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"This is a magnificent book that analyzes the damaging consequences of violence. . . I have never read such a well-documented contribution to a complex problem. Although based on American conditions, it is relevant and convincing to the European reader also. . . From now on there is no excuse for being just a bystander—here is a tool for action for professionals and laymen in medicine, social work, law, mass media, and legislation."

Ingrid Leth
Department Head,
Institute of Clinical Psychology,
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Denmark
More pre-publication 
REVIEWS, COMMENTARIES, EVALUATIONS . . .

"Bloom and Reichert have made a totally convincing argument documented by reams of terrible, chilling factual evidence that violence is the number one public health problem in the world today. This book demands careful study by all elected representatives, the clergy, the mental health and medical professions, representatives of the media, and all those unwittingly involved in the repressive perpetuation of this catastrophic global problem. Their work is hopeful in that it suggests solutions involving all levels of individual societies as well as the world community. We delay getting on with the compassionate solutions suggested by Bloom and Reichert at our peril."

Harold I. Eist, MD  
Past President,  
American Psychiatric Association

"Bloom and Reichert write clearly and with a minimum of jargon, thus making their book accessible. To survey the escalating violence of our world is so depressing that the instinct is to shut our eyes. Yet for the triumph of evil all that is necessary is that good men should do nothing and it is greatly to the authors’ credit that they examine and explain today’s violence, with a wealth of evidence. Much praise is due to Bloom and Reichert."

Sir Richard Bowlby  
Boundary House,  
London

"This is a book of immense importance, in which with wisdom, the secrets of the consulting room and the scientific knowledge base are integrated and applied as a way of understanding our responsibilities to one another and to ourselves."

Stuart Turner, MD  
The Traumatic Stress Clinic,  
London

"Filled with an important blend of scientifically based information, practice, and advocacy, this is a very useful manual. Its trauma-based principles for intervention can be applied internationally in different cultures and in different regions of the world."

Sahika Yuksel, MD  
Medical Director,  
Istanbul Psychosocial Trauma Program and ESTSS Board Member,  
Istanbul University Medical School of Psychiatry
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Chapter 9
Primary Prevention: 
Ending the Cycles of Violence

As with tertiary and secondary prevention efforts, we already know what needs to be done. Let's look first at family violence.

PREVENTING FAMILY VIOLENCE

We Do Know What to Do

The American Psychological Association in their report Violence and the Family (1996), made a number of recommendations aimed at primary prevention which are entirely consistent with all that we have discussed in this manual. Their recommendations for universal interventions include:

- Media efforts that educate about the connection between gender role expectations and family violence.
- Programs that reduce unemployment and poverty, which are strongly associated with increased rates of family violence.
- Enforcement of existing handgun laws; creation of handgun laws where none exist.
- Change laws to criminalize family violence.
- Advocate for community agency support.
- Change the physical structure of schools to reduce opportunities for expression of highly aggressive behavior.
- Media efforts to deglamorize violence and more accurately portray its consequences.
- School-based programs to teach conflict, problem solving, and anger-management skills to all children.
- School programs to counter traditional gender role stereotypes and expectations.
Alcohol and drug abuse prevention programs.
- Parenting education programs.
- Documentaries about family violence shown on network television.
- Sex abuse prevention programs such as “good touch, bad touch” for young children.
- Training legal, medical, and mental health professionals to better understand the dynamics of family violence.
- Sermons delivered by religious leaders declaring family violence immoral.
- Community-based activities, such as clean-up and beautification projects or midnight basketball, that bring people—particularly adolescents or young adult men—together in productive activities.

The National Conference on Family Violence: Health and Justice, whose recommendations we reviewed earlier, also made extensive recommendations for the prevention of family violence.

**Prevention**

Prevention of family violence should be viewed in terms of social justice and affirmation of basic human rights, rather than retributive criminal justice. We support the shift of social, economic, and political resources toward strengthening communities and families in their many forms. This means ensuring equitable access to employment, education, housing, and health care.

**Strategies**

- Collaboration among health, criminal justice, and the private sector to regulate products that increase the potential for family violence or magnify its consequences (i.e., alcohol and other drugs and firearms).
- Inclusion of representatives of groups with the highest rate of victimization at every level of decision making concerning issues of family violence.
- Development and employment of alternatives to violence and aggression as a means to resolve conflict at all levels of society.

Effective primary prevention programs must be implemented through the sustained allocation of human and financial resources at the federal,
Primary Prevention: Ending the Cycles of Violence

Primary prevention must encompass the cooperation, integration, and sharing of information by the health, justice, social service and education systems, both public and private, in allocating funding and resources in culturally responsive, community-empowered efforts. Programs of proven effectiveness should be funded by reallocating existing funding and allocating new resources.

- Instead of building more prisons, use the money to fund community-based, community-controlled systematically evaluated prevention programs that build on strengths. Develop, systematically evaluate, and disseminate new, effective primary prevention programs.
- Primary prevention should be sustained over the long term as a core public health function by generating new revenue (e.g., surcharge on marriage licenses, taxes on alcohol, ammunition).

Because violent behaviors are learned within the context of family, community, and society, the unlearning of these behaviors and the substitution of more appropriate behaviors must take place within the context of the family, community, and society. Therefore, we recommend the establishment of community-based, community-controlled prevention systems that would include:

- A vehicle to foster communication and coordination among public and private entities.
- Violence prevention community educational efforts, with a focus on early interventions that are comprehensive and multidisciplinary.
- Home visitation programs of proven effectiveness to reduce violence to children and elders and to improve maternal health.
- Life skills education, including conflict resolution, goal setting, caregiving, etc.
- Parenting and caregiving education and support.
- Programs that focus on perpetrators as well as victims.
- Comprehensive public school violence-prevention education, beginning in preschool years and available to all families, which includes training in stress management, conflict resolution, parenting and caregiver skills, substance abuse, and gender relationships.

Individuals in high-risk situations such as job loss, divorce, child custody, HIV, elder care situations, and adolescent transition stages should be included. Services for family violence prevention must be made available to all persons in need of services without regard to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, or ability to pay.
• Comprehensive public school violence-prevention education, beginning in preschool years and available to all families, which includes training in stress management, conflict resolution, parenting and caregiver skills, substance abuse, and gender relationships.

Recognizing that all human beings are valuable, we must design and implement a national public awareness and educational campaign to convince the American people that family abuse, neglect, and exploitation are not okay. Strategies include:

• Promote the formation of broad-based community boards representing public and private systems to further a national agenda aimed at preventing family violence through education, promotion of legislation, identification of service gaps, and development of resources.

**Professional Education**

Family violence is a public health crisis in the United States. We are speaking on behalf of those whose lives have been affected by violence and whose voices are too often unheard.

• Mandatory comprehensive education about family violence throughout the life span must become a standard component in undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education curricula in all health, justice, and other helping professions.
• As a central component, professional education must include the perspectives and participation of survivors and/or advocates in its development and delivery. Education should utilize appropriate interactive and experiential models and should be integrated throughout the professional curriculum.
• Education of family violence for health, justice, and social service professionals must be fully valued. Those who provide such instruction should be given professional recognition and support. Professional education activities, including resource and faculty development, implementation and evaluation, must be adequately funded.
• Professional education requires an interdisciplinary approach; didactic and practical/clinical educational programs should include approaches to facilitate interdisciplinary contact and collaboration.
• The educators must reflect the diversity of our society.
• Family violence content must be a component of the licensure and certification for all health and justice professions.
• The AMA working with other organizations, should quickly develop and widely disseminate a “Patient to Plaintiff” video/instructional
guide that incorporates the response of various disciplines to all forms of family violence.

- The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Justice should fund the development and dissemination of publications on model professional educational programs as well as directories of all educational programs on family violence.

- The federal government, professional associations, private foundations, and educational institutions should foster the development and continuation of high-quality research on family violence.

