A More Humane Approach to Addressing the Harm of Criminal Behaviour Starts with Victims*

Tim Chapman[†]

Summary: This paper argues that the critical problems in relation to crime are not the people who commit crimes but the harms that have resulted from the crime, the harms that have caused the crime and the harms that result from inhumane and ineffective ways of addressing crime. Most crime is inhumane because it violates the dignity of human beings, because it can weaken social relations and because victims generally experience it as unjust. The commission and consequences of crime can dehumanise both the victim and the perpetrator. More humane approaches to addressing the harm of criminal behaviour are based on the dignity of the individual, on the solidarity of people supporting each other and on social justice. More humane approaches activate in practical and effective ways people's agency, victims' ability to act to recover from harm and perpetrators' ability to act to redeem themselves. More humane approaches build pro-social relationships that support recovery and desistance from offending. More humane approaches bear witness to and strive to reform abuses of human rights, discrimination and stigmatisation.

Keywords: Humane, victim, community, harm, restorative, criminal justice, relationships.

Introduction

The global economy has harnessed scientific and technological advances to produce goods and services, which have added greatly to many people's standard of living, material comfort and convenience. However, there have also been major negative consequences, including a widening gap between those with power and money and those who struggle to live

† Tim Chapman is a Visiting Lecturer at the Ulster University and current Chairperson of the European Forum for Restorative Justice (email: tj.chapman@ulster.ac.uk).

on a restricted income and are excluded from political influence. This in turn has a negative impact on social stability and cohesion.

The *harm of criminal behaviour* is also being globalised through cybercrime, the drug trade, organised human trafficking, terrorism and hate crime. Ethnic minorities and migrants are stigmatised and subject to greater control by the state authorities, especially the agencies of the criminal justice system, leading to a disproportionate number of foreign prisoners in European prisons.

The modern world, while it offers many material comforts, also creates an underlying sense of insecurity (Bauman, 1989). Social theorists now refer to 'risk society' (Beck, 1992) and to the 'precarity' many people experience (Butler, 2004). Citizens lose the experience of solidarity with others that community and religion offered in the past. They feel threatened by other ethnic groups, often blaming them for their lack of resources, and thus offering opportunities for populist and identity politics.

There is a real danger that the value of the common good is being eroded in modern society. Yet there remains a yearning among many people for social relationships of a more human scale and for a more humane culture.

The focus on the *harm caused by criminal behaviour* signifies that crime is not simply rule-breaking activity that is addressed strategically by a large, expensive professional bureaucracy. It draws attention to how people suffer from its impact. This viewpoint prioritises the lived reality of individual and communal experiences, perspectives, feelings, needs and desires.

Human beings can act both inhumanely and humanely. A more humane approach must not only encourage, develop and support the capacity within people to contribute to the common good but also allow for the expression of society's condemnation of serious harm and the control of people's capacity to act unjustly and to inflict suffering on others.

A fuller expression of humanity would take account of a more complex view in which cultural and social background, personal narratives, identity and relationships interact to influence how individuals make sense of their circumstances and choices. This reality brings into focus not only human agency and relationships but also structural inequality and discrimination requiring a commitment to social justice and human rights. This is essentially about taking the harm

people experience in relation to criminal behaviour seriously and about pressing for reform within criminal justice to ensure that more humane approaches to harm are implemented and sustained.

I will suggest that to transform the way we address the harm of criminal behaviour, we should start with victims' experiences of crime rather than the risks that perpetrators pose. The EU's Directive on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime[1] and the Criminal Justice (Victims of Crime) Act 2017 offer an opportunity to radically engage once again with the way a society addresses crime.

The harm of criminal behaviour

Generally, people accept that there are rules or norms that regulate behaviour and that, if a person violates these rules, a social reaction in the form of a sanction is appropriate. We cannot ignore the fact that deviance from the norm is performed before a moral audience. Crime is generally experienced as an injustice and those affected expect justice.

When harm occurs, the criminal justice system focuses on the perpetrator – detecting, building a case, prosecuting, sentencing and implementing the sentence. A focus on addressing the harm of criminal behaviour through policy and practice can fundamentally alter the orientation of approaches to crime. Following White's (2007) maxim: the person is not the problem; the problem is the problem. And the problem is harm.

