime, harm and conflict that raises broader theoretical questions about restorative justice as a social movement or innovation. This article will describe the restorative justice movement in an historical context and its emergence into a worldwide phenomenon. The authors also examine the role of communities, or "instrumental communities" in public organizations.

## Introduction

As the legend goes, off the shores of Koshima, a young female monkey known as Imo one day began washing sweet potatoes in the waters of the sea. This behavior might not seem unusual, except for the fact that until that point in time the monkeys (of the species *Macaca fuscata*) on this small island off the northern coast of Japan, were not know to have engaged in this kind of practice. Eventually, most of the other monkeys were also washing their potatoes before eating. But the most startling realization occurred when, suddenly and spontaneously, monkeys on other islands starting washing potatoes as well. No physical or other contact transpired between these two

groups of monkeys inhabiting islands physically removed from each other by a large body of water.

Imo was part of an experiment in the 1950's in which these potatoes had been dropped in the sand by the scientists. Few would have predicted this apparent spontaneous transmission of a cultural trait across space, in the absence of physical contact. This "leap of consciousness" allegedly occurred when some critical mass was reached. Popularized in 1981 as a result of an appeal to the dangers of nuclear power and weapons, the scientific accuracy of what has become known as the "hundredth monkey phenomenon" as it was called was never verified. Nonetheless, the study, or *story* as it were, generated new ways of thinking about cultural transformation. Whether reliable and valid as an account of what really occurred in the spread of potato washing, the story is a case study in the phenomenon of unique behavioral adaptations spreading in the absence of any apparent rational explanation. Similarly, other popular and provocative efforts to describe the rise of trends and social movements point to appealing, if not always empirically and theoretically rigorous, concepts such as "tipping points" and "social epidemics" to explain what appear to be otherwise unpredictable events (e.g., Gladwell, 2001; Levitt and Dubner, 2005).

It is clearly tempting to apply such unorthodox theories in response to recent rather dramatic challenges to conventional ways of responding to crime and achieving justice. In a number of locations around the world, beginning in the mid-to-late 1990s, communities in very different cultural contexts began experimenting with practices that seemed to defy dominant understandings of crime and the logic of what to do about it. In addition, many began to question the value of the decades-old, one-dimensional debate between advocates of more punishment and proponents of expanding "treatment," or rehabilitative services. In doing so, proponents of these new practices began to conceptualize the problem of crime as bigger than the problem of the offender. These new conceptualizations and an array of policies and practices with a common focus broader than those associated with traditional crime control and social work/treatment agendas, are now being characterized by the general term *restorative justice*. Proponents of restorative justice argue that truly "just" and effective solutions must address the harm caused by crime and the needs of those harmed—victims, offenders and their families and communities—and that is doing so, they must involve all these parties in this decisionmaking process and in the intervention itself to the greatest extent possible.

It could be said that this new thinking and response grew directly out of the experience with practices such as various forms of mediation, reparative sanctions practices such as restitution and community service, and related innovations. However, for the most part, these "alternatives" had been viewed within the framework of retributive or just deserts agendas (von Hirsch, 1976; McDonald, 1986; Galaway and Hudson, 1990) or as an extension of the treatment

model[1] rather than as components of an emerging movement that would challenge the premises of both punishment and rehabilitation-based agendas. Instead, something apparently new emerged that drew upon other forces, as well as apparently new justice philosophies, theories and innovative "big ideas." Notably, for example, New Zealand's unique and radical statutory reform that required that all juvenile crimes, with the exception of murder and aggravated rape, have their dispositions (sentences) developed in a family group conference provided a signal that something very new was occurring that could have dramatic systemic and cultural implications (Maxwell and Morris, 1993). Culturally, family group conferencing was a practice common among the indigenous Maori population whose children had been heavily overrepresented in overcrowded juvenile residential treatment facilities.

Adoption of these indigenous practices to national public policy was an unprecedented response that seemed aimed at empowering this significant minority group in the justice decisionmaking process. Ultimately, the new policy helped to close down these facilities in the years following passage of the legislation mandating their use. This wholesale application of a radically distinctive decisionmaking practice used instead of court provided a template for adoption of a new and very different philosophical approach that for some was an important component of a paradigm shift in criminal justice (Zehr, 1990; Bazemore and Umbreit, 1995).

The impact of this radical departure from business-as-usual soon was replicated in different forms in Australia (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994) and then prompted training and implementation of these new models in Canada, the U.S, the UK, and various European countries. Later adaptation of restorative justice principles to South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation committees, and to related peacemaking efforts elsewhere in the world demonstrated the potential resiliency and broader impact of a less adversarial, healing-focused response to massive harm and conflict (Weitekamp, 2005). Restorative justice initiatives now range from townships around South African cities such as Cape town and Johannesburg, to African–American inner city neighborhoods in communities in Chicago and Pittsburg, to Aboriginal villages in Canada that had once abandoned indigenous restorative practices. European cities and villages, London and northern Ireland, Southeast Asian and Japanese cities and towns, cities, small towns and rural areas of Wisconsin, Colorado, Minnesota, New York, California, Florida, Georgia and Oregon also make use of restorative justice practices.

Such applications also clearly challenged the perception that earlier restorative practices such as victim-offender mediation were culturally specific, North American (generally Midwestern), alternatives or add-ons to dominant justice orientations (Umbreit, 1999). Soon an internationally popular criminological theory of intervention, reintegrative shaming (Braithwaite, 1989; Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994), was being applied to (and empirically tested with) family group conferencing policies and practices. Other theories of social exchange,

social support, and informal social control/social capital were also being applied as models for explaining the apparent or potential success of some of these practices (Bazemore, 1998). How these very different experiences and new understandings of justice emerged in a variety of cultural contexts and led to a rather sudden multi-national shift in thinking about the collective response to crime, harm and conflict raises broader theoretical questions about restorative justice as a social movement or innovation and poses the basic question, *why now?*

One purpose of this article is to describe the restorative justice movement in an historical context. More importantly, we consider various reasons for the emergence of this movement as an almost worldwide phenomenon in multiple political and cultural environments in the decade of the 1990s. In doing so, we examine the role of communities, and especially what we call the "instrumental communities" of public organizations, in an emerging effort to return some of the responsibilities for the response to crime and harm to informal systems of social control.

### What is restorative justice? Principles and practices

The new restorative justice is a way of responding to crime that begins with a challenge to the traditional core questions of criminal justice systems. Typically, when a crime occurs, criminal justice professionals ask the questions: who did it, what laws were broken, and what should be done to punish the offender. By contrast, through a restorative justice "lens" (Zehr, 1990), crime is viewed as important not simply because a law has been broken and a guilty person must be charged and punished. Rather, crime causes harm to individuals and their communities. While legal questions of guilt and sanctions are important, if crime is in fact about harm, "justice" can never be achieved simply by punishing or attempting to rehabilitate offenders. In contrast to this one-dimensional focus, restorative justice is based on the principle that justice is best served when there is a balanced response to the needs of victims, offenders, and community members. Each of these groups impacted by crime then become stakeholders, actively involved in the resolution of the problems crime causes, with an emphasis on the offender's personal accountability.

### Restorative principles and criminal justice philosophies

In the broadest sense, restorative justice is a principle-based method of responding to crime or harmful behavior that includes all processes that seek to achieve justice by repairing the harm that crime causes (Bazemore and

Walgrave, 1999; see Van Ness and Strong, 1997, 2001). The strength and integrity, of the "restorativeness," of a given intervention in response to crime is a matter of degree best gauged by the relative adherence of such a response to three core principles. These principles include:

1. *Repairing the Harm*: Working toward healing victims, offenders, and communities that have been injured by crime.
2. *Stakeholder Involvement*: Providing victims, offenders, and communities with the opportunity for active involvement in the justice process as early and as fully as possible.
3. *Transforming the Community/Government Relationship*: Rethinking the relative roles and responsibilities of government and the community in the response to crime by increasing the responsibility and resources of the latter while viewing the government/criminal justice system in a facilitative role. (Van Ness and Strong, 1997: 8–9).