- Federal incentives should be provided for expansion of family violence professional education.

Professional associations should join with accrediting bodies for educational institutions, postgraduate programs, and continuing education courses to develop and support core family violence curricula that incorporate the following educational principles. Each professional organization will establish a time frame, with specific measurable goals, for instituting these reforms. Professional schools and associations should examine, modify, and develop curricula, as appropriate, to include these principles.

All family violence professional education from the undergraduate level through continuing education programs should:

- Foster awareness and sensitivity to cultural diversity.
- Formally address interrelationships among (and the uniqueness of) each form of family violence.
- Explore how power and control affect relationships (i.e., victim-victimizer, professional-professional, and professional-victim/victimizer).
- Develop awareness and understanding of the language, culture, responsibilities, and needs of the other disciplines.
- Teach that violence as a primary means of resolving conflict is not acceptable.
- Incorporate and value skill development.
- Teach how to establish, maintain, and value the relationship with one's community and its resources.
- Encourage continuous evaluation and improvement of the system's effectiveness.
- Be provided in an empathic and caring environment.
- Acknowledge that professional groups will include survivors and/or perpetrators of family violence at various stages of awareness, defenses, and healing; be prepared to provide link to appropriate services for these individuals.
Breaking the Cycle of Family Violence—Peaceful Posse

Posse: Any body of men who have authority to aide in maintaining the peace

Who is about Peace? We are about Peace
Walk away from violence and say yes to Peace

Boys of Peaceful Posse:
Sean, Juan, David, Cyrus, Kenneth,
Mike, John, Matt, Darnell

I can’t do nothing by myself. It’s we that gotta do something. That’s what the Peaceful Posse means to me.

Tyrone, age 14

The Peaceful Posse, a violence prevention program of Philadelphia Physicians for Social Responsibility, offers boys new relationships, mentoring, and an opportunity to share and heal in a safe space. The eight- to fourteen-year-old boys meet weekly in after-school groups led by a mature male, who models nonviolent solutions to life’s problems for them. In every group meeting, boys are listened to as they describe situations in which violence occurred. They learn to express their feelings about this violence and validate each other in a context that promotes mutual healing and support.

After watching the film on domestic violence, Louis talked for the first time about hating his father for beating up his mother. His mother, he said, hated the word “sorry” because his father said it all the time. Tyrone also talked about his father beating up their mother. Cleo talked about how violent a man his father is. Cleo says his father was abusive to everyone. (Progress notes, May 6, 1996)

The thirty boys who make up the Peaceful Posse live in two Philadelphia public housing communities. Every day they are faced with pressures to conform to a hyperviolent image of masculinity:

Brother Rob [the leader of Peaceful Posse] was late for our in-service training. He was obviously upset, so at the break I asked him what was wrong. He told me that on the way to the meeting, he had been stopped by one of his boys from the Peaceful Posse. This child had just been held up at gunpoint—for the third time in a year—for a
thin gold chain he wore around his neck, a single memento from his usually absent father. Brother Rob was proud of the boy, because this time, he didn't fight back, thereby possibly saving his life.

This vignette describes everyday life for many boys growing up amid the viciousness of today's city neighborhoods, and for the adults trying to save them. Since violence, not harmony, is normal for these kids, the skills of nonviolent engagement need to be taught. According to a preliminary appraisal of Peaceful Posse conducted by an evaluator from the City University of New York, "The majority of the boys believe that hitting, screaming, being mean, getting into a fight or otherwise being physical, is typically wrong behavior." The evaluator also found the boys to be receptive to a goal of gender justice, building on the close relationships the boys typically have with their mothers to enable the boys to develop empathy for women. Pending adequate funding, future plans for expanding this two-year program include training new adult leaders, creating more Peaceful Posse groups, creating Senior Posses to provide ongoing support for graduates of Peaceful Posse, and creating Parent Posses in order to foster the development of parent peer support.

PROMOTING RESILIENCY

Earlier we defined resiliency and began to develop some ideas about how to encourage its development. Promoting resilience is a vital aspect of primary prevention. Violent and traumatic events threaten the ability of human communities to foster health and resilience, as do such ecological "pollutants" as racism, sexism, and poverty (Harvey, 1996). Garbarino and colleagues have discussed the human ecological threat posed by high-risk communities as conferring "social toxicity" on the residents of those communities (1997). Nonetheless, we need to be reminded that although the failure rate is higher, most children who grow up in toxic family environments and communities still succeed in spite of their surroundings. For children in violent neighborhoods to grow up into healthy and competent adults, three factors appear to be critical: (1) a warm and affectionate relationship with an adult who cares for and supports the child; (2) an environment that includes high expectations for the child and faith in the child’s ability; and (3) opportunities for the child to participate in the life and work going on around him or her (Benard, 1991). Promoting resiliency is something everyone can do, in every interaction with another human being.
How Families Can Promote Resilience

Families can promote resilience in some clearly defined ways. In the studies undertaken by Virginia Demos, the families who showed high resilience shared certain characteristics:

- They maximized opportunities of the shared experience of good feelings by doing things that made each other feel good as frequently as possible.
- They were quick to reestablish good feelings after a break occurred, such as an angry scolding or an experience of bad feelings on the part of the child.
- They found ways to help their children when they were overwhelmed by bad feelings such as distress, anger, fear, or shame by acknowledging the negative feeling and helping the child reestablish a positive feeling. (Demos, 1989)

The management of positive and negative emotional states is extremely important and can be learned by anyone, thus increasing the number of options we have in dealing with other people and increasing the chances for resilient types of responses to stress. Perhaps the most overlooked parental failure is the tendency of parents to focus on behavior and completely overlook the sequence of feelings that the child experiences and as a consequence, the most powerful tool in shaping behavior is lost.

Rutter (1990) has explored the very important concept of “turning points,” the particular experiences in a child’s life that can change the developmental trajectory from that point on. He focuses on the kinds of protective processes that can be put into place to reduce the risk of damage and increase the likelihood of resiliency. The first necessary step in supporting protective processes is to reduce the risk impact. The first and most logical way of accomplishing this task is to alter the child’s exposure to, or intimate involvement with, the risk situation. But when this is not possible, then sometimes it is possible to alter the meaning or riskiness of the risk variable for that child. This introduces the concept of stress inoculation—controlled exposure to stress in circumstances in which successful coping or adaptation can take place. Thus children who are exposed to normal experiences of separation, e.g., baby-sitters, in situations that are not overwhelming, begin to develop coping skills that serve them when they are exposed to a higher degree of separation stress. Stress inoculation involves the promotion of coping with the hazards when the exposure is of a type and degree that is manageable in the context of the child’s capacities and social situation.
A second vital protective process is the reduction of negative chain reactions. Negative chain reactions occur, for instance when the child is traumatized in some way, say sexually abused, and then further traumatized when the caregivers deny the abuse or blame the child. Often the chain reaction response does more long-term harm than the trauma itself. Here the protective function does not simply reside within the individual, but within the interaction between the individual and other people's reactions.

A third protective process resides in the establishment and maintenance of self-esteem and self-efficacy. Two types of experiences are most influential: the establishment of secure and harmonious love relationships and success in accomplishing tasks that are identified by individuals as central to their interests. Various kinds of research studies including short-term prospective studies, retrospective recall of adults, and intergenerational studies of high-risk populations all show that early childhood attachments provide a degree of protection against later risk environments. It is important to remember however, that self-concepts continue to be modified according to the nature of life experiences encountered so that positive interpersonal experiences in adulthood can also be transformative.

The fourth protective process includes anything that opens up opportunities for children to find other alternative sources of empathic experiences with others, other coping strategies, and other ways of getting their needs met (Rutter, 1990).