Three parties can be affected as a consequence of criminal behaviour:

1. the person who has been harmed and their family members, friends, etc.
2. the person responsible for harm and their family members, friends, etc.
3. society (both communities on a micro level and the society at large).

People who have been harmed

People who have been victims of crime may report material and physical harms which can be assessed for reparation by the legal system. From a more humane point of view we need to distinguish between the reality of harm and the experience of suffering, which may be emotional,

---

[1] Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of the European Union, 25 October 2012, establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA.

psychological or relational. The suffering caused by the harm of criminal behaviour will be subjective and specific to each individual.

The meaning of the harm caused by criminal behaviour is also mediated by its wrongfulness in that it has no justification in law. For Shklar (1990) injustice is experienced in a very human way, distinct from how the system administers justice. It stimulates powerful, often distressing, emotions particular to the individual. Consequently victims' experiences are personal and specific to the context in which the injustice occurs. Their lives are interrupted and disrupted by an unwelcome experience of harm over which they had no choice and little control (Crossley, 2000). This interruption to a life narrative can cause 'shattered assumptions' (Janoff-Bulman 1992) about living in the world and can have a seriously detrimental effect on the capacity to participate in society. This complex combination of distressing emotions and moral judgements that arise from an injustice will often continue to dominate the victim's thoughts and behaviour long after physical wounds have healed, punishment has been inflicted or compensation received.

The criminal justice system, as a bureaucratic, professional system operating as far as possible under universal principles, strives to address the criminal offence in an impersonal and rational manner. Victims' wish to undo the injustice that they have suffered personally is usually very much at odds with their experience of the criminal justice process, which is bound by rules and procedures.

In some countries there have been improvements, such as the option of victim impact statements and police victim liaison officers. The EU Directive on Victims has required member states to improve services for victims. Nevertheless, many victims continue to experience *secondary victimisation* by the criminal justice system (Dignan, 2005; Laxminarayan *et al.*, 2013; Kunst *et al.*, 2015).

Families of victims may experience a 'ripple' effect from the harm and suffer from distressing emotions arising from their concern for the victim's suffering. Important relationships may be weakened or ended due to changes in the victim's personality, moods and behaviour caused by trauma. A family's standard of living may be adversely affected by the victim's ill health having an impact on employability.

People responsible for harm

From a humane point of view, the risk factors (Farrington, 2007) found to be associated with offending can also be experienced as harmful. Indeed, many offenders have experienced trauma in the past (Ardino, 2011; Foy *et al.*, 2011; Weeks and Widom, 1998). These experiences may interact to reinforce what Maruna (2001) has called 'a condemnation script', inhibiting desistance from harmful behaviour.

A humane approach would recognise the reactions of society and the media (Cohen, 1973) and the criminal justice system to the individual as a significant part of this cycle (Becker, 1963). Social reaction theory states that these reactions often cause stigmatisation leading to *secondary deviance* (Lemert, 1951).

If, as research into desistance has found, the process of desisting from harming others is facilitated by improving social circumstances, attachment to pro-social relationships, maturation, and generating a more positive identity or life narrative, it is clear that social and criminal justice reactions to the perpetrator can have the effect of excluding offenders from the resources that they require, weakening personal relationships, reducing personal responsibility, and reinforcing a commitment to antisocial values and peers.

There is also a ripple effect of harm in relation to perpetrators. Their families may suffer also from stigma and consequent isolation and lack of support. If the main earner is in prison or unable to gain employment, the family's income will be reduced. The absence of a parent can lead to children not thriving and, in many cases, engaging in harmful behaviour themselves.

The impact on society

The *harm of criminal behaviour* can also be experienced by society. Fear of crime (Hale, 1996) is an example of such harm. This fear can be a very concrete emotion at certain times of the day or in specific places or in the vicinity of certain types of people. It can also be more general, a prevailing feeling of anxiety or unease over the problem of crime. Some groups perceive the risk of becoming a victim more than others. They tend to be people who feel less able to cope with the consequences of crime. Often this fear is exaggerated when related to the actual risk. This fear of crime can have concrete effects on people's choices and behaviour. They avoid certain areas, purchase equipment to improve their security and take other preventive measures.

Crime can also be detrimental to social cohesion and the social capital available to members of a community. Intergroup conflict may develop, for example between gangs or between groups of young people and other residents, or between different ethnic groups.