While these principles suggest somewhat independent goals and priorities, they are also interrelated and mutually reinforcing. The first principle, repairing harm, establishes a set of outcomes for restorative practice—including holding the offender accountable to victim and community for the harm caused by their behavior, making amends, and rebuilding or strengthening relationships. To achieve this repair, it is essential to engage those affected by the crime—victim, offender, and their supporters—in decisionmaking about what needs to be done. Although necessary for establishing guilt when responsibility for crime is contested, procedural rules and bureaucratic guidelines often also limit the response needed for achieving such outcomes. Hence, on the basis of the second principle of stakeholder involvement, restorative justice tends to prioritize deliberations that occur in nonadversarial decision-making practices (e.g., "restorative group conferencing" approaches) (Braithwaite, 2002; Bazemore and Umbreit, 2001). Such processes seek to maximize the involvement and input of victims, offenders, and community members in a leadership role that promotes ownership of conflict and harm by those most affected by it (Christie, 1977). The third principle, transforming the community/government role and relationship, therefore suggests the need for a less directive, more facilitative role for the traditional justice system, in favor of empowering community members, and also building community capacity to respond more effectively to harm and conflict by mobilizing community control and support (Christie, 1977; Braithwaite, 2002; Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). Though focused first on the needs and involvement of individual stakeholders (victim, offender, and their supporters), restorative justice practice is therefore also concerned increasingly with various new entities of "community." Specifically, practitioners ask how schools and universities, workplaces, residential facilities, faith community organizations and neighborhood groups can begin to gain both power and capacity to address conflict and harmful behaviors (which may or may not

become labeled as crimes) without what has become an almost complete reliance on criminal justice institutions of formal social control.[2]

This focus for criminal justice based on restorative principles must be viewed in contrast to traditional philosophies that have guided criminal justice policy and policy reform in previous decades. Restorative justice is almost directly at odds with retributive justice or "just desserts" approaches (von Hirsch, 1976) in its focus on repairing harm and healing rather than state-sponsored punishment as the primary goal of intervention in response to criminal behavior (Braithwaite and Petit, 1990; Zehr, 1990). Neither soft on crime, nor supportive of expanded punishment (Van Ness and Strong, 1997; Bazemore, 1998). It is, on the other hand, compatible with core goals associated with most traditional criminal justice philosophies. Most restorative justice proponents will, for example, stand with advocates of rehabilitation and treatment. However, they also insist that the complex problems of crime cannot be resolved by policies based on offender-driven services alone (Braithwaite and Mugford, 1994; Bazemore, 1998, 1999).

Because restorative justice principles also have implications for redefining the role and boundaries of criminal justice systems, they will also ultimately side with criminal justice libertarians on many issues including a commitment to due process, concerns about the boundaries of criminal justice intervention, and related critiques of recent expansionist trends in criminal and juvenile justice (Bazemore et al., 2004; Harcourt, 2001). However, many restorative justice advocates also acknowledge the concern of crime control advocates that youth crime and behavioral problems do not go away simply by ignoring them and therefore recognize the need for deterrence and incapacitation, albeit with the possibility for application of restorative justice principles even within the most restrictive settings necessary in some cases to ensure public protection (Braithwaite, 2002). The new restorative vision therefore cannot be reduced to a "hands-off" approach, yet intervention in response to crime and conflict is not seen as a job that should be left to government alone. Instead, more consistent with a communitarian approach (Etzioni, 1996; Braithwaite, 1994), restorative justice seeks to promote a community "hands on" agenda, in part through government action that casts justice agencies and professionals in a significantly different role.

This transformation of professional roles and transfer of responsibilities from formal criminal justice agencies to these various entities of community is of course not something that can happen overnight. Indeed, with the partial exception of countries such as New Zealand and recently the UK, the movement in making the shift to give priority to restorative practices versus priorities based on other criminal justice agendas has not been rapid. What has been acknowledged—consistent with the interests of readers of this publication—is that this movement requires not only a substantial effort to build or rebuild community capacity for taking on these responsibilities—but also systemic change in the way criminal justice organizations and systems operate.

**Principles to practice**

Restorative practice is inclusive of a wide range of interventions that operationalize its three core principles (Van Ness and Strong, 1997). However, two general categories of practice are indispensable because of their capacity to achieve reparation of harm by empowering stakeholders:

- *Restorative decision-making or conferencing models*—Designed to enable victims, offenders, their supporters, and affected community members to have input into a plan to repair harm, these processes can assume many variations within four general structural models: (1) family group conferences, (2) victim-offender mediation/dialogue, (3) neighborhood accountability boards, and (4) peacemaking circles (Bazemore and Schiff, 2004), all of which share a focus on decision-making that seeks to maximize stakeholder involvement.
- *Restorative sanctions or obligations*—These include restitution, community service, apologies, victim service, behavioral agreements, and other efforts to make amends for harm caused by one's offense. Restorative obligations represent the concrete, behavioral aspect of offender accountability defined as "righting the wrong" in a way that provides evidence to the community and victim that the offender has earned redemption (Maloney et al., 2001).

It is most important to note, in any summary of restorative practices, that the restorative justice framework is not limited to one form of intervention, to certain types of offenders and victims, or to certain points in the criminal or juvenile justice process. Indeed, in the relatively short modern history of restorative justice, a wide array of restorative practices have emerged within criminal and juvenile justice systems that attempt to address harm in multiple circumstances. As illustrated in Table 1, these practices address multiple objectives that range from the point of neighborhood police or citizen encounters with troublesome behaviors or minor violations, through residential placement or incarceration, to reintegration or reentry to the community following incarceration. In addition, preventative peacemaking and informal conflict resolution efforts based on restorative principles that have emerged in schools and other neighborhood settings (e.g., Karp and Breslin, 2001) with *no formal connection* to juvenile or criminal justice systems must also be included in this broad definition of restorative practice.

In addition to these applications in and around criminal and juvenile justice systems, it is important to note that restorative justice practices are also being applied in child welfare cases of abuse and neglect (Pennel and Burford, 2000), school and university disciplinary reform (Morris et al., this volume), international peacemaking (Braithwaite, 2002; Weitekamp, 2005), regulation of public agencies (Braithwaite, 2002), workplace discipline (Stuart, 2001), and substance abuse intervention (Toews-Shenk and Zehr, 2001; Kraft et al., 2001). Although research on restorative justice practices is in its relative infancy, results thus far

Table 1. Restorative justice objective, practice, and typical location.

| Objective/focus | Practice | Typical location/use |
|---|---|---|
| Prevention, peacemaking, youth development, community building; family and school discipline | School and neighborhood conferencing; youth development circles; victim awareness education, restorative discipline; family support and discussion groups | Schools; neighborhoods; churches, civic groups |
| Provide decisionmaking alternative to formal court or other adversarial process for determining obligations for repairing harm | Victim offender dialogue; family group conferencing; peacemaking circles; neighborhood accountability boards; other restorative conferencing approaches | Police and community diversion; court diversion, dispositional/sentencing alternatives, post-dispositional planning, residential alternative discipline; conflict resolution; post residential re-entry |
| Victim and community input to court or formal decisionmaking | Written or oral impact statement to court or other entity | Court, probation, residential facilities |
| Provide reparative sanctions or obligations in response to crime or harmful behavior | Restitution, restorative community service, service to victims, service for surrogate victims, payment to victim service funds | Diversion, court sanction, probation condition, residential program, reentry |
| Offender treatment/rehabilitation/education | Victim impact panels; victim awareness education; drunk driving panels; community service learning projects | Probation; residential facilities; diversion program; jails |
| Victim services and support groups | Volunteer support groups; faith community groups; counseling | Multiple settings |
| Reintegration of incarcerated persons | Reentry conferences; support circles; restorative community service | Neighborhood and community |

Adapted from Bazemore and Schiff (2004).

in criminal and juvenile justice settings are promising with regard to impact on offender empathy, victim satisfaction, and recidivism (for summaries, see Braithwaite, 2002; Sherman, 2003; Nugent et al., 2003; Bonta et al., 2002; Schneider, 1986; Butts and Snyder, 1991; Bazemore and Schiff, 2004).