Recommendations from Resilient Adults

Resilient adults have made some constructive recommendations for anyone hoping to enhance resiliency in others. They recommend a focus on strengths, on how persons survived as well as they have, rather than a focus on weakness, vulnerability, or pathology. Helpers need to ask, "What were the coping skills that were effective, even if in a limited way?" It is important to help the person look for the beacons of hope that have sustained them—in themselves and in others. These beacons often come in the form of surrogates who become symbols of opportunity, of possibility—a teacher, a therapist, a family friend, a distant relative. It is vital never to underestimate the importance of simple kindness in the lives of those who are downtrodden and betrayed. Even small doses of kindness can last a lifetime in memory. Likewise it is important to openly admire the successes of each person—their capacity to learn and love which overcomes their history of abuse (Higgins, 1994).
Another interesting recommendation made by resilient survivors relates to
the qualities inherent in the helper, in the person—therapist, physician,
teacher, or friend—who hopes to be of help to others:

Clinicians and educators need to have both technical knowledge
and ability; but in addition, I feel it's absolutely essential for the
person to be highly developed as a human being: capable of caring
for others, capable of loving others, ... a realized person. You
cannot get good work done by defective individuals who just have
the right credentials. ... The people who helped me the most helped
me partially because of who they were, modeling for me how to be
as a human being. (Higgins, 1994, p. 327)

As Higgins points out, it is important that anyone hoping to help
encourage resilience in others recognize that these individuals have grown
up with models of exploitation, cruelty, and boundary violation. They lack
a positive role model of human interaction and often do not recognize how
bizarre their childhood treatment has been. This is an essential role of
other people—to communicate positive regard, to provide an alternative to
abusive relationships, to validate their perceptions of the destructive
nature of their experiences.

**SHARING THE WEALTH**

*Business as Perpetrator of Violence*

The present level of economic inequality, both nationally and interna-
tionally, cannot hold. Without changes in our system of distributing wealth
we are destined to become our worst nightmare. These are George Ken-
nan’s prophetic and disturbing words from 1948 when he was head of the
state department’s policy planning staff:

We have about 50 percent of the world’s wealth, but only 6.3
percent of its population. In this situation, we cannot fail to be the
object of envy and resentment. Our real task in the coming period is
to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain
this position of disparity without positive detriment to our national
security. To do so we will have to dispense with all sentimentality
and daydreaming; and our attention will have to be concentrated
everywhere on our immediate national objectives. We need not
deceive ourselves that we can afford today the luxury of altruism and world-benefaction. . . . We should cease to talk about vague and . . . unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of the living standards, and democratization. The day is not far off when we are going to have to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealistic slogans, the better. (Kovel, 1994, p. 58)

The time is coming, and coming rapidly, when we are either going to have to move away from what Ralph Nader has termed "malignant capitalism," or we are going to have to give up any pretense of upholding the basic tenets that are the bedrock of the American identity—democracy, freedom, tolerance, fair play, compassion, and human rights—both abroad and at home. A system based on taking from the poor to give to the rich cannot maintain its stability without increasing oppression and the invocation of authoritarian rule. Depriving whole populations of the poor with the means to feed their children, while at the same time arming them with lethal weapons, forces an insurrection bound to deprive us all of our basic civil rights in the name of increased security. Changing government policy now could prevent disaster in the near future.

On January 17, 1961, Dwight Eisenhower, President of the United States, stood to give his Farewell Address to the nation. The Cold War was waging and America was prospering, so his warning, somewhat surprising since he was a firmly entrenched military man, elicits surprise even thirty-seven years later.

Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense. We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations.

Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the Federal Government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society. In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition
of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together. Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture has been the technological revolution during recent decades.

... It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society. ... As we peer into society's future, we—you and I, and our Government—must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

During the long lane of the history yet to be written, America knows that this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be, instead, a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect. Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected as we are by our moral, economic and military strength. That table, though scarred by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.

Disarmament, with mutual honor and confidence, is a continuing imperative. Together we must learn how to compose differences—not with arms, but with intellect and decent purpose. Because this need is so sharp and apparent, I confess that I lay down my official responsibilities in this field with a definite sense of disappointment. As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war, as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years, I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.
As it turns out, Eisenhower's warning that "In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex" has not been well heeded. Thanks to the military-industrial complex the most important sector in international trade is not oil, cars, or planes—it is armaments. Arms sales are incredibly large—at least $900 billion annually. Some experts place the real figures for arms sales at two, three, even four times higher (Saul, 1992). Even though the Cold War supposedly ended the U.S. defense budget continues to escalate; in 1995 the House approved funding that the Pentagon had not even requested (Dellums, 1995). We will spend $2.5 trillion from 1995 to 2005 under Clinton's deficit reduction proposal for the military (Hartung, 1995). What does it say about us as a society, when in 1997, only $10 million was earmarked exclusively for child abuse research by the National Institute of Health, but we can spend $2.5 trillion for guns?

We cannot have strict gun control laws here because it is just too big a business. Too much of our economy—33 percent of the federal budget alone (Saul, 1992)—now depends on armaments, while total expenditure for education, social services, and highway construction only amounts to 15 percent (Saul, 1992). Forty percent of all U.S. scientists are employed on defense-related projects. Because our economy—and increasingly the economies of other countries—are so interconnected, everyone is affected by weapons sales. As a civilized country we cannot really decide that this is insane because this business is an essential part of our economy. Our behavior is similar to that of traumatized patients. They eventually come to base their existence on strange, destructive behavior that originates with some response to perpetration against them, and then defend that behavior with every conceivable rationalization and fight strongly against any attempt to get them to give it up. As Americans, we have decided that safety = gun ownership and many of us are now prepared to die for this belief. If we are afraid to really look at the roots of the problem—as troubled patients are afraid to look at the reality of the homes they grew up in—then we will lie to ourselves and lie to everyone else to protect our cherished belief systems.

But it is not only armaments that drive our present economic system. It is also competition and the eternal search for the best bottom line, the most profitable outcome for the shareholders and the executives. "Competition to make the largest possible profit exceeds every other motive for economic expansion. In no other civilization has this drive for money become such a central power as it has in ours" (Bahro, 1994, p. 99). Earl Shorris (1994) has called America a "nation of salesmen," "homo vendens,"
operating on the principle that all value is exchange value, set by the market and no one else. The market determines the value of everything and nothing, neither the utility of the thing nor its intrinsic qualities (durability, beauty, happiness, economy, healthfulness) have any role to play in the judgment of the market. Nothing has value in and of itself. It is this paradigm that allows us to base an economy on weapons, to spoil the environment, to sell dangerous substances, to deny medical and social services, and it cannot easily be changed without catastrophic upheaval.

As Jim Garbarino has noted,

It has become a tenet of our society that “The business of America is business,” and the world has listened. We’ve heard it over and over: What’s the bottom line? Discussions of the sustainable society seem to run aground on the shoals of profitability. Will this measure pay off? Will it maintain or increase dividends? Will such a program meet the payroll? No analysis of the sustainable society can proceed without accounting for the role of corporate economic enterprise—the private “for-profit” sector. (Garbarino, 1992, pp. 193-194)

**Socially Responsible Business**

As early as the 1920s there was at least one person in business who, with uncanny prescience, wrote about changes that were necessary for business to prosper. Her name was Mary Parker Follett. The prevailing management theory in her day was similar to what persists in many corporate settings—a fondness for command-style, hierarchical organizations inspired by the military model. Follett advocated an entirely different approach characterized by flatter hierarchies, teamwork and participative management, leadership based on ability, cooperative conflict resolution, and a shared corporate vision. Says London School of Economics Chairman, Sir Peter Parker, “People often puzzle about who is the father of management. I don’t know who the father was, but I have no doubt about who was the mother” (Linden 1995, p. 77).