Some communities can be stigmatised as 'hot spots' for crime and this can have an impact on how the rest of society see and act towards residents. Local people can then perceive the police as a force of control rather than protection. More generally people can lose a common belief in a just, stable and moral society (Wenzel *et al.*, 2008; Vidmar, 2000).

What is the impact of these harms on personal and social life?

The harm of criminal behaviour diminishes people's sense of control over their lives and has a negative impact on their self-efficacy (Simantov-Nachlieli *et al.*, 2013). It was the limitation to people's agency or capacity to take action that Arendt (1958) understood through the concept of the irreversibility of a harmful act: the impossibility of undoing past actions once they have been taken.

The irreversibility of an action can lead both victim and perpetrator of harm to be stuck in the consequences of what they have done, as Arendt (1958: 237) writes: 'our capacity to act would, as it were, be confined to one single deed from which we could never recover; we would remain the victims of its consequences forever'.

The shattered assumptions (Janoff-Bulman, 1992) that harm causes in the victim lead to a sense of unpredictability about future events, which disrupts the individual's preferred life narrative. Just like the perpetrator, the victim can be trapped in a narrative of harm, which inhibits each party from moving on and fully engaging in activities that are important to them.

According to Fraser (in Fraser and Honneth, 2003), injustice in relation both to the distribution of resources and to the recognition of the value of people violates the principle of *parity of participation* in society. In conclusion, the harm of criminal behaviour may be defined as the loss or damage of resources and the violation of values that enable both victims and perpetrators and those in relation to them to participate actively in society.

What is distinctive about more humane approaches to harm?

The concept of the *common good* can be traced from ancient Greek philosophy through Catholic social teaching to modern liberal philosophy. It stands in opposition to a life lived purely in the pursuit of personal interest. A just society is one in which people have the opportunities and capacities to participate in society for the common good as they choose. The aim of more humane approaches to addressing the harm of criminal behaviour is to enable people responsible for harm, people who have been harmed and others who have been affected to participate fully in society and to contribute to the common good.

A more humane approach to addressing the harm of criminal behaviour includes all actions designed and delivered with the purpose of preventing or undoing injustices and repairing the individual, relational and social harms that have caused and been caused by criminal behaviour. Such actions should restore the internal and external resources required to participate actively in society.

We have seen that crime harms individuals, relationships and society in general. The values that shape more humane approaches relate to three key areas: the value we place on the individual, the value we place on how individuals relate to each other and the quality of the society we aspire to create. Thus we define 'humane' as that which respects, restores and sustains these values, and 'inhumane' as that which disregards, damages or violates these values.

The dignity of human beings is derived from the value of human life and the potential of people's agency, their ability to choose their actions and be responsible. To be a victim of a crime is to be treated as a means to another's end or to be objectified. This is dehumanising and humiliating. Disrespect can provoke aggression and violence (Gilligan, 1996; Butler and Maruna, 2009). Respect requires a refusal to stereotype, stigmatise, objectify or idealise individuals and a belief that in spite of previous behaviour, people can change.

A more humane approach reinforces solidarity derived from mutual responsibility and reciprocal support. Human beings can only live in relation to others (Levinas, 1969). As a consequence, both actions for the common good and harmful behaviour have a 'ripple effect' beyond those directly responsible and those directly affected. Families, friends, neighbours and communities all have a stake in the harm being dealt with. The criminal justice system's almost exclusive focus on the person

responsible for the harm means that these other parties are mainly ignored and neglected.

Responsibility originates from the demands of living with others (Levinas, 1969). The primacy of relationships explains why human beings consider that norms and their ethical basis are so important. Other people are not only an essential part of our well-being and our capacity to survive and to thrive, but also an imminent threat to our safety and well-being. This reality requires individuals to be socialised in the norms and values of society and to eventually learn to take personal responsibility for acting according to a duty to others.

Inequality in society tends to separate people physically and relationally according to wealth, status, ethnicity and faith. This disconnectedness can lead to moral indifference or the neutralisation of moral responsibility for others (Bauman, 1989). This enables the system to consider the problem of harm as a technical problem that can be solved effectively by technical methods, often involving excluding or separating people. A more humane approach would create opportunities for people to reconnect.