We turn now to a consideration of the roots of restorative justice in ancient societies and its decline in the middle-ages. We then consider its surprising modern reemergence in the late 20th century and possible explanations for this interest in practices that directly challenge dominant justice paradigms.

## Restorative justice: History and reemergence

Unlike the potato washing behavior of the monkeys of Koshima, restorative justice practices did not emerge in the late 20th century with no apparent historical precedent. Indeed, virtually all early human societies appear to have practiced some form of what has been referred to since the 1990s as a "restorative justice" process (Weitekamp, 1999). That is, humans in these early societies resolved conflict and the harm of what would today be called "crimes" sitting in circles using an informal decisionmaking process. This process pursued a peaceful settlement usually involving agreements to "repay" the person(s) harmed and/or their families with goods and services.

## Ancient origins and displacement with state punishment

Ancephalous societies preferred restitution and other reparative and often ritualistic responses to crime. These sought to restore community peace and harmony as an alternative to blood feuds which generally had devastating consequences for community life (Michalowski, 1985). In addition, the most advanced ancient state societies—those in Egypt, Babylon, China, Persia, Rome, Greece, as well as Hebrew, and Anglo-Saxon societies—featured formal codes that specified various forms of reparation (including precise monetary amounts and goods and services) as a means of social exchange by which an offending party was required to make amends to the person harmed and/or his family for virtually all forms of crime, including murder, rape and violent assault (Cook, 1983; Farazmand, 2001; Frye, 1975; Olmstead, 1948; Van Ness and Strong, 1997, 2001). Of these historical examples, the "Universal Law of Darius the Great," borne out of the comprehensive administrative and justice administration circa 520 BC, for the first time in history extended the laws of the Courts (that characterized those of Egypt and Babylon) to the far flung corners of the vast realm of the "first world-state Empire of Achaemenid Persia (550–330 BC), from India and Central Asia to North Africa and Southern Europe. Persian Laws covered "all peoples of the Empire," with judges making no distinction between Persians and non-Persians. "Restorative justice" was a key to a community-based

and balanced justice "administrative system", that was one of the central components of education in ancient Persia preparing new generations of leaders and public civil servants with high standards of ethics and justice in legal administration (for more details on these points, see Cook, 1983; Farazmand, 2001; Frye, 1975; Herodotus, 1972; Olmstead, 1948). According to the ancient Greek historian Herodotus (1972), "Persian judges and justice system do not discriminate, and they balance faults against services" (Herodotus, 1998). "I also admire the custom which forbids even the king himself to put a man to death for a single offence, and any Persian under similar circumstance to punish a servant by an irreparable injury. Their way is to 'balance faults against services,' and then, if the faults are greater and more numerous, anger may take its course."

Despite popular beliefs that the need for punishment is hardwired into humans and substantial evidence of acts of personal vengeance throughout history, these ancient examples suggest that social exchange and the need for reciprocity may be more natural components of the human condition. Indeed, some historians argue that *punishment* was "invented" in Western human societies as an innovation that essentially formalized and to some degree placed limits on personal and family vengeance (Michalowski, 1985; Weitekamp, 1999). In the 10th Century at the time of the Norman invasion in Western Europe, reparation schemes, conflict resolution processes, and informal settlement practices were however, also gradually displaced by fines and other far more severe punishments. As this occurred, William the Conqueror and later feudal lords began to define the obligation of the "offender" to an individual victim or victims as an obligation to the "King" and later the state. In doing so, they consolidated the response to crime and social control through the power of the state and began to view the legal process as one effective tool for centralizing their own political authority. Eventually, anything that violated the "king's peace" was interpreted as an offense against royal authority, and the formerly predominant role of the crime victim and his/her family in bringing a case forward to public authorities, was replaced by public prosecutors (Strang, 2003). As this occurred, the understanding of crime as a victim-offender conflict within the context of community was transformed to an understanding of crime as an offense against the state. Moreover, the emphasis on informal resolution of crime and conflict and settlement by reparation to crime victims was gradually replaced with the emphasis on punishment of the wrongdoer by the state, today referred to as "retributive justice" (e.g., Zehr, 1990).

## Reemergence

Although social exchange as reparation for harm and informal settlements have no doubt persisted in nonadversarial responses to crime throughout Western history, restitution and community service (another reparative sanction) were

rarely used by courts in most of the Western world well into the twentieth century (Schafer, 1970). While these reparative sanctions did not become widely popular even as sentencing alternatives until the 1970s, by the late 1980s, monetary restitution with the support of an increasingly strong crime victims movement was being used with some regularity in U.S. criminal and juvenile courts. The collection and monitoring of restitution, like the development of and follow-up on community service agreements were often administered by probation and/or community diversion programs (Hudson and Galaway, 1990; Schneider, 1986; Umbreit, 1994).

It was not until the 1990s, however, that the informal *decisionmaking processes*—now viewed as the heart of restorative justice practice—began to appear in many forms on most continents. Victim-offender mediation had been used, in addition to arbitration and more formal mediation approaches as alternatives or supplements to court procedures in some jurisdictions since the early 1980s. However, it was only in the past decade that a range of non-adversarial alternative processes, now described generically as "restorative group conferencing" models, emerged on the international scene as part of a new paradigm for justice decisionmaking (Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). In addition to an explosion in international policymaking that created statutes or administrative rules that mandated or encouraged use of these decisionmaking processes (often through presumptive guidelines), the United Nations also developed a Working Group on Restorative Justice and sought to promote wider application of restorative practices in criminal justice as well as peace-making efforts. This group also began to define restorative justice practice and provide standards for use in various contexts (Van Ness and Strong, 2001; Helmick and Petersen, 2001).

Because criminal justice agencies as organizations are by their very nature among the least open to innovation, it is somewhat surprising nonetheless that they played a lead role in promoting restorative justice reform in some instances. This unexpected leadership in the U.S. came from advocates of what became known in the Clinton administration (under Attorney General Janet Reno's direction) as a "community justice" policy emphasis. Building initially on a strong and somewhat groundbreaking vision of community policing (e.g., Sparrow et al., 1990; Kelling and Moore, 1998), this new policy focus was to some degree trivialized as means of funding local police, prosecution, courts, and defenders to relocate or "outpost" services in neighborhoods, while also changing the flexibility and "user-friendliness" of these services.[3] Yet, while the term community justice no doubt helped criminal justice practitioners in some jurisdictions conceptualize and communicate restorative justice ideas to diverse constituencies (Maloney and Holcomb, 2001; Clear and Karp, 1999), what was often a singular focus on decentralization of services unfortunately failed to challenge and change the way the system addressed incidents of crime and harm.

Despite this narrowing of what was envisioned as a broader reform agenda, an emerging, more holistic, normative theory around this movement by the late

1990s seemed to call for a much needed transfer of responsibility, resources and skills to neighbors and neighborhood groups (O'Brien and Bazemore, 2004; e.g., Clear and Karp, 1999; see also, Harris, 2004). This vision centered around a basic definition of community justice not so much as new *programs* in the community, but as "all justice activities that explicitly include the community in their processes…[and are] rooted in the actions that citizens, community organizations, and the criminal justice system can take to control crime and social disorder (Clear and Karp, 1999, p. 25)." Moreover, the broader agenda of community justice included a commitment to "problem-solving rather than individual case processing system", and a systemic focus on neighborhood concerns and collective *outcomes* (Clear and Karp, 1999). What remained, however, was precisely this need for a different way of responding to cases using a distinctive process in pursuit of outcomes other than punishment and offender change.