Today, many companies are struggling with the issues Mary Parker Follett described. There is an increasing focus on corporate social responsibility, and a new paradigm does appear to be struggling to be born. Under various titles such as the “learning organization,” “workplace community,” the “Third Way,” the “humane corporation,” and the “living organization,” many businesspeople appear to be arriving at conclusions similar to medical and mental health workers, some criminal justice thinkers, and many educators (Nirenberg, 1993; Senge, 1990). We stand on the brink of enormous opportunity; our actions will determine whether
Business for Social Responsibility (BSR) is a nonprofit organization that provides access to successful corporate strategies and practices through member education and information programs and materials. BSR focuses not just on the well-being of the bottom line but also on practices that ensure the well-being of the workforce, the environment, and the surrounding communities.

Influenced by the work of modern physicists, biologists, and ecologists, some business organizations are beginning to view themselves as living systems and are finding that paying attention to all the aspects of the system pays off in dividends, both financial and psychological. In such organizations, workers are treated as whole human beings with families and extended networks, rather than as cogs in some huge industrial machine. Peter Senge, one of the gurus of this movement and author of the *Fifth Discipline*, warns companies that survival depends on the ability to think systematically, seeing patterns, interrelationships, and interdependencies rather than chains of cause and effect. He calls the type of organization he describes a “learning organization” and says that, “The organizations that will truly excel in the future will be the organizations that discover how to tap people’s commitment and capacity to learn at all levels in an organization” (Senge 1990, p. 4). The concept of fifth discipline derives from the five disciplines Senge believes are essential ingredients for a learning organization: systems thinking, personal mastery (learning to be open with others), mental models (putting aside old ways of thinking), shared vision (forming a plan that everyone can agree on), and team learning (working together to achieve the plan) (Dumain, 1994).

Such companies as Federal Express, GS Technologies, and Ford have been using the concepts of Senge and his colleagues with positive results to change the way they do business (Dumain, 1994).

Shaffer and Anundsen (1993) have highlighted eight qualities of the workplace community that seem consistent across the literature: alignment of values between all members of the workplace, an employee-based structure, teamwork, open communication, mutual support, respect for individuality, permeable boundaries, and opportunities for group renewal. These qualities of the workplace community bear a strong likeness to those of the therapeutic community and the therapeutic school. Management consultant Walter Bennis suggests a complete overhaul of our present way of doing business, from the top down. He comments on the repetition compulsion: “A lot of companies still don’t understand.... Einstein’s definition of insanity is when you
continue to repeat over and over the same practice, hoping to get different results" (Bennis, 1993, p. 30).

But, to accomplish the creation of a “workplace community” we must address our idolization of competition, one of the great American myths. As Alfie Kohn (1986) points out, we are under the illusion that even minimal profitability and productivity, to say nothing of excellence, is entirely dependent on competing with each other and that competition brings out the best in us. The real situation is quite different. Johnson and Johnson surveyed 122 studies from 1924 to 1980, including every North American study on the subject of competition and performance. The evidence was clear and overwhelmingly consistent—competition almost never improves performance, in fact, superior performance seems to require the absence of competition. Competition sometimes produces better results only if the task is simple, such as rote decoding, and not interdependent at all. Cooperation within and between groups is the real motivator for performance (Kohn, 1986).

John Paluszek, President of Ketchum Public Affairs and winner of the 1994 Gold Anvil Award given by the Public Relation’s Society of America, says that there will be an “integrated standard” of success for companies in the future. The new age company will be judged not just on bottom-line profits but also on its “corporate citizenship,” that corporations will adopt social responsibility as a part of their own enlightened self-interest. “Post-modern society requires that many voices need to be heard in solutions to society’s common problems. As we’ve progressed, consensus, messy as it may be, is more important that it has ever been in order to avoid conflict” (Bovet, 1994, p. 32).

Apparently, the idea of “corporate social responsibility” dates back to at least the mid-1920s when business executives were beginning to speak of the need for corporate directors to act as trustees for the interests, not just of stockholders, but other social claimants as well. These ideas were accompanied by a growing belief that business and society were linked by what we now call interconnectedness or interdependency. Some writers of the day began to advocate that businesses had an obligation to provide “service” beyond profits, yet without denying profits (Frederick, 1994 [1978]).

Experts who have studied the rise of ethics as a central corporate responsibility trace concerns surfaced during the Watergate scandal of the early 1970s, when some companies were convicted of setting up illegal political slush funds. Later came the disclosure of bribe payments by U.S. firms to obtain foreign military sales, followed by defense-procurement scandals and more recently by insider-trading revelations as well as the
The fundamental idea embedded in "corporate social responsibility" is that business corporations have an obligation to work for social betterment. Recently, Hyman and Blum (1995) have described "just" companies. "A just company is a morally driven organization, the long-term economic success of which demands that it serve most participants well . . . Harm done by one party to another always affects both parties" (p. 48).

Harry Van Buren (1995), in writing about business ethics for the next millennium writes of five basic principles, all of which are good for business in the long run. He defines a just society as one that does not tolerate employment discrimination because employees deserve a living wage and safe working conditions. He promotes the idea that corporate responsibility requires the business community to regard the environment as a resource to be protected for future generations. Included in this sense of responsibility are corporate decisions not to create products that kill or maim. For him, a healthy business ethic also decrees the government repression of democracy, unions, and free speech as creating environments that are inappropriate for business.

Interestingly and encouragingly, the public appears to agree. According to the results of a 1993 study on "cause-related marketing" (CRM) consumers believe business has a responsibility to help improve social ills. Seventy-one percent say they think CRM is a good way to help solve social problems, while 64 percent of consumers believe that CRM should be a standard part of a company’s activities. A whopping 84 percent say they have a more positive image of a company if it is doing something to make the world a better place (Caudron, 1994).

And, there are companies who are listening. New England Electric System ranks first of all electric utilities because of its environmentally sound energy conservation programs. Colgate is collaborating with the New York City School District to rebuild schools and develop "theme" schools. The Timberland Company has invested millions in the development of urban "peace corps" through City Year. Their mission statement makes a social commitment directly by stating "Each individual can and must, make a difference in the way we experience life on this planet." Additionally, the company’s Standards for Social Responsibility creates international guidelines for choosing business partners including those who offer medical and insurance benefits, pay the at least the minimum wage, compensate for overtime, do not employ children under fourteen, and provide a safe workplace—and inspections confirm compliance. The Coca-Cola Company has made a significant contribution to supporting women and minority-owned businesses, supports minority youth
through internships, encourages all employees to volunteer in the community in various programs, and has been sited as one of the best places to work for minorities. Polaroid has instituted one of the most comprehensive AIDS education and prevention plans in the country and has strongly supported women and minorities. Merck and Company has formed a partnership with a Costa Rican institution that supplies Merck with plant and insect samples that ensures the Costa Rican company will benefit from any developments of pharmaceuticals that arise from their efforts. Merck is also helping to fund conservation efforts to preserve the rainforests (Will, 1995). All of these companies realize that good citizenship is also good business. The behavior and value system of those at the top is directly conveyed throughout the entire company and with consistency, can change the entire corporate climate.

At present, we are in a situation that is extremely destructive and dangerous for any democracy—an increasing economic inequity. The trend over the last century had been in the direction of a more equitable distribution of wealth until the 1980s. During the 1980s the real income of most American families has stagnated or fallen while that of the top percent increased by 115 percent. During the 1980s the number of individuals in poverty rose from 23 million to 35 million while the number of millionaires increased from 642 in 1975 to 60,667 in 1991. Managerial salaries average 100 times the average pay of employees, ten times greater than the ratio in other advanced capitalist countries (Heilbroner, 1995).