A Jesuit priest named Luigi Taparelli is usually credited with introducing the term 'social justice' in the 19th century. It now forms the basis of international conventions of human rights and many international statements on crime and criminal justice. Social justice refers to the fair and just relations between the individual and society. It involves the redistribution of resources in conditions of inequality and the removal of obstacles to equality of opportunity and full participation in society. Social justice has in recent times focused on the recognition of the value of diversity. Similar approaches can be adopted in relation to the neglect of victims and discrimination against and labelling of offenders.

Criminal justice in the modern era has focused on the value of safety, emphasising public protection, operating on the basis of risk management and measuring its effect through the reduction of reoffending. A shift towards more humane approaches would not abandon these concerns but would place the value of justice at the core of criminal justice.

Rather than seeing individuals as simply products of their genes, their upbringing or their environment, more humane approaches would recognise their capacity to make meaning out of situations and events, to choose their actions, to reflect on the results of these actions and to learn

and to generate new understandings. To have the ability to choose one's actions, not necessarily in the circumstances of one's choosing, and to be responsible for the consequences of one's actions is to be human. The harm of criminal behaviour can disrupt and inhibit this ability. Unfortunately, the response to crime by the system often reinforces this disruption in the lives of both victim and perpetrator of the harm.

More humane approaches should offer opportunities for all parties to take active responsibility for the process of addressing the harm so that they may get on with their lives.

When one acts in such a way as to harm a person unjustly, one has broken a social contract that enables people to go about their lives and societies to function. This breach creates an obligation to make things right with the individual who has been harmed and with society. By fulfilling these obligations (or repaying the debt) one should be reintegrated into society with all its benefits and responsibilities. In this way, the offender is redeemed and forgiven. This is what Bazemore (1998) refers to as 'earned redemption'. Not all perpetrators of harm will be ready or willing to redeem themselves when held accountable. This does not mean that they will never be ready or willing to in the future (Maruna, 2009, 2010).

More humane approaches should offer all parties the opportunity and support to 'signal' that they have transformed themselves or are in the process of transforming themselves (Bushway and Apel, 2012). Desistance from crime (Weaver, 2016) and recovery from trauma (Courtois and Ford, 2012) are relational processes. Both processes involve finding one's place in the world again and moving on in one's life. To do so requires the individual to actively participate in the process, with support and with the recognition of others that change is taking place.

More humane approaches should offer the opportunity and support to repair broken relationships, maintain and strengthen important relationships or build new relationships.

Which theories support more humane approaches?

Reintegrative shaming

John Braithwaite's (1989) theory of reintegrative shame has had a significant influence on restorative justice. Its emphasis on the importance of emotion, responsibility, relationship and reintegration means that it is

compatible with more humane approaches. Its key idea is that the shame should arise naturally from the examination of the harm in the presence of the person who has been harmed and other people significant to the perpetrator. In this way the shame is attached to the act, not to the person, and can lead to genuine remorse and motivation to repair the harm and to desist from further conduct causing harm. The acceptance of the perpetrator and the offer of support by the community on the basis of his/her making good the wrong are critical to this process.

Desistance from crime

Desistance research (Maruna, 2001; Farrall, 2002; McNeill, 2006; Weaver, 2015) is the study of how offenders stop harming people. It is an uneven process of progress and relapse. Three key and overlapping concepts have been identified, each of which resonates with more humane approaches, as follows.

1. *Maturation:* People eventually grow out of criminal behaviour.
2. *Social bonds:* Significant relationships cause the individual to decide that the risks of crime are no longer worth it. The relationship may be intimate, a partner or a child, a new set of pro-social friends, or a job or recreational activity.
3. *Identity transformation:* The individual develops a new, non-criminal narrative. Maruna (2001) distinguishes the 'condemnation script' of the persistent offender from the 'redemption script' of desistance.

Recovery

'Recovery-oriented systems of care' refer to a holistic framework of services and relationships that can support the long-term recovery of people who have suffered harm or trauma. This is clearly relevant to victims. But it is also true that many offenders have suffered trauma in their lives and this may be driving their harmful behaviours, such as addictions.

This means mobilising social support and activating the individual's personal resilience and other psychological resources. It also requires positive living conditions, a safe home, sufficient income, meaningful activities, etc. Support (Courtois and Ford 2015) may include self-help groups, mutual aid and other peer-based care. It also involves under-standing the impact of the harm on families and communities.