Today, in 2005, the restorative justice movement is more visible than ever and has the appearance of a reform effort that, though still in its early stages, has potential for continued growth and impact. Practically, however, restorative policy and practice face the challenge of sustainability. We suggest that even relative permanency is dependent upon the ability of restorative justice advocates to introduce and establish restorative practices in institutions *outside* the criminal justice system. To understand the rationale behind this view, it is first important to understand why restorative justice suddenly became popular when it did. That is, it is necessary to explore what needs were being met by these practices, and why this international, almost spontaneous momentum around them by the mid-1990s appeared to have many of the characteristics of a social movement (Braithwaite, 2004; Sherman, 2003; Helmick and Petersen, 2001; O'Brien, 2000). A number of questions remain about the reasons for what some might view as the unlikely rise in popularity of restorative justice at this time.

### Why now? The communitarian factor

Commitment to ideas, policies and practices is often cyclical. Industrialized societies experience what appear to be pendulum swings in support of increased punishment followed by demands for more rehabilitative (or simply less punitive) approaches to crime and justice (Bohm and Haley, 2005). It is possible therefore that the not-so-distant epidemic of prison building in response to perceived increases in crime and violence would inevitably be met with a strong counter-response. Such a pendulum swing could, however, have favored almost any other solution (e.g., a return to a rehabilitative focus), including many that had nothing in common with restorative justice. While the rapid expansion of prison building did not reduce, and may have even increased crime rates in some communities (Fagan et al., 2004), it might, however, have just as easily led more people to believe that this approach was responsible for what was an overall decline in violent crime. Clearly, the idea of a pendulum swing seems

inadequate to explain the sudden rise in interest and support for something as different and unfamiliar as restorative justice.

### Innovation and cultural change: Experiential learning and lifestyle change

An additional part of the story of the monkey Imo and the spread of the practice of potato washing suggests that it is not only the utility and need met by a dramatic change in routine behavior that causes the spread of a social phenomenon. The case study is actually referred to as "the *hundredth* monkey" story because, according to most accounts, the washing of potatoes went on for some time before an exponential affect was felt. That is, it was not until the "hundredth monkey" started to wash its food that the practice became commonplace on other islands (Keyes, 1982). A "social epidemic" does not reach its zenith until a cultural shift occurs (Gladwell, 2001). Like many other social phenomena, the rise of restorative justice may be understood as an "idea, whose time has come," the right concept for the right time. However, the idea of an epidemic seems to suggest that the spread of a behavior across distances, disciplines, and cultures is based in part on the prevalence of adoption of such behavior. In addition, when certain conditions are not present, even the best ideas are unsuccessful and remain irrelevant and presumably undiscovered.

This concept of a "cultural shift" may be used to describe what may be a slow, even glacial process of transformation in values. Yet, such a process may be at times spontaneous, powerful and unrelenting when it reaches what has recently been referred to as a "tipping point" (Gladwell, 2000). Such a shift is just as relevant within the very agencies that have delivered traditional services to offenders, victims, and the general public. Culture and custom are compelling influential forces that bring about predictability and security in social organizations (Carey, 2001; Schein, 2004). Change of culture can be threatening or at least anxiety producing, yet certain conditions, when present, are more likely to assist the change process.

When one examines the change process in bureaucratic agencies, most often this change is either embraced because it is an opportunity that the majority of members think would benefit them personally or improve the services they are employed to deliver. Change is also often motivated by a high level of frustration or confusion resulting in a desire for a better work environment (Carey, 2001). Change that is most permanent typically results from a "bottom-up" reform process whereby individuals in an agency voluntarily adopt the change as a better or more coherent way to conduct business that is also expected ultimately to achieve better *outcomes*. It is usually not forced, but is often participatory, inclusive, cooperative, respectful, and rewarding in itself. In other words, the change process embraces the very values of a restorative process.

Individuals choose to adopt the value structure, to promote the ideals that it embraces, and to change their behavior to reflect restorative justice principles. Rather than a "how-to" set of instructions, restorative justice reformers adopt a "mind-set," a way of thinking about the consequences of crime and the parties it harms. They then begin to act in a different way guided by an understanding of emotional impacts, the deterioration of relationships, and the desire for restoration and healing.

Yet, for this to occur, broader motivations may be necessary. Beyond the boundaries of criminal justice, and other organizations, larger community forces may also become a primary catalyst for change. One such force and motivation is a fear or at least concern that something important may be at stake unless steps toward the change in focus are taken. Specifically, as the social capital literature has begun to document (e.g., Putnam, 2000), there may be a fear or concern about a loss of coherence in community life, a weakening in relationships with other community members, or a decline in collective conflict resolution skills. In general, this is a sense of wanting to preserve something in community life—in social relationships and networks of relationships—that appears to be slipping away.

## Reclaiming conflict and building community

The 100th monkey story, the idea of tipping points, and other conceptualizations for improving understanding of the rise of social movements may help to describe the synergy needed to spark an apparently simultaneous international rise in interest in restorative justice. It is also important, however, to consider somewhat more rational and empirically grounded explanations. One compelling basis for explanation is tied to broader trends, even and perhaps especially, globalization and the various international reactions and adaptations to problems generally associated with its influence (Farazmand, 1999, 2004). In this case, the specific problem is the implications of these broader macro-economic changes for community life and civil society.

Indeed, perhaps the most apparent reason for the rise in interest in more informal and less adversarial, community-based responses to crime and conflict grounded in restorative principles is most likely a reaction to a growing anxiety that formal systems seem out of touch with community needs. Justice systems have expanded their scope of authority and control while formalizing the response to many behaviors once addressed by informal means. The rise of zero tolerance codes of conduct and the criminalization of disciplinary violations once addressed within schools has, for example, led to an influx of cases into juvenile courts and other juvenile justice agencies (Stinchcomb et al., 2006).

Though popular accounts often rightly blame the expansion of a "culture of litigation" for many of these problems (Glendon, 1991), it seems at least equally likely that *both* criminal justice boundary expansion and the growth in litigation as

a generic solution may be outcomes of a decline in community level private and parochial social control (Hunter, 1985). In addition, communities that lack participatory conflict resolution mechanisms, must therefore rely primarily or exclusively on more rigid, rule-based, punitive discipline and/or "point system" reward/punishment regimes imposed by authorities. Unfortunately, such approaches feed upon themselves, and as is often the case in neighborhoods where formal criminal justice and social service systems provide most of the social control that exists, these systems may experience a continued weakening in existing informal controls and supports. Ironically, this deterioration in capacity may also be a *result* of a criminal justice *expansionism* (Harcourt, 2001; Fagan et al., 2004) that has enhanced formal justice control and, to some extent, expanded the mandate of social service agencies (Rose and Clear, 1998; McKnight, 1995; Bazemore et al., 2004). As Clear and Karp (1999) observe:

> When agents of the state become the key problem solvers, they might be filling a void in community; but just as in interpersonal relationships, so in community functioning, once a function is being performed by one party it becomes unnecessary for another to take it on ... parents expect police or schools to control their children; neighbors expect police to prevent late night noise from people on their street; and citizens expect the courts to resolve disputes … informal control systems may atrophy like dormant muscles, and citizens may come to see the formal system as existing to mediate all conflicts (p. 38).

The turn toward restorative justice may therefore be viewed as a response of desperation among some community members and groups to the realization that they are losing something important. Specifically, they have experienced a decline in their capacity as parents, neighbors, teachers, faith community members, and members of other networks of civil society to socialize young people and respond effectively to crime and conflict. This apparent decline in the skills needed to exercise informal social control and our increasing willingness and need to call "experts" to address problems previous generations addressed informally, presents a clear challenge. Specifically, in maintaining the status quo, communities perpetuate a deskilling process that in turn demands an expansion of criminal justice and related social service resources (McKnight, 1995). The *opportunity* presented by this decline is to be found in the growing recognition that this state of affairs is no longer viable (Schorr, 1988, 1997).