As we mentioned in Part I, the rich have gotten richer while the poor—most often women and children—have gotten poorer. Between 1947 and the mid-seventies the ratio of the income of the top 5 percent of families to the lower 20 percent dropped from a ratio of 14 to 1 to 11 to 1. Since then the ratio has risen to 19:1. Newly released census data also show that incomes fell on average for the bottom 60 percent of households over the past seven years. Not only have real wages continued to decline but the share of workers covered by health insurance and pension plans has also declined. In addition there has been a steady increase in the share of workers forced to work under part-time and other nonstandard work arrangements, making Manpower, a temporary employment agency, the largest private employer in the United States. In 1974, the average CEO of a major company was paid thirty-four times the earnings of the average worker. Today he is making about 180 times the worker's pay. Poverty rates in the United States, despite economic expansion, are two to three times those of Western Europe. The poverty rate for children under six in France is 6 percent (Faux, 1997). According to the National Center for Children in Poverty, 24 percent of all American children under the age of 6 are poor (Herbert, 1995).
We desperately need a strong dose of universal corporate social responsibility and it is going to require overturning some strongly held shibboleths about the importance of competition, obedience to the bottom line, and the sanctity of money. As Michael Linton warns,

It all comes down to money in the end. The problems of the world come from our actions, and our actions, both as a society and as individuals, are largely determined by the way money works. Many trivial and even damaging things are happening—simply because some people have the money and the will to do them. In contrast, other things of real value, many essential to the survival of the planet, are not happening—simply because those who have the will, have not the money. People are working in ways detrimental to their personal health, to that of the environment, both locally and globally, and to the well-being of their community because they need the money. (Linton, 1993, p. 65)

**PRIMARY PREVENTION AND THE MEDIA**

Violence in America, including increased portrayals of violence in the media against children, adults, and the elderly, has reached such epidemic proportions that media consumers, providers, and professionals must take action to reverse this trend. As television becomes more sophisticated and interactive, the commercial media has an extraordinary opportunity to change the present direction of the public will and experience. At present, much criticism is justifiably aimed at the media moguls for their extraordinary influence in maintaining standards of violence, cruelty, sadism, and meanness that are unprecedented. But it does not have to stay this way. Media giants have families too and are a fundamental and important part of the massive web we call American society. As such, they have a vital role to play in generating a much greater sense of social responsibility. The educational possibilities of the media are endless. If they chose to do so, television producers and moviemakers could as deliberately provide models for peace, nonviolent conflict resolution, and compassion as they do models of violence. Different choices are there to be made but it is unlikely to happen until concerned citizens organize in great enough numbers to exert sufficient pressure to bring about changes.

Television could also help change the national climate by generating more thoughtful, in-depth analyses of issues that serve to show the public how truly complex and interconnected problems are instead of attempting to dazzle the public with sensationalistic, unbalanced presentations of
issues through soundbites. Both television and radio could do an extraordinary service to the public in modeling how to think about, discuss, and problem solve very complicated, multidimensional issues, rather than presenting oversimplified and unbalanced presentations of ideas, social movements, and events. News programs could show some good news as news instead of concentrating solely on one disaster after another. In actual fact, extraordinarily positive things are happening every day and yet if they get any play at all, they come at the end of the regular news reports as the final laugh of the evening. Good, but not good enough.

The Media Can Promote Safety, Not Violence

In their recommendations, the National Conference on Family Violence addressed the issue of the relationship between the media and other social institutions. They noted that in the past, consumers and media providers have endured an adversarial relationship and urged that future efforts to address the problem should be inclusive and collaborative in nature. In service of this, they urged consumers, providers, and professionals to participate in creating a new climate of socially responsible perspective on violence. They hoped that the American Medical Association and the American Bar Association would provide the leadership necessary to promote such an initiative (Witwer and Crawford, 1995). Here are the media recommendations that were made by the work groups:

Establish a national coalition of professional organizations (including health, justice, education, and child advocacy groups) to promote safe, nonviolent families and society. This group will work in partnership with the media, to examine violence in the media, and to promote socially responsible approaches.

Strategies

* Create a national resource center.
* Collect sources of data.
* Identify experts.
* Encourage continued research.
* Educate the media and the public.
* Provide media with resources, media kits, etc.
* Develop forums for sharing information and strategic planning.
* Encourage development of media education efforts to help prevent violence.
• Outreach with state and local violence prevention efforts.
• Acknowledge excellence.
• Establish multidisciplinary criteria for media excellence in violence prevention.
• Encourage media organizations to give awards for promotion of nonviolence.
• Include award recipients on national advisory board.
• Market nonviolence.
• Create public service announcements to raise awareness.
• Encourage health and justice professionals to form liaisons with local media.
• Produce programs in partnership with media to promote alternatives to violence.

AMA Guidelines on Media Violence

But in the meantime, what can each of us do to prevent media violence from having such an impact on our children and families? The American Medical Association has publicized the potential adverse health and social consequences from excess media activity (1996). These include: increased violent behavior, obesity, decreased physical activity and fitness, increased cholesterol levels, excess sodium intake, repetitive strain injury (video and computer games), insomnia, photic seizures in vulnerable individuals, impaired school performance, increased use of tobacco and alcohol, increased sexual activity, decreased attention span, decreased family communication, excess consumer focus (resulting in envy, entitlement, etc.). The list of national organizations concluding that violent entertainment causes violent behavior is by now extensive and includes: American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, American Academy of Pediatricians, American Medical Association, American Psychiatric Association, American Psychological Association, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute of Mental Health and the Surgeon General’s Office. How much more convincing do we need?

The AMA has produced a Physician’s Guide to Media Violence (1996) and in that document, they provide a list of suggestions for parents about media use:

• Be alert to the shows your children see. These suggestions are important for all children, and most important for young children: the younger the child, the more impressionable he or she is.
• Avoid using television, videos, or video games as a baby-sitter. It might be convenient for busy parents, but it can begin a pattern of
always turning to media for entertainment or diversion. Simply turning the sets off is not nearly as effective as planning some other fun activity with the family.

- **Limit the use of media.** Television use must be limited to no more than one or two quality hours per day. Set situation limits, too—no television or video games before school, during daytime hours, during meals, or before homework is done.

- **Keep television and video player machines out of your children’s bedrooms.** Putting them there encourages more viewing and diminishes your ability to monitor their use.

- **Turn the television off during mealtimes.** Use this time to catch up and connect with one another.

- **Turn television on only when there is something specific you have decided is worth watching.** Don’t turn the TV on “to see if there’s something on.” Decide in advance if a program is worth viewing. Identify high-quality programs, using evaluations of programs in your selection process.

- **Don’t make the TV the focal point of the house.** Avoid placing the television in the most prominent location in your home. Families watch less television or play fewer videos if the sets are not literally at the center of their lives.

- **Watch what your children are watching.** This will allow you to know what they’re viewing and will give you an opportunity to discuss it with them. Be active: talk and make connections with your children while the program is on.

- **Be especially careful of viewing just before bedtime.** Emotion-invoking images may linger and intrude into sleep.

- **Learn about movies that are playing and the videos available for rental or purchase.** Be explicit with children about your guidelines for appropriate movie viewing and review proposed movie choices in advance.

- **Become “media literate.”** This means learning how to evaluate media offerings critically. First learn yourself and then teach your children. Learn about advertising and teach your children about its influences on the media they use.

- **Limit your own television viewing.** Set a good example by your moderation and discrimination in viewing. Be careful when children are around and may observe material from “your” program.

- **Let your voice be heard.** We all need to raise our voices so that they are heard by program decision makers and sponsors. We need to
RESTITUTION NOT RETRIBUTION: REWORKING THE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Justice and Religion

Ask many people today what should be done with a murderer and they will quickly answer “fry ‘em.” Retribution is the byword of the day, punishment the apparent solution to our epidemic of crime. The justification that is repeatedly used for this attitude is biblical, an “eye for an eye.” But few of those calling loudly for this principle appear to be aware of how biblically misguided they are. According to Howard Zehr, Professor of Sociology and Restorative Justice at Eastern Mennonite University’s Conflict Transformation Program, an “eye for an eye,” a phrase that only appears three times in the Bible, is not at all what it seems. The Bible opens in Genesis with a recognition of the human tendency to take unlimited revenge, called the “Law of Lamech”; it is described as seventy times seven, a number representing infinity. The “eye for an eye” idea was meant to set a limit on this unrestricted desire for revenge by establishing a law of proportion that laid the basis for restitution—not that you were to take an eye for an eye, but that you were not allowed to take more than an eye for an eye. These same voices, who call so loudly for retribution are often Christians, who perhaps forget that the New Testament message of Jesus was that we love not just our own kind but our enemies as well—until seventy times seven, an unlimited number of times. In putting it this way, Jesus was apparently intending to set the law of retaliation on its head (Zehr, 1994a).