The Good Lives Model

The Good Lives Model (GLM) developed by Ward and colleagues (see Ward and Maruna, 2007) is an approach to offender rehabilitation that is responsive to offenders' particular interests, abilities and aspirations. The practice involves making plans with the offender to achieve the 'goods' that are important to the individual. This is based on the premise that people harm others because they lack the internal and external resources necessary to satisfy their values, needs and goals.

Restorative justice

'Restorative justice is an inclusive approach to addressing harm or the risk of harm through engaging all those affected in coming to a common understanding and agreement on how the harm or wrongdoing can be repaired, relationships strengthened and justice achieved' (European Forum for Restorative Justice, 2016).

Restorative justice is distinguished by its focus, its participants and its process of making decisions. Restorative justice entails an encounter or at least communication between those affected by a specific act of harm. Crucially, it involves a process of coming to a common understanding of the harmful act and its consequences and an agreement on what should be done about it.

Restorative justice places harm at the centre and identifies all those with a relationship to the harm: the persons harmed and those close to them, the person responsible for the harm and those close to them, and those affected in society or the community.

The harm creates a real stake in the process of undoing the injustice, repairing the harm, and strengthening relationships. The counter-intuitive aspect of the restorative process is that even though they may hate or fear each other, each party needs the other to have what they have lost or violated restored. The harm may have resulted in material loss. In many cases this is not so important. Existential losses such as safety, respect, justice and control over one's life are often what motivate both parties to engage in this difficult process.

The very human activities of storytelling and dialogue drive the restorative process towards its outcomes. Arendt (1978: 216) wrote of the ability of stories to 'reclaim our human dignity'. Stories represent human beings as actors and sufferers rather than passive victims or objects of others' narrative or theories. Not only does the space to tell one's story in the words and style of one's choosing restore dignity, but it also often

facilitates an emotional and relational connection which can lead to mutually satisfactory outcomes (Wenzel *et al.*, 2008; Black, 1976; Horwitz, 1990; Winkel, 2007; Rossner, 2013; Strang *et al.*, 2006).

Dialogue is a conversation with a centre, not sides (Isaacs, 1999). At its best in a restorative process it connects with our humanity: 'We humanise what is going on in the world and in ourselves only by speaking of it, and in the course of speaking of it we learn to be human' (Arendt, 1968: 25).

This quality of dialogue requires skilful preparation and facilitation to be empowering: 'Power is actualised only where word and deed have not parted company, where words are not empty and deeds are not brutal, where words are not used to veil intentions but to disclose realities, and deeds are not used to violate and destroy but to establish relations and create new realities' (Arendt, 1958: 200).

Blustein (2014: 594) points out that participation in a justice process 'enables victims to move recognition of their moral standing and psychological needs to a more central place in the justice process, something that often does not happen when wrongdoers are subject to criminal prosecutions'. Minow (2000: 243) has observed that the telling of the story by the victim transforms the narrative from one of 'shame and humiliation to a portrayal of dignity and virtue'. Through this the victim regains 'lost worlds and lost selves'.

There has been extensive research into the effects of restorative justice. Restorative processes consistently achieve at least 85% satisfaction among victims (Shapland *et al.*, 2012; Jacobson and Gibbs, 2009; Beckett *et al.*, 2004; Strang, 2002; Strang *et al.*, 2006; Umbreit and Coates, 1993).

Restorative justice reduces further harm. There is considerable empirical work acknowledging the role that restorative justice processes play in lowering reoffending rates. Offenders in restorative programmes are more likely to complete the programmes and less likely to reoffend compared to a control group. A meta-analysis of victim–offender mediation and family group conferencing studies (De Beus and Rodgriguez, 2007) found that family group conferencing had twice the effect on recidivism of traditional justice programmes, and victim–offender mediation had an even larger effect. Another meta-analysis (Latimer *et al* 2005) found that restorative processes were associated with reduced recidivism for both youth and adults. A rigorous study (Shapland *et al.*, 2012) in England found that significantly fewer offences

were committed by those who participated in restorative processes over two years than by those in a control group. This amounted to a 14% reduction in the frequency of offending.

Restorative justice saves money. In the criminal justice system In England, £9 was saved for every £1 spent on restorative justice (Shapland *et al.*, 2012).

How can more humane approaches demonstrate their value?

This article refers to *approaches* rather than *projects, programmes, services, techniques or methods*. 'Approaches' is a more inclusive term and can encompass each of these activities, but is not confined by them. An approach tends to denote an orientation and a movement towards a destination or goal rather than a scientific method or highly developed professional practice. An approach requires action designed to reach a goal. Yet this approach is not described as *more effective*. It is a *more humane approach*, which, as I have explained, places the importance of values at the core.

