

INTEGRATING INDIGENOUS PEACEMAKING IN THE ACADEMY



NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL
CENTER AT STANFORD

Purpose of toolkit

This toolkit serves as an introduction to the Indigenous practice of Peacemaking. It provides foundational knowledge for individuals, communities, and organizations who are considering building alternative processes to address harm, violence, difference, decision making, and community building.

This toolkit serves as a starting point. As practitioners, we recognize that there is a “substantial distinction between having skills and learning skills, between being experts and practicing” (Dixon, 2020, p. 21). Peacemaking is a fluid process which takes different shapes with different communities. It is a practice that encourages constant learning, growth, and innovation. In the words of our community partners, peacemaking is a process best learned through practice on an individual and communal level.

We acknowledge the many truths and processes that surround Peacemaking. Thus, we do not attempt to assert any hierarchy within this knowledge system. With that, we emphasize the importance of readers continuing to learn beyond this toolkit. This resource promotes the further exploration of the various articles, books, scholars, and programs mentioned. But also encourages seeking knowledge beyond what is presented by standard Academia. Look to the source.

This toolkit is the culmination of a research project conducted by Niyolpaqui Moraza-Keeswood `20 in collaboration with the Native American Cultural Center and the Policy, Organization, and Leadership Studies Program.

Version 1.0

Published June 2020

Stanford University

Native American Cultural Center
Old Union Clubhouse Ground Floor

524 Lasuen Mall

Stanford, CA 94305-3064

Phone:

(650) 725-6944

Table of contents

[Our Partners](#)

[What is Peacemaking?](#)

[A Nod Towards Existing Peacemaking Programs](#)

[Navajo Nation Peacemaking](#)

[Ho'oponopono](#)

[Peacemaking and Balance](#)

[Hózhó: A Diné Understanding of Balance](#)

[Tikanga Māori: A Māori Understanding of Balance](#)

[A Values Based Approach to Balance](#)

[System/ Mechanisms of Justice](#)

[Horizontal Justice](#)

[Restorative Justice](#)

[Transformative Justice](#)

[Mediation](#)

[Punitive/ Vertical Justice](#)

[Stanford Peacemaking Initiatives](#)

[Applications of Peacemaking In Higher Education](#)

[Additional Resources](#)

[References](#)

[Appendix](#)

Our partners

The initiatives that have been crafted at Stanford were done in partnership with various community partners. We would like to recognize and thank them for their contribution to our efforts and for their greater contributions to the field of Peacemaking and Restorative practices.

Karen Biestman is the Associate Dean and Director of the Native American Cultural Center and teaches at the Center for the Study of Race and Ethnicity in the areas of Federal Indian Law, Nation Building, and American Indian Religious Freedom. Prior to 2011, she taught at