In the past, there have been other systems of achieving justice that were not based solely on retribution and revenge. As documented by Herman Bianchi, retired Dean of the Law School of the Free University of Amsterdam, there was a role for penance for a crime, for making restitution, for restoring wholeness to a damaged relationship or community (Bianchi, 1995). Before modern times, crime was a violation of people and of community and such wrongs created obligations. Justice called for situations to be made right. The options of vengeance or courts existed, but were largely backups used when negotiation and restitution did not work. Crime was not a monopoly of the state; even when victims and offenders resorted to courts, they retained power to settle when they wished.
It is beyond doubt that the ancient legal systems that preceded our modern Western system—Hebrew, Greek, Roman, and Teutonic—did not favor punitive crime control as we have it today (Bianchi, 1995, p. 15). Zehr has compared biblical justice with contemporary justice and has found some dramatic differences (1990, p. 151):

**Contemporary Justice**

1. Justice divided into areas, each with different rules
2. Administration of justice as an inquiry into guilt
3. Justice tested by rules, procedures
4. Focus on infliction of pain
5. Punishment as an end
6. Rewards based on just deserts, “deserved”
7. Justice opposed to mercy
8. Justice neutral, claiming to treat all equally
9. Justice as maintenance of the status quo
10. Focus on guilt and abstract principles

**Biblical Justice**

1. Justice seen as integrated whole
2. Administration of justice as a search for solutions
3. Justice defined by outcome, substance
4. Focus on making right
5. Punishment in context of redemption
6. Justice based on need, undeserved
7. Justice based on mercy and love
8. Justice both fair and partial
9. Justice as active, progressive, seeking to transform status quo
10. Focus on harm done

The origin of modern punitive law dates from thirteenth-century European culture and reached its full organization in late eighteenth century. According to Bianchi, between 1200 and 1750, it gradually developed from a civil system of repair and compensation into the system of painful public repression we know today. The first crime in this modern sense was not murder—it was heresy against the Church, followed by witchcraft. The punitive system we know today has its roots in the Roman Catholic Inquisition and was rapidly adopted by secular authorities to increase their own power and control over the people. Gradually, crime was no longer
seen as a conflict between citizens but as a conflict between the state and the accused, just as religious beliefs were no longer between God and man but between church/state and man (Bianchi, 1995). At this point God was interpreted as an increasingly punitive and legalistic judge resulting in a Western obsession with the retributive theme in the Bible that so affects our social milieu today. We must not forget that this attitude served the needs of those in power, and served powerful political strivings then, just as it does today.

In the process of this shift, the voices of the victims have been lost and thus an opportunity to heal the victims, the offenders, and the shattered community is lost as well.

Healing requires opportunities for meaning and empowerment but the criminal justice response usually ignores victims, often not even informing them of events. It steals their experience and denies them meaning. Moreover it reinterprets the whole experience in foreign, legal terms. So victims feel fundamentally disrespected not only by the offenders but then by justice. (Zehr, 1994a, p. 7)

Restorative Justice

The alternative to the present system of retributive justice is restorative justice. In a restorative system of justice, the fundamental concerns are entirely different and focus on the restoration of relationship as well as individual and social healing. The first question is “Who has been hurt?” Once established, the next consideration is “What are the needs of victims, offenders, and communities?” The last consideration is “What are the obligations and whose are they?” Under such guidelines the aim of justice is to meet needs and promote healing of (a) victims, (b) the community, (c) offenders, and (d) of relationships between them. In a restorative system of justice, there is a recognition that violations create obligations and these obligations are bilateral—the offender must acknowledge and take responsibility for the harm done to victims and communities, and society acknowledges a responsibility to both victims and offenders.

We are really describing two very different paradigms for a criminal justice system. In a system of retributive justice, crime violates the state and its laws, justice focuses on establishing guilt so that doses of pain can be measured out, justice is sought through a conflict between adversaries in which the offender is pitted against the state, and rules and intentions outweigh outcomes. One side wins and the other loses. In a system of restorative justice, crime violates people and relationships, justice aims to identify needs and obligations so that things can be made right. Justice
encourages dialogue and mutual agreement, gives victims and offenders central roles, and is judged by the extent to which responsibilities are assumed, needs are met, and healing of individuals and relationships is encouraged (Zehr, 1994a).

Attempts to implement this philosophy have been in effect since the 1970s. Called Victim-Offender Reconciliation Programs (VORP), the current focus is usually on property crimes and acts of vandalism, although some programs are beginning to deal with more serious offenses as well. In these programs, offenders must deal directly with those they have harmed and are helped to understand the “three dimensions of harm” involved in their offenses—harm to victims, to the community, and to themselves. They are encouraged to develop and carry out their own sentence proposals. Reoffense rates tend to be remarkably low, at least at the Juvenile Reparations Program in Elkhart, Indiana—home of the original United States VORP. Programs that involve juveniles have been studied more than those with adults but so far the results are encouraging. Eighty-nine percent of VORP restitution agreements are fulfilled as opposed to 50 to 60 percent for restitution ordered by the court. In one study, 79 percent of victims and 85 percent of offenders said they were satisfied and in an earlier study 97 percent of victims said they would go through the process again if necessary. Victim fear was reduced, stereotypes were changed, offenders see these programs as a “tough response,” and recidivism is reduced. Both the victims and the offenders have a true experience with justice. In one study of burglary victims, those who had gone through the VORP were twice as likely to say they had experienced justice as those who only went through the normal criminal justice process (Zehr, 1994b).

DEALING WITH BULLIES:
REFUSING TO BE A VICTIM OR A BYSTANDER

Bullies come in all shapes and sizes—but originally they come in the form of very little boys and girls. Grown-up bullies have learned that the skills of intimidation, threat, and manipulation learned as children continue to get results as adults. The screaming boss, the batterer, the abusive radio talk show host, the leaders of gun organizations, and even the guy that pulls a gun can only be taken seriously because they have the power to enforce their threats—in terms of emotional development, they are still badly behaved children.
Richard Hazler (1996) has written a long overdue book about bullying. He defines bullying as repeatedly harming others. This can be done by physical attack or by hurting other’s feelings through words, actions, or social exclusion. Bullying may be done by one person or by a group. It is an unfair match since the bully is either physically, verbally, and/or socially stronger than the victims. (p. 6)

In reviewing the literature, he notes that bullies apparently share a number of characteristics:

- They must demonstrate power or be seen as failures. The need for power and control is a compensation for underlying inadequacy.
- They see no alternatives other than aggression to preserve dignity and self-image.
- They have difficulty in reaching out to others for help.
- They generally feel unloved, unimportant, and inferior—feelings they then project upon their victims.
- The bullying behavior is learned. Bullies are often victimized at home; their families have three times more problems; they have few good role models for constructive conflict resolution; the discipline they receive is harsh and inconsistent; there is little empathy expressed in their families; and the aggressive patterns of behavior are transmitted from generation to generation.
- Bullying by girls typically takes the form of verbal and social attacks. Bullies are more likely to demonstrate paranoid types of thinking and thus are likely to see hostile intent in the actions of potential victims.
- Bullies are less likely than others to recognize prosocial responses to threatening situations.
- They are quicker to anger and to use force.
- Typically, they have greater than average strength, are more energetic, are generally older than their victims, and place a great deal of importance on physical image.
- They are less positive about schoolwork and are more likely to have a variety of violence and crime-related problems as adults.