## Monkeys, potatoes and conditions for cultural change

When Imo began washing the sweet potato there was no mad rush by all the other primates to do the same. They watched, carefully and with curiosity. Washing food was not normal behavior; this was indeed a countervailing trend.

Eventually, some of the less timid monkeys began to copy the behavior. Social learning theory reminds us that we tend to learn best through role modeling, and we model the behavior of those we best relate to and want to emulate. And, if one enjoys rewards from those behaviors, if it is reinforced positively, then there is increased likelihood that this action will be repeated. In this environment, routine slowly begins to change until it becomes the new routine.

Two general sets of cultural conditions seem necessary for practices to be elevated to a status in which they are perceived to be legitimate and possibly superior. First, new practices must resonate with common experience. Second, proponents must make a compelling enough case for, and demonstrate through practice and experience, the benefits of what may be difficult change in behavior. Though restorative justice practices have apparently always been part of the human experience, they were displaced or at least de-emphasized in Western cultures when emerging nation states consolidated authority (in other cultures these practices are only one or two generations removed). The first cultural condition would suggest the need for natural opportunities to again experience, practice, and learn the behaviors associated with restorative practices. The second cultural condition needed to legitimize restorative practices must then make restorative justice convincing as a new and better way of addressing problems or meeting routine needs that arise in the response to crime and conflict.

*Resonates with common experience*

If Imo had washed the potatoes and a clean potato did not taste any better to any of the other monkeys, it is doubtful that the practice would have flourished. However, a clean potato was presumably more pleasant to the palate and therefore led to the change in behavior. For change to sweep an entire generation, it requires that the change address a need that is commonly shared. Regarding experiential learning (the first condition), if the second, third, fourth and one hundredth monkeys had not practiced and shared the experience, no change would have occurred.

It is safe to say that everyone has experienced unwelcome conflict at some point in their lives. Most of us have also been victims of crime at some time in their lives, and certainly all have been impacted by crime either through fear, increased security devices or practices, higher insurance premiums, or vicariously through a friend/relative who was directly harmed by crime. Humans share common, negative experiences with crime and harm. Many also have had encounters with the criminal justice system, experiences which for crime victims in particular are typically unsatisfying, unpleasant and even harmful (APPA, 1995; Zehr, 2001) To what degree do we have common positive experiences in dealing with those conflicts?

Regardless of the commitment of citizens and community groups to restorative justice, it is mainstream criminal justice decisionmakers who, because of

their position of authority and training within traditional adversarial systems grounded in punishment and control, might be expected to be most resistant to restorative justice reforms. As with most of their fellow community members, however, it is direct experience that is most essential to change the perspective and behavior of these decisionmakers. A judge in a medium-sized city near Minneapolis, Minnesota, for example, was on a committee charged with considering how to improve the local justice system. She was a participant in numerous discussions on how restorative practices were making a difference in individual lives. While she understood this intellectually and seemed generally supportive, restorative process did not resonate with her emotionally or experientially. After months of examining outcomes for restorative practices being used in her community and hearing success stories second-hand, she decided to participate as a community member in a family group conference involving a case that had been diverted from her court. By the time she left the meeting that evening, the judge had a totally different understanding, and commitment, to practices that seemed to challenge the very essence of courtroom decisionmaking.

Returning to the courthouse the following day, she concluded: "I have been a judge for seven years. Never in all of my seven years have I ever had an offender or victim leave my courtroom as fulfilled or feeling as positive and hopeful as what happened at the conferencing meeting. We have to change the way we handle cases." The only thing that was different for this judge from the day before she attended the family group conference was that she had participated in a new form of conflict resolution that resonated with her human experience. To the extent that restorative justice resonates with our common human experience, the more likely it will be that a cultural shift will occur.

Yet, if the restorative process is a natural way of addressing conflict and harm, why have we not embraced this approach sooner? Christie (1977) argues that to explain what happened historically in the displacement of ancient restorative practices (500 years ago in European civilizations and more recently in most other cultures), it is important to understand conflict as the "personal property" of those involved in the conflict. The gradual professionalization of the response to crime whereby paid experts—police, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, and other criminal justice agents—began to assume responsibility for this response can therefore be viewed as a "theft" of conflict that denied the parties ownership of the process and the resolution. However, this transfer of responsibility also took away the need to develop and maintain skills to deal with harm and other conflicts in the future, and created the expectation that others would play this role. This process itself gradually produced a change in lifestyle and ultimately addressed an unmet collective need that was itself grounded in common experience. Because emerging cities and townships were finding it difficult to apprehend and prosecute offenders by relying only on crime victims and their families to bring a case to justice, the office of the public prosecutor was created to serve this function (Strang, 2003).

In recent decades, a growing number of those who have been victimized by crime, and then had the *common experience* of having their voices "stolen" by prosecutors and other criminal justice professionals are now demanding input and ownership. As part of the vanguard of an international crime victims movement (e.g., Strang, 2003), victims are returning to the table to tell their stories and becoming active parties in the resolution of the crime and in the healing process. They are experiencing what it is like to have input both in the formal criminal justice process, and in a host of less formal settings including those involving employer/co-worker conflict, neighborhood disputes or classroom bullying. In the end, just as potatoes tasted better to the Koshima monkeys, restorative justice practices should *feel* more effective, if not always more comfortable, to participants than mainstream alternatives such as court. In this regard, it could be said that this common experience of personal involvement in conflict resolution, indeed in peacemaking, is the core idea whose time has come.

*Changes a way of life*

Cultural and structural changes implicit in the movement toward a radically new behavior such as washing food (or restorative justice decisionmaking) present a daunting reform agenda. However, simple new insights and experience with new practices can have almost immediate profound impact as one change leads naturally to another innovation. After discovering how water could make their food taste better, the Koshima monkeys soon also realized that the vast sea was a precious resource that could be manipulated for other purposes. After learning to wash potatoes, for example, the monkeys began to use the water to wash wheat, which led to bathing and ultimately to the expansion of their food source to sea plants.

In like manner, new innovations in restorative practices have emerged in diverse cultural and regional settings without apparent contact between the practitioners and those in other parts of the world in part because of adaptation of robust and highly resilient principles to a wide range of problems and contexts (Braithwaite, 2002). Education and training across communities, continents, and organizational contexts has employed different words and strategies to describe similar concepts and practices. Yet, when those involved in the process later encountered others from different cultures, communities, and disciplines, they discovered commonalities in their work and then borrowed and refined techniques based on new insights. This cross-cultural learning and adaptation was moreover facilitated by the fact that restorative justice proponents shared a sense that they were no longer limited by the boundaries and procedures of mainstream criminal justice systems.

After Imo washed her potatoes and found the difference in taste pleasing, she voluntarily adopted a new way of life. Imo was a young monkey, only eighteen months old. While fifteen of the nineteen young monkeys aged two to seven

years of age started washing their potatoes and similarly adopted a permanent life change, only two of the eleven adults did the same. The older generation generally clung to their old behavior. New practices may not necessarily become commonplace, and will certainly not be sustainable, until younger generations gain formal and informal power and the next generation matures with these new habits.