This is not to say that evidence of effective achievement of outcomes is disregarded. It is important that treating human beings in a humane manner meets real social needs and will yield socially beneficial results. This means that there should be evidence that the approach adopted will be effective in meeting the identified needs or that it is designed in such a way as to ensure that it is possible to assess its effectiveness. The second option allows the opportunity to test an innovative approach.

Research and policy on approaches to the harm caused by crime in modern society are dominated by two perspectives: on the one hand empirical sciences (the observation, description and measurement of crime and its causes and the effectiveness of responses established to address these causes), and on the other hand practical philosophy, values, beliefs and norms which determine how society ought to be and how approaches ought to contribute to such a society.

Ferrara offers a 'third term' as an alternative to either facts or values as a means of understanding the world: 'the force of the example'. He defines exemplarity as 'entities, material or symbolic, that are as they should be, atoms of reconciliation where *is* and *ought* merge and, in so doing, liberate an energy that sparks our imagination' (2008: ix–x). Exemplarity can take two forms: examples of best practices judged on existing criteria and examples of completely new practices, which extend the range of

possibilities open to society. Ferrara argues that the exemplarity of *what is as it should be* accounts for much of the change in the world. Examples 'illuminate new ways of transcending the limitations of what is and expanding the reach of our normative understandings' (2008: 3).

This is what *more humane approaches* seek to achieve – concrete examples, which people can attest to be both real and successful and ultimately to be a satisfying experience of justice. Other dimensions of *humane* can be quantified through measures of efficacy and efficiency:

- reducing the number of people causing harm
- reducing the number of people being harmed
- reducing the number of people being prosecuted
- reducing the number of people being incarcerated
- increasing the number of people improving their educational attainment, gaining employment, and other personal and social circumstances
- increasing the number of people rebuilding relationships with their family or community.

Specific exemplars

What would count as specific exemplars of more humane approaches in Ireland? I would like to conclude with some recommendations.

1. Support schools to challenge the normalisation of violence as a means of dealing with conflict
This can be done through establishing a strong non-violent culture within the school, through staff taking responsibility to be role models in non-violence and through restorative conferences and circles to address violence or the threat of violence when it occurs.

2. Develop victim-initiated restorative processes
The flaw in most restorative processes is that they depend on the perpetrator being identified and being willing to participate in the process. This means that the victim has limited access to reparation and that restorative processes tend to be unbalanced in favour of the offender. Often this results in victim support organisations being sceptical about restorative justice. Victim support agencies could be supported to develop victim-led restorative justice.

3. Support communities to challenge gang violence in their neighbourhoods
This can be modelled on the successful project Operation Ceasefire in Boston. The approach combines three elements:

i.   representatives of the local community expressing their disapproval of the gang members' violence and requesting them to desist and reintegrate within the community
ii. the offer of support to desist and reintegrate from service providers, Probation and Parole Officers, the church and other community groups
iii. a focused deterrence strategy by the police aimed at the most serious offenders to apprehend and prosecute those who carry firearms, to put them on notice that they face certain and serious punishment for carrying illegal firearms.

A simple pre/post comparison (Braga *et al.*, 2001) found a statistically significant decrease in the monthly number of youth homicides in Boston following implementation of Operation Ceasefire. There was a 63% reduction in the average monthly number of youth homicide victims, going from a pre-test mean of 3.5 youth homicides per month to a post-test mean of 1.3 youth homicides per month.

This approach to violence has also been used to address domestic violence successfully in High Point, North Carolina. It could also be used in relation to radicalised violent extremists and other forms of violence.

4. Test a rigorous approach which combines restorative justice with follow-up support based on research into desistance from offending
Restorative justice has consistently been found to reduce reoffending, and desistance research has discovered the processes through which most people eventually desist from offending. There are clear links between the two approaches. For example, the key operating values in restorative processes according to Howard Zehr (2005) – responsibility, relationships and respect – have a clear connection to the key desistance processes, maturation, social bonding and changing one's identity and narrative. These links could be tested in practice to find out if it is possible to support and accelerate desistance.