The book suggests interventions for victims and bystanders to manage bullies. These suggestions can be used toward preventing cycles of violence from starting in the family, at work, on the streets, and within communities. Here are some of the suggestions:
Ideas for Victims

- Avoid giving the bully an emotional payoff. Victims who can find ways to rob the bully's emotional payoff will take the pleasure out of the bully's behaviors and decrease the likelihood that these behaviors will continue over time.

- Be physically and verbally assertive (not aggressive). Bullies do not want to be challenged; they are only interested in easy targets. Choose assertive words and behaviors that convey confident messages without demeaning the other person. Take an assertive and direct physical stance. Avoid being aggressive or making threatening gestures.

- Do something unexpected. Bullies want victims who are predictable.

- Practice necessary behaviors. Don't just ruminate after the fact, but plan ahead for different responses that may work, but practice where it is safe and with someone who is safe to be with.

- Strengthen continuing friendships and make new ones. Bullying requires that victims be isolated in some way. Reversing isolation is a good way of decreasing the possibility of victimization.

- Seek support when necessary. Victims need to know that they are not alone.

Ideas for Bystanders

- Recognize and give permission to act on your feelings and discomfort. Bystanders are frequently embarrassed, feel inadequate, and are afraid when confronted by the acts of a bully. Find other people who feel similarly and start sharing feelings together.

- Decide on specific actions to take. To overcome inadequacy bystanders have to act. Thinking about specific actions and doing something is better than doing nothing at all. Not all interventions work, but we can learn from the ones that do not.

- Provide immediate and/or follow-up support for victims. Bystanders can become involved by helping victims either through direct intervention or personal support. The larger the number of bystanders available and the more united their approach, the greater will be the possibility of success.

- Spend time with victims.

- Get physically and personally closer to victims rather than keeping your distance.
  - Talk with victims about casual things.
  - Invite victims to be involved in a variety of group activities.
  - Be encouraging of victims efforts and accomplishments.
Primary Prevention: Ending the Cycles of Violence

Primary Prevention: Ending the Cycles of Violence

• Talk about serious things and problems when the victims want to do so.
• Express your desire to find additional ways to help.
• Give support regularly.
• Help bullies change in ways that are positive for themselves and others. Condemn the behavior, not the person.
• Seek help in appropriate ways and situations.

If we all took these recommendations seriously, in every social setting, most victimization would stop before it even started. We all have known people who fit this description. We probably still do. Bullies are not only hoodlums on the streets. They also run corporations, sit in houses of Congress, and dominate our airwaves. The problem is that bullying works. Bullies gain power, prestige, and wealth. But as many observers have pointed out, they only get away with it because of the power of the bystander effect. When groups of people join together to say no to bullies, the bullies are forced to back down. We all must stop being bystanders and instead, become witnesses.

A COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO VIOLENCE

Bucks County, Pennsylvania, is one of the wealthiest counties in the United States. North of Philadelphia, it is the site of the original home of William Penn and contains the exact point where Washington crossed the Delaware. For our purposes, Bucks County is interesting because of its demographics. Large for a northeastern region, it encompasses wealthy suburbs, rural farmlands, old small towns, trailer parks, and suburban ghettos. Every major ethnic group and every religion is represented. A stronghold of Republican voters, it has a county government that has historically tended toward conservatism. But faced with rising crime in the streets, in the schools, and at work, the movers and shakers of the county decided to take action and in May 1995, presented an antiviolence plan which they have been busily putting into place ever since.

William Eastburn is a prominent local attorney who survived a shot to the heart by an assailant. He joined forces with Judge Kenneth Biehn, President Judge of the Bucks County Court of Common Pleas and husband of the Education Director of the local Network of Victims Assistance. Together and with the support of three County Commissioners, Charles Martin, Michael Fitzpatrick, and Sandra Miller, they spearheaded the development of a countywide Task Force on Violence. The task force participants rapidly swelled to over 300 individuals representing more than 150 organizations in the county.
Among those included were grassroots community groups, civic associations, schools, police departments, churches and synagogues, hospitals and health agencies, cultural organizations, criminal justice agencies, corporations, small businesses, and the media. These active volunteers gave freely of their time and talents, willingly traveling to attend meetings, often early in the morning and in the evening hours, and spending many hours in between meetings organizing, preparing reports, making calls, writing up minutes, recruiting more people, and doing what it takes to get a massive effort off the ground. The United Way of Bucks County provided some one-year support to get the effort under way and this was supplemented by a planning grant from the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency through its “Communities That Care” program.

The charge of the task force was this:

To reduce violence in Bucks County’s homes, schools, and communities by identifying model public and private prevention efforts and by developing a countywide action plan to design and implement the most effective programs.

In the executive summary, the task force outlined six major strategies with implementation plans for each strategy.

**Strategy 1**

Build strong violence prevention relationships among community members, schools, social agencies, governmental agencies, religious institutions, law enforcement agencies, and mass media.

* Create an ongoing working group of diverse community members and professionals to establish priorities and to evaluate progress in all areas of the plan.
* Establish a council of social service agencies and community organizations that includes a business and industry link to promote continued resource sharing and collaboration.
* Promote media involvement by assisting in communication between media and community resources, promoting public discussion on violence prevention and related issues, and encouraging media sensitivity in handling stories involving violence.

**Strategy 2**

Prevent violence by acknowledging existing positive efforts and by identifying and implementing additional prevention and intervention programs for our families, our schools, and communities.
• Promote culturally sensitive parenting programs for physical, psychological, and social safety in families.
• Encourage increased use of Student Assistance Programs and Instructional Support Teams in the schools to help children at risk.
• Establish a domestic violence treatment network for abusive partners.
• Promote increased awareness and use of prevention and intervention services by older adults and people with disabilities.
• Integrate alcohol and drug prevention programs with violence prevention programs.

Strategy 3

Strive to build community programs that provide social, economic, and recreational opportunities with special focus on youth.

• Present models to motivate adults to take positive roles in the development of youth and to provide youth with more opportunities for leadership and cultural awareness.
• Promote the growth of a variety of mentoring programs.
• Present a model to increase recreational alternatives through community partnerships.
• Gather and disseminate job and volunteer opportunities for youth; encourage the development of increased opportunities.
• Encourage employers and employees to get involved with youth through community service activities such as adopt-a-school programs.

Strategy 4

Promote the implementation of violence prevention education.

• Establish a central data bank through the Bucks County Free Library for violence prevention resources and information and explore ways to keep citizens abreast of state-of-the-art prevention information.
• Link trainers and mentors with organizations and neighborhood groups to assist them in implementing violence prevention programs.
• Encourage every public and private school to designate a violence prevention facilitator.
• Provide community education and professional training in sexual and domestic violence prevention and treatment in understanding the management and supervision of sex offenders in the community.
• Provide community education and professional training about the mental health system and methods of crisis intervention.

**Strategy 5**

Improve the Justice System in Bucks County to provide a system of response to diminish incidences of violence.

• Create a Violence Against Women coordinating team to develop a unified system's response to domestic and sexual violence.
• Investigate the establishment of a Family Resource Center for supervised visitations, information, and referral.
• Promote ways to increase communication between the justice system and the drug and alcohol systems.
• Encourage and assist self-identified communities in stopping the cyclical patterns of drug abuse and violence.
• Coordinate justice agencies with treatment providers to help in the supervision, management, and treatment of sex offenders in the community.

**Strategy 6**

Create a sense of community and foster leadership development in all our neighborhoods.