Perhaps the most compelling story about the potential for restorative justice practices to produce fundamental change in a way of life of young Homo sapiens once they meet the cultural condition of a high level of experiential involvement in a community context was told by a Minnesota school administrator. Having brought restorative justice training to several elementary, middle and high schools in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area for the primary purpose of addressing disciplinary issues in a way that avoided suspension (Stinchcomb et al., 2006), she was informed by several teachers that they had begun adapting restorative techniques on a daily basis for use in resolving student conflict and faculty disputes. Peacemaking circle processes were the practices teachers found most useful in addressing these diverse issues in several schools—helping students and teachers deal with day-to-day concerns as well as conflict and discipline—by "giving everyone a voice" in addressing the problem. One day, while supervising the playground during recess, a five year old girl came running up to the administrator flushed with excitement, "Can I please, please have a talking piece," she asked holding out her hand impatiently while waiting to receive the object that would be passed around the circle to manage dialogue by allowing each young participant to speak without being interrupted while he or she held the object in their hand. The school administrator withdrew a fluorescent, plastic dinosaur from her pocket and handed it to the kindergartner. The girl grabbed the piece without another word and ran back to her group of peers on the other end of the playground. She then directed each student to sit on the grass in a circle at which point she began the restorative peacemaking process to address a playground conflict between several of the kindergarten group that began with an argument and scuffle about use of swing sets.

While this application of a restorative process may seem trivial, examples like this one provide the promise of cultural change in a way of life that seems to grow naturally from the repeated experience with restorative justice practice. When the youngest generations adopt and skillfully apply conflict resolution techniques routinely and with less effort than it takes them to learn to spell or complete simple math problems, there is the opportunity for all of us to learn a new way of life.

**Organizational importance and the criminal justice context**

Although it was anxiety about rising crime rates, youth violence and crime, and family violence in the 1990s that prompted development of much current criminal

and juvenile justice policy in the Western world (Walgrave, 2004), the complexity of these problems suggests a need for a broader inter-organizational and inter-disciplinary response than what is generally associated with criminal justice agencies. Indeed, problems ultimately associated with a decline in civil society impact child welfare, mental health, education, substance abuse control and prevention, and public health systems. These problems in turn, ultimately rely for their resolution on community-based networks of resistance to crime, violence, and other harmful behavior (e.g., substance abuse), that themselves demand a transformation in organizational agendas. Thus, while the "silo" mentality that has characterized these organizations and systems remains, these systems and organizations must be part of the solution. The community, or *loss-of-community*, theme discussed in the previous section resonates across organizational system boundaries and requires both intra-organizational and systemic transformation. At times, this theme has become the basis for consensus and collaboration at least around common root causes of social problems.

**Beyond agency silos and programs**

As previously suggested, common solutions centered on restorative justice principles are beginning to create synergy in multiple agency contexts. As one example, restorative group conferences, that feature one or more consensus-based nonadversarial decisionmaking processes in response to conflict and crime, often look essentially the same whether initially aimed at problems that surface in child welfare, workplace regulation, school discipline, criminal justice and other contexts (Braithwaite, 2002). Essentially, regardless of agency jurisdiction or mandate, restorative practices share an effort to: address harm, resolve conflict, and to the greatest extent possible rebuild and strengthen both trust and relationships. Generally, regardless of the organizational context, and despite the growing adversarial emphasis that has taken hold in the governance of these organizations, they share a commitment to a fair and just process, and to "doing justice" by healing and meeting multiple stakeholder needs.

   The challenge presented to organizational proponents of these practices is to break out of programmatic boxes. Restorative justice in its first decade of implementation was focused almost exclusively on promoting a different response to individual cases that would, as previously described, engage victim and offender as primary stakeholders in a response that sought to heal or repair harm rather simply punish or treat the offender (Galaway, 1984; Umbreit and Coates, 1994). This primary commitment to individual stakeholder (victim and offender) needs, and often explicit disinterest in system needs, remains appropriate as a value-based hallmark of restorative justice as a nonadversarial response that shifts the focus to those most directly impacted by crime and harm. By itself, however, the commitment to the needs of individual stakeholders

as a *sole* focus places limits on the sustainability of restorative justice as a holistic and reform model capable of addressing systemic problems and collective needs.[4] Restorative justice practitioners have in recent years therefore become more neighborhood and community focused (e.g., Rodriguez, 2004). A growing number of programs and policies also now emphasize community empowerment, skill development, and capacity-building as explicit intervention objectives (Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). At a minimum, this emphasis seems to be slowly addressing a weakness that remains in restorative justice practice—a processing modality in which cases are referred to a centralized location in large cities or counties and then resolved in restorative programs that have been essentially extracted from their neighborhood, or other relevant community sources of support and social control (Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). This centralized processing creates obstacles to representing the interests of these communities or benefiting from their input in any meaningful way.

### The new "communities" in new organizations

Perhaps more important than a general neighborhood-based intervention focus, has been an emerging, broader understanding of community in restorative justice practice. Specifically, restorative justice practitioners have most often generally employed a flexible definition of community as not necessarily, or not only, "a place" (McCold, 1996; see Boyes-Watson, this issue). From this perspective, community is "where you find it," including in its often most important form, the micro "community of care" around the victim and offender. Recently, an emerging conceptualization of housing projects, schools, work places, residential correctional or treatment facilities, churches, mosques, and synagogues, sports teams, and youth development centers as "communities" has also become apparent in restorative justice practice. This new conceptualization in part builds upon a growing view of certain organizations as "instrumental communities" that exist to meet some specific need— educational, civic, safety, and rehabilitative—where length of residence is temporary, not necessarily voluntary, and generally clearly defined at the upper limit by policy or statute (Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). Similar to what Bellah et al. (1991) call "mediating institutions" these organization-based, instrumental communities at their best play a vital role in socializing youth, establishing normative standards, and shaping character.

   Like neighborhoods and other more traditional community entities, such as faith communities and civic organizations, these instrumental communities can be molded in a way that may have potentially positive or negative individual and collective impacts. The instrumental community of young offenders living together in a secure residential treatment facility, along with staff and other professionals who work inside the facility, for example, shares many character-

istics of any other more permanent residential community where members live by choice. Often, like some communities on the outside, such instrumental communities, though designed with the intent of rehabilitation and public protection, can be dysfunctional or even criminogenic. Similarly, high schools, like their institutional counterparts, are capable of operating in a fashion similar to the most secure prison, where residents (or students) may be generally protected from each other, but have little opportunity for personal decision-making or exercising control over their own lives. Just as even safe prisons often fail to prepare offenders for life in free society, and highly secure gated communities remove the need to learn to build relationships with one's neighbors, even apparently safe schools may also fail to teach students to live productively in peaceful interaction with others.

Schools and even residential treatment facilities can, on the other hand, operate as restorative environments where members take responsibility to repair harm when it occurs, hold each other accountable, and build skills in collective problem-solving (Karp and Breslin, 2001; Morrison et al., this issue). In such environments, collective values of prosocial behavior are learned primarily through modeling, conflict resolution, and mutual support. As is apparent in the criminological literature on neighborhoods and crime (Bursik and Grasmick, 1993; Sampson, 1999, 2000), the instrumental community of the high school or middle school may also lack mechanisms of informal social control, which encourage residents to honor and help to enforce group behavioral norms, as well as processes for resolving conflict peacefully. Communities in organizations that lack participatory conflict resolution mechanisms, must therefore rely primarily or exclusively on more rigid, rule-based punitive discipline or point system reward regimes imposed by authorities. Unfortunately, such approaches feed upon themselves, and as is often the case in neighborhoods where criminal justice and social service systems (or gates and security guards) provide most of the social control that exists, these systems may experience a continued weakening in informal controls and supports.

Any agency delivering services to offenders and victims based on a restorative justice vision and mission must either have an organizational culture consistent with restorative justice or it must be willing to adopt similar principles. Without such an alignment in values, members of the organization will view these reforms as hypocritical, reducing their desire to invest time and resources in what should be a dramatic transformation in leadership and management approaches, job descriptions, performance objectives, and practice priorities (McLeod, 2003). Criminal justice organizations driven by rules and an authority/punishment orientation will find a restorative change process a challenge (Carey, 2001). Just as a societal cultural shift takes time, as well as awareness of "tipping point" opportunities for dramatic shifts in policy priorities, an organizational transition is a long-term process that also requires an intentional focus on similar opportunities for exploiting incidents of healing and resolution as "teaching moments" that provide direction and motivation for staff. Most importantly, the change pro-

cess itself must reflect restorative values – and teach through modeling – restorative justice problem-solving principles (McLeod, 2003).