5. Support the development of the 'moral community'
Christie (1993) describes a 'moral community' in Norway through which politicians, practitioners, journalists and prisoners meet privately on retreat annually. For Christie these meetings encouraged participants to consider what standards of treatment are valid for all human beings, not just for the objectified and stigmatised prisoner.

6. Support work towards building dynamic security (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2015) approaches in prisons
Physical and procedural security arrangements are essential for any prison. But daily interactions between staff and prisoners, the development of positive relationships, fair treatment and concern for prisoners' well-being, and a routine of constructive activities all reduce the risk of discipline problems, conflict and breaches of security. By having positive relationships with prisoners, staff will not only act as positive role models but also be more aware of what is going on generally and with individual prisoners and be enabled to 'nip problems in the bud'.

7. Support the development of the restorative city model
This would provide an opportunity to research the effectiveness of integrating more humane approaches throughout the 'offender pipeline' from prevention to reintegration and co-ordinating a city's resources to achieve this end.

References

Ardino, V. (2011), 'Post-traumatic stress in antisocial youth: a multifaceted reality', in V. Ardino (ed.), *Post-traumatic Syndromes in Children and Adolescents* (pp. 211–229), Chichester, UK: Wiley/Blackwell

Arendt, H. (1958), *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Arendt, H. (1968), *Men in Dark Times*, New York: Harcourt Brace

Arendt, H. (1978), *The Life of the Mind*, San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace

Bauman, Z. (1989), *Modernity and the Holocaust*, Cambridge: Polity

Bazemore, G. (1998), 'Restorative justice and earned redemption: communities, victims, and offender reintegration', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 768–813

Beck, U. (1992), *Risk Society*, London: Sage

Becker, H.S. (1963), *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, New York: The Free Press

Beckett, H., Campbell, C., O'Mahony, D., Jackson, J. and Doak, J. (2004), *Interim Evaluation of the Northern Ireland Youth Conferencing Scheme*, Research and Statistical Bulletin 1/2005, Belfast: Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency

Black, D. (1976), *The Behavior of Law*, San Diego, CA: Plenum Press

Blustein, J.M. (2014), *Forgiveness and Remembrance: Remembering Wrongdoing in Personal and Public Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Braga, A.A., Kennedy, D.M., Waring, E.J. and Piehl, A.M. (2001), 'Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: an evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire', *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 38, pp. 195–225

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

Bushway, S.D. and Apel, R. (2012), 'A perspective on employment-based re-entry programming: training completion as a desistance signal', *Criminology and Public Policy*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 73–86

Butler, J. (2004), *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*, London: Verso

Butler, M. and Maruna, S. (2009), 'The impact of disrespect on prisoners' aggression: outcomes of experimentally inducing violence-supportive cognitions', *Psychology, Crime and Law*, vol. 15, nos 2 & 3, pp. 235–250

Christie, N. (1993), *Crime Control as Industry: Towards Gulags, Western Style?* Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Cohen, S. (1973), *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and Rockers*, London: Paladin

Courtois, C. and Ford, J.D. (2012), *Treatment of Complex Trauma: A Sequenced, Relationship-Based Approach*, New York: Guilford Press

Crossley, M.L. (2000), 'Narrative psychology, trauma and the study of self/identity', *Theory & Psychology*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 527–546

De Beus, K. and Rodgriguez, N. (2007), 'Restorative justice practice: an examination of program completion and recidivism', *Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 35, no. 3, pp. 337–347

Dignan, J. (2005), *Understanding Victims and Restorative Justice*, Maidenhead, UK: Open University

European Forum for Restorative Justice (2016), *Forum 15*, Leuven, Belgium: European Forum for Restorative Justice

Farrall, S. (2002), *Rethinking What Works with Offenders*, Cullompton, UK: Willan

Farrington, D. (2007), 'Childhood risk factors and risk-focused prevention', in M. Maguire *et al.* (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed.), Oxford: Oxford University Press

Ferrara, A. (2008), *The Force of the Example: Explorations in the Paradigm of Judgment*, New York: Columbia University Press

Foy, D.W, Furrow J. and McManus, S. (2011), 'Exposure to violence, post-traumatic symptomatology, and criminal behaviors', in V. Ardino (ed.), *Post-traumatic Syndromes in Children and Adolescents* (pp. 199–210), Chichester, UK: Wiley/ Blackwell

Fraser, N. and Honneth, A. (2003), *Redistribution or Recognition: A Political– Philosophical Exchange*, London: Verso