• Encourage individual communities to build neighborhood identity through more opportunities for resident contact and communication.
• Provide leadership skills training for volunteers who seek to improve their communities.
• Develop opportunities for interaction and communication among municipalities and communities.
• Establish a countywide council dedicated to ending discrimination based on age, race, color, gender, religion, creed, culture, socioeconomic status, sexual orientation, ancestry, handicap, or disability.
• Recognize and promote neighborhood models of successful, nonviolent approaches to problem solving.

Two years into the development of the plan, the task force has formed an implementation committee of about eleven members representing the president judge, the head of the largest charitable organization in the county, the publisher of the local newspaper, representatives of district
justices, juvenile justice, children and youth, schools, clergy, hospitals, law enforcement, human health services, and the county commissioners. Significant progress has already been made in covering many areas of the action plan. Violence in the workplace has been strongly addressed with positive results through seminars, meetings, and agency involvement. With the cooperation of law enforcement and several public agencies, the schools have received increased funding for antidrug and antiviolence programs. A Human Relations Council has formed and has been involved in the investigation of several violent situations involving problems in several different communities. Because of the unity of the council, it was able to respond quickly and forcefully to a recent incidence of violence involving area students. The media has been integrally involved in all of the antiviolence efforts and have made commitments to do more extensive stories that present the stories of the victims and the follow-up to violence, rather than just sensationalizing the acts of perpetration. Parenting centers have been established in three different communities. Every school has appointed an antiviolence coordinator who integrates services with the drug and alcohol agencies and law enforcement. Mentoring programs have dramatically increased and local industries and chambers of commerce have become involved in adopting schools. This example of one community action plan was designed to bring about long-term change over the next decade, but already the residents of this county are able to see positive change as a result of local empowerment.

**BEARING WITNESS AND HUMAN LIBERATION**

As physicians and health care providers, we are convinced that the kinds of major interventions and changes that we have described in this book are necessary. Our work with individual patients has shown us why this is so. It is not possible to curb an epidemic as long as the disease carriers are allowed free access to other vulnerable people. It is not possible to correct potentially fatal physiological problems on a battlefield. The first step in any situation in which there is the potential for a high casualty rate is triage, to sort out the most life-threatening cases from others. The next step is to establish some kind of order, to restore even a minimal element of safety to the situation. Our debates over gun control, media violence, corporal punishment, domestic violence, prison, affirmative action, child abuse, health care, and welfare reform make about as much sense as two surgeons in a MASH tent arguing about which kind of suture material to use while the patient is bleeding to death.
We do not need any more studies to prove that there is a correlation between guns and gunshot wounds, between violence on TV and violence in vulnerable children, between corporal punishment and the perpetuation of violence, between domestic violence and many forms of psychological and social problems, between prison environments and the learning of violence, between discrimination and identity problems, between child abuse and adult psychiatric and social problems, between poor health care and poor health, between poverty and environments that promote trauma. We do, however, need more research to help us understand what the most effective strategies are to deal with these very complex problems. Because of the complicated and often provocative nature of the problems, perhaps it is only natural that we would want to avoid wrestling with these issues. Or that we would keep trying to label the problems as being less complex and interconnected than they are. After all, committing ourselves to reversing the structural violence that comprises much of the normal behavior in our society will take enormous effort, time, and money. The changes that are required necessitate a total mobilization of social resources, the kind of activation that we usually only see in response to a declared war. Turn on the news or read a newspaper and one could begin to believe that perhaps we are in a war, but this war is much more difficult to fight—this is a war against ourselves.

We have titled this book *Bearing Witness* because we wanted to convey the vital importance of the need for all those who are presently silent to speak up and bear witness to what they have seen. This is a particularly urgent call to health care workers and other service providers who spend a lifetime in the “trenches,” attempting to fix what is already broken, while trying to prevent more damage from occurring. The idea of bearing witness derives from the concept of testimony that came out of Chile in the 1970s, when psychologists, priests, nuns, and other caregivers put their own lives on the line by collecting testimonies from former political prisoners who had been tortured (Agger and Jensen, 1990). This process of listening to, recording, and transmitting the details of pain and moral outrage has also been a process that Holocaust survivors such as Victor Frankl, Bruno Bettelheim, Primo Levi, and Elie Wiesel have used for themselves and to help others.

Ignacio Martín-Baró was a Salvadoran Jesuit priest, theologian, and psychologist who was assassinated by the U.S.-trained government soldiers in November 1989 because of his alignment with the Salvadoran people in their collective resistance to oppression and their struggle for peace and justice. In a manuscript he finished just before his murder, he wrote about a “liberation psychology,” a sister discipline to the “libera-
tion theology" that grew out of war-torn Latin America. He noted that psychology—and by extension all caregiving professions—have served directly and indirectly to strengthen oppressive political structures that exist by drawing attention away from themselves and toward individual and subjective factors. He called for a new psychology that would engage initially in three major tasks. The first task is the recovery of historical memory,

to discover through collective memory, those elements of the past which have proved useful in the defense of the interests of exploited classes and which may be applied to the present struggles... Thus, the recovery of a historical memory supposes the reconstruction of models of identification that, instead of chaining and caging the people, open up the horizon for them, toward their liberation and fulfillment. (Martín-Baró, 1994, p. 30)

The second task is to de-ideologize everyday experience, since

we know that knowledge is a social construction. Our countries live burdened by the lie of a prevailing discourse that denies, ignores, or disguises essential aspects of reality... this process of de-ideologizing common sense must be realized as much as possible through critical participation in the life of the poorer people. (Ibid., p. 31)

The third task is to utilize the people's virtues because

current history confirms, day by day, their uncompromising solidarity with the suffering, their ability to deliver and to sacrifice for the collective good, their tremendous faith in the human capacity to change the world, their hope for a tomorrow that keeps being violently denied to them. (Ibid., p. 31)

For healing to occur, victims of violence need to "speak out to power," whether that power is invested in their parents, their spouse, their teacher, their boyfriend, their employer, their neighbor, their clergyman, or their government. In an interconnected, interdependent world there simply is no room for violence.

In his essay on postmodernism and the prospects for a new world order, philosopher and legal scholar Richard Falk (1992) reminds us that

The human species has a special coevolutionary capacity and responsibility. Unlike other species we are aware of our roles in the world and
be the burdens of awareness of having disrupted the ecological order to such a dangerous and unnecessary degree. As humans, we can respond to the pain of the world by devoting our energies to various kinds of restorative action, building institutional forms and popular support for such a dramatic reorientation of behavior. This "conversion" from secularism is under way but to an uneven degree, and virtually not at all in relations to the powerfully entrenched governmental and market structures associated with modernist enterprise. ... We remain at a stage of postmodern consciousness in which our discernment of negations has formed a consensus but our imaginative attempts at alternatives remain at the experimental stage, hence fraught with controversy and disillusion. (p. 36)

There is no logical reason why our world cannot become a place of peace, tolerance, compassion, and care if we have sufficient dedication, imagination, and perseverance to overcome time-honored obstacles. But it will not happen without the active participation of those who are presently still silent, fearful of their own voice and the bullies that surround us. It is our hope that this book has offered those silent ones a different way of thinking about, understanding, and integrating much of what we already know at a deeper, soul level about what needs to change and that this knowledge will help us all find courage for the struggle that lies ahead. We must commit ourselves to some higher vision, some greater spiritual, moral, or religious reality that allows us at least a momentary glimpse of wholeness, health, and integrity. Once we have experienced wholeness, we will never want to be fragmented again.

Human rights are universal and indivisible. Human freedom is not separate from these; if it's denied to anyone anywhere, it is therefore denied, indirectly, to all. This is why we can't remain silent in the countenance of evil or violence; silence merely encourages evil and violence. ... Respect for the universality of human and civil rights, their inalienability and indivisibility, is perforce possible only when it's understood—at least in the philosophical or existential sense—that one is "responsible for the whole world" and that one must behave in the manner in which all ought to behave, even if not all do.

Vaclav Havel
"True Democracy Demands Moral Conviction"
1993, p. 607