**Summary and conclusion**

We have attempted in this paper to define and describe restorative justice practice and policy, and most importantly, to describe and attempt to account for the rise of an international movement around this justice reform model that began in the 1990s. While the question of "why now" is a complicated one, we have argued that a common experience with a loss of community and the collective skills and relationships implied in terms like social capital (Putnam, 2000) may be one primary reason for this dramatic questioning of traditional criminal justice paradigms. Finally, we have argued that restorative justice practice appears to be increasingly rooted in organizations that represent "community" in its instrumental sense. These organizational community entities moreover may be the critical factor in the sustainability of restorative practices.

   As noted in the introduction, the other contributions to this special issue of POR all focus directly or indirectly on an instrumental community in which restorative justice has direct implications for building community/organizational capacity for addressing conflict and harm relying primarily on the resources of members of these communities (e.g., students, delinquent youth) and professional staff. Though restorative practice remains directed at providing a more effective, nonadversarial way of resolving a variety of crimes and harms, involving persons of all ages as offenders and victims or parties in a conflict, it is no accident that the papers in this issue are focused primarily on youth and young people as victims and offenders. As we have suggested in this contribution, this is due in part to what may be viewed as a generational crisis manifested in the decline in skills and willingness of adults to intervene to exercise appropriate controls and support for children and adolescents (Sampson et al., 1997; Putnam, 2000).

   While each contribution features a description and consideration of the utility, potential and challenges for restorative justice practice to address the needs of victims and offenders and resolve conflict, each is also linked to the common theme of the emerging crisis associated with a breakdown in informal controls in a declining civil society. Restorative justice is no "magic bullet" for these problems, and while we have attempted to paint a hopeful picture to promote understanding among those who are unaware to these practices, we ourselves are concerned about many problems raised by critics including some of the authors of the contributions in this special issue (see also for summaries Braithwaite, 2002; Bazemore and Schiff, 2004). However, to the extent that restorative justice practice builds the relationships, trust and social support needed to strengthen and mobilize community member skills in repairing harm, it has important implications for safer, more peaceful communities through

organizational reform. We leave the implementation dynamics of organizational change and the leadership challenges associated with finding a "fit" for such practices in modern instrumental organizational communities for consideration in future issues of this journal and elsewhere.

## Notes

1. Community service, for example, was viewed as a potential substitute punishment which could be used as an alternative to jail, with the objective of punishing the offender through work obligations rather than repairing harm (McDonald, 1986; Hudson and Galaway, 1989). Mediation generally, and the more specifically restorative practice of victim-offender mediation (Umbreit, 1999) were seen as marginal alternative programs associated with small, often faith-based programs or as a means of determining restitution orders (Schneider, 1986).
2. Indeed, the focus of the papers in this issue on schools, universities, community based youth development organizations, families and extended families contextualizes what criminal justice systems typically take *out* of context in their centralized case processing models.
3. Community justice has not been apparent internationally as a movement, though programmatic and conceptual components appear to have found their way into legislation in the U.K and Canada. Programmatically, community policing rapidly became popular in a variety of countries, with some experimentation with community courts. However, community justice has not been identified as an international movement in the same way that restorative justice has.
4. Following the New Zealand experience with systemic juvenile justice reform, restorative justice advocates in other countries including the UK, Australia and the U.S. have developed more holistic reform models that articulate new values and missions and articulate new performance outcomes, job descriptions, and incentive structures consistent with restorative practices and policies (e.g., OJJDP, 1998).

## References

American Probation and Parole Association. (1995). *Probation and Parole: A Handbook for Crime Victims*. Lexington, KY: American Probation and Parole Association.

Bazemore, G. (1998). "Restorative Justice and Earned Redemption: Communities, Victims and Offender Reintegration." *American Behavioral Scientist* 41(6), 768–813.

Bazemore, G. (1999). "The Fork in the Road to Juvenile Court Reform." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science* 564(7), 81–108, July.

Bazemore, G., and M. Schiff. (2004). *Juvenile Justice Reform and Restorative Justice*: *Building Theory and Policy from Practice*. Cullompton, Devon, UK: Willan Publishing, forthcoming.

Bazemore, G., and M. Umbreit. (1995). "Rethinking the Sanctioning Function in Juvenile Court: Retributive or Restorative Responses to Youth Crime." *Crime & Delinquency* 41(3), 296–316.

Bazemore, G., and L. Walgrave. (1999). "Restorative Juvenile Justice: In Search of Fundamentals and an Outline for Systemic Reform." In G. Bazemore and L. Walgrave (eds.), *Restorative Juvenile Justice: Repairing the Harm of Youth Crime*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Bazemore, G., J. Stinchcomb, and L. Leip. (2004). "Scared Smart or Bored Straight? Testing Deterrence Logic in an Evaluation of Police-Led Truancy Intervention." *Justice Quarterly* 21(2), 269.

Bellah, R., R. Madsen, W. Sullivan, A. Swidler, and S. Tipton. (1991). *The Good Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Bolm, R.M., and K.M. Haley. (2005). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Bonta, J., S. Wallace-Capretta, J. Rooney, and K. Mackanoy. (2002). "An Outcome Evaluation of a Restorative Justice Alternative to Incarceration." *Contemporary Justice Review* 5(4), 319–338.

Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Braithwaite, J. (1994). "Thinking Harder about Democratizing Social Control." In C. Alder and J. Wundersitz (eds.), *Family Group Conferencing in Juvenile Justice: The way forward or misplaced optimism?* Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Braithwaite, J., and S. Mugford. (1994). "Conditions of Successful Reintegration Ceremonies: Dealing with Juvenile Offenders." *British Journal of Criminology* 34(2), 139–171.

Braithwaite, J., and P. Petit. (1990). *Not Just Desserts: A Republican Theory of Criminal Justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bursik, R.J., and G. Grasmick. (1993). *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimension of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington Books.

Butts, J., and H. Snyder. (1991). *Restitution and Juvenile Recidivism*. Monograph. Pittsburgh, PA: National Center for Juvenile Justice.

Carey, M. (2001). "Infancy, Adolescence, and Restorative Justice: Strategies for Promoting Organizational Reform." In G. Bazemore and M. Schiff (eds.), *Restorative Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.

Christie, N. (1977). "Conflict as Property." *British Journal of Criminology* 17(1), 1–15.

Clear, T., and D. Karp. (1999). *The Community Justice Ideal: Preventing Crime and Achieving Justice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cook, J.M. (1983). *The Persian Empire*. New York: Schoken.

Etzioni, A. (1996). "The Responsive Community: A Communitarian Perspective." *American Sociological Review* 61(1), 1–12.

Fagan, J.J., V. West, and J. Holland. (2004). "Neighborhoods, Crime, and Incarceration in New York City." *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 36(1), 71–108.

Farazmand, A. (1999). "Globalization and Public Administration." *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal* 59(6), 509–522.

Farazmand, A. (2001). Learning from Persia: Administrative Legacies of Persian World-State Achaemenid Empire." In A. Farazmand (ed.), *Handbook of Comprative and Development Public Administration*, 2nd ed., revised and expanded inot 76 chapters. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., pp. 33–60.

Farazmand, A. (2004). "Globalization and Governance: A Theoretical Analysis." In A. Farazmand (ed.), *Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovations*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Frye, Richard. (1975). *The Golden Age of Persia*. New York: Harper & Row.

Galaway, B. (1984). "Victim Participation in the Penal-Corrective Process." (*Proceedings of the Third International Institute on Victimology*, Lisbon, Portugal, Nov. 11–17, 1984). *Victimology* 10. 1–4 (Wtr-Fall 1985), 617–630.

Galaway, B., and J. Hudson. (1990). "Community Service: Toward Program Definition." *Federal Probation* 54(2), 3–9.