Gilligan, J. (1996), *Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and Its Causes,* New York: Grosset/ Putnam

Hale, C. (1996), 'Fear of crime: a review of the literature', *International Review of Victimology*, vol. 4, pp. 79–150

Horwitz, A.V. (1990), *The Logic of Social Control*, New York: Plenum Press

Isaacs, W. (1999), *Dialogue: The Art of Thinking Together*, New York: Doubleday

Jacobson, J. and Gibbs, P. (2009), *Making Amends: Restorative Youth Justice in Northern Ireland*, London: Prison Reform Trust

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992), *Shattered Assumptions: Towards a New Psychology of Trauma*, New York: Free Press

Kunst, M., Popelier, L. and Varekamp, E. (2015), 'Victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system and emotional recovery: a systematic and critical review of the literature', *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 336–358

Latimer, J., Dowden, C. and Muise, D. (2005), 'The effectiveness of restorative justice practices: a meta-analysis', *Prison Journal*, vol. 85, no. 2, pp. 127–144

Laxminarayan, M., Bosmans, M., Porter, R. and Sosa, L. (2013), 'Victim satisfaction with criminal justice: a systematic review', *Victims & Offenders*, vol. 8, pp. 119–147

Lemert, E. (1951), *Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall

Levinas, E. (1969), *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press

Maruna, S. (2001), *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Press

Maruna, S. and King, A. (2009), 'Once a criminal, always a criminal? "Redeemability" and the psychology of punitive public attitudes', *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research*, vol. 15, pp. 7–24

Maruna, S. (2010), 'Why our beliefs matter in offender management', *Prison Service Journal*, vol. 192, pp. 22–27

McNeill, F. (2006), 'A desistance paradigm for offender management', *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 39–62

Minow, M. (2000), *Between Vengeance and Forgiveness: Facing History After Genocide and Mass Violence*, Boston: Beacon Press

Pemberton, A. (2014), 'Respecting victims of crime: Key distinctions in a theory of victims' rights', in I. Vanfraechem *et al.* (eds), *Justice for Victims: Perspectives on Rights, Transition and Reconciliation*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Rossner, M. (2013), *Just Emotions: Rituals of Restorative Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press

Shapland, J., Robinson, G. and Sorsby, A. (2012), *Restorative Justice in Practice: Evaluating What Works for Victims and Offenders*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Shklar, J. (1990), *Legalism: Law, Morals and Political Trials*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Shklar, J. (1990), *The Faces of Injustice*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Simantov-Nachlieli, I., Shnabel, N. and Nadler, A. (2013), 'Individuals' and groups' motivation to restore their impaired identity dimensions following conflict: Evidence and implications', *Social Psychology*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 129–137

Strang, H. (2002), *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Strang, H., Sherman, L., Angel, C.M., Woods, D.J., Bennett, S., Newbury-Birch, D. and Inkpen, N. (2006), 'Victim evaluations of face-to-face restorative justice

experiences: a quasi-experimental analysis', *Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 62, pp. 281–306

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2015), *Handbook on Dynamic Security and Prison Intelligence*, New York: United Nations

Umbreit, M. and Coates, R. (1993), 'Cross-site analysis of victim offender mediation in four states', *Crime and Delinquency*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 565–585

Vidmar, N. (2000), 'Retribution and revenge', in J. Sanders and V.L. Hamilton (eds), *Handbook of Justice Research in Law* (pp. 31–63), New York: Kluwer/ Plenum

Ward, T. and Maruna, S. (2007), *Rehabilitation: Beyond the Risk Paradigm*, London: Routledge

Weaver, B. (2016), *Offending and Desistance: The Importance of Social Relations*, Abingdon, UK: Routledge

Weeks, R. and Widom, C.S. (1998), 'Self-reports of early childhood victimization among incarcerated adult male felons', *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 13, pp. 346–361

Wenzel, M., Okimoto, T.G., Feather, N.T. and Platow, M.J. (2008), 'Retributive and restorative justice', *Law and Human Behavior*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 375–389

White, M. (2007), *Maps of Narrative Practice*, New York: Norton

Winkel, F.W. (2007), *Posttraumatic Anger: Missing Link in the Wheel Of Fortune*, Nijmegen, The Netherlands: Wolf Legal

Zehr, H. (2005), *Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice* (3rd ed.), Scottdale, PA: Herald Press