Gladwell, M. (2000). *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Glendon, A. (1991). *Rights Talk: The Impoverishment of Political Discourse*. Harvard, MA: Free Press.

Harcourt, B.E. (2001). *Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Window Policing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Harris, M. (2004). "An Expansive, Transformative View of Restorative Justice." *Contemporary Justice Review* 7(1), 117–143.

Helmick, R.G., and R.L. Petersen. (2001). *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy and Conflict Transformation*. Philadelphia: Templeton Foundation Press.

Herodotus. (1972). *The Histories*. Revised edition. New York: Penguin Books.

Hunter, A.J. (1985). "Private, Parochial and Public Social Orders: The Problem of Crime and Incivility in Urban Communities." In G.D. Suttles and M.N. Zald (eds.), *The Challenge of Social Control: Citizenship and Institution Building in Modern Society*. Norwood, NJ: Aldex Publishing.

Hudson, J., and B. Galaway. (1989). "Financial Restitution: Toward an Evaluable Program Model." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* 31, 1–18.

Karp, D., and B. Breslin. (2001). "Restorative Justice in School Communities." *Youth and Society* 33(2), 249–272.

Kelling, G.L., and C.M. Moore. (1998). "The Evolving Strategy of Policing." *Perspectives on Policing* National Institute of Justice, and the Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Keyes, K., Jr. (1982). *The Hundredth Monkey*. Coos Bay, OR: Vision Books.

Kraft, K., R. Muck, and G. Bazemore. (2001). "COMMON GROUND: Opportunities and Possibilities." *Youth and Society* 33(2), 329–335.

Levitt, S.D., and S.J. Dubner. (2005). *Freakonomics: A Rogue Economist Explores the Hidden Side of Everything*. New York: Morrow.

Maloney, D., and D. Holcomb. (2001). "In Pursuit of Community Justice." *Youth and Society* 33(2) 296–313.

Maloney, D., G. Bazemore, and J. Hudson. (2001). "The End of Probation and the Beginning of Community Corrections." *Perspectives* 4, 23–30, Summer.

Maxwell, G., and A. Morris. (1993). *Family Participation, Cultural Diversity and Victim Involvement in Youth Justice: A New Zealand Experiment*. Wellington, New Zealand: Victoria University.

McCold, P. (1996). "Restorative Justice and the Role of the Community." In B. Galoway and J. Hudson (eds.), *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

McDonald, D. (1986). *Punishment Without Walls: Community Service Sentences in New York City*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

McKnight, J. (1995). *The Careless Society: Community and Its Counterfeits*. New York, NY: Basicbooks.

McLeod, C. (2003). "Toward a Restorative Organization Transforming Police Bureaucracies." *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal* 4(4), 427–441.

Michalowski, R. (1985). *Order, Law and Crime: An Introduction to Criminology*. New York, NY: Random House.

Nugent, W., M. Williams, and M.S. Umbreit. (2003). "Participation in Victim-Offender Mediation and the Prevalence of Subsequent Delinquent Behavior: A Meta-Analysis." *Utah Law Review.*

Pennel, J., and G. Burford. (2000). "Family Group Decision Making: Protecting Children and Women." *Child Welfare* 79(2), 131–158.

Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, NY: Simon and Shuster.

O'Brien, S. (2000). *Restorative Juvenile Justice Policy Development and Implementation Assessment: A National Survey of States*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL: Balanced and Restorative Justice Project, Florida Atlantic University.

O'Brien, S., and G. Bazemore. (2004). "A New Era in Governmental Reform: Realizing Community." *Public Organization Review* 5, 205–219.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1998). *Guide for Implementing the Balanced and Restorative Justice Model*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Olmstead, A. (1948). *The History of the Persian Empire: The Achaemenid Period*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rodriguez, N. (2004). "Restorative Justice, Communities and Delinquency: Whom Do We Reintegrate?" *Criminology and Public Policy* 4, 103–130.

Rose, D., and T. Clear. (1998). "Incarceration, Social Capital and Crime: Implications for Social Disorganization Theory." *Criminology* 36(3), 471–479.

Sampson, R. (1999). "What 'Community' Supplies." In W.J. Dickens and W.T. Dickens (eds.), *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Washington, DC: Bookings Institution Press.

Sampson, R., S. Raudenbush, and F. Earls. (1997). "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multi-Level Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science Magazine* 77(4), 918–924.

Schafer, S. (1970). *Compensation and Restitution to Victims of Crime*. Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith.

Schein, E. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. New York, NY: Wiley Publishers.

Schneider, A. (1986). "Restitution and Recidivism Rates of Juvenile Offenders: Results from Four Experimental Studies." *Criminology* 24, 533–552.

Schorr, L.B. (1988). *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage*. New York: Doubleday.

Schorr, L.B. (1997). *Common Purpose: Strengthening Families and Neighborhoods to Rebuild America*. New York: Anchor.

Sherman, L. (2003). "Reason for Emotion: Reinventing Justice with Theories, Innovations, and Research: The American Society of Criminology Presidential Address." *Criminology* 41(1), 1–38.

Sparrow, M., M. Moore, and D. Kennedy. (1990). *Beyond 911*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Stinchcomb, J., G. Bazemore and N. Riestenberg. (2006). *"Beyond Zero Tolerance: Restoring Justice in Secondary Schools*." Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 4(2) (forthcoming).

Strang, H. (2003). *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Stuart, B. (2001). "Guiding Principles for Designing Peacemaking Circles." In G. Bazemore and M. Schiff (eds.), *Restorative and Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

Toews-Shenk, B., and H. Zehr. (2001). "Restorative Justice and Substance Abuse: The Path Ahead." *Youth and Society* 33(2), 314–328, December.

Umbreit, M. (1999). "Avoiding the Marginalization and McDonaldization of Victim Offender Mediation: A Case Study in Moving Toward the Mainstream." In G. Bazemore and L. Walgrave (eds.), *Restoring Juvenile Justice: Repairing the Harm of Youth Crime*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Umbreit, M., and R. Coates. (1994). *Victim Meets Offender: The Impact of Restorative Justice and Mediation*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Van Ness, D., and K.H. Strong. (1997). *Restoring Justice*. Cincinnati OH: Anderson.

Van Ness, D., and K.H. Strong. (2001). *Restoring Justice*, 2nd ed. Cincinnati OH: Anderson.

Von Hirsch, A. (1976). *Doing Justice*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Walgrave, L. (2004). "Youth Crime and Youth Justice: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives." In M. Tonry (ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 31. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Weitekamp, E.G. (1999). "The History of Restorative Justice." In G. Bazemore and L. Walgrave (eds.), *Restorative Juvenile Justice: Repairing the Harm of Youth Crime*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.

Weitekamp, E.G. (2005). "Offending and Victimizations as Interrelated Phenomena: Age-Correlations and Dynamic Sequences Over Time." Plenary Panel Presentation, World Congress of Criminology, Philadelphia, PA, August.

Zehr, H. (1990). *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Zehr, H. (2001). *Transcending: Reflections of Crime Victims*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.

**Gordon Bazemore, Ph.D.**, is Professor of Criminology and Criminal Justice and Director of the Community Justice Institute at Florida Atlantic University. His primary interests include juvenile justice, youth policy, corrections, community policing, and crime victim's issues. He is the author of three books, over 60 journal articles, numerous book chapters, and research monographs on these topics.

**Sandra O'Brien, Ph.D.**, is an Assistant Professor in the Division of Public Affairs and Director of the Institute for Youth and Justice Studies, College of Professional Studies at Florida Gulf Coast University. Her interests include: public policy, juvenile justice, community and restorative justice, and program evaluation.

**Mark Carey, M.S.**, is President of The Carey Group, a criminal justice consulting firm and former Deputy Commissioner of Community and Juvenile Service, Minnesota Department of Corrections with more than 25 years of experience in the corrections field. He is currently President of the American Probation and Parole Association, and is the author of two books and numerous articles on correctional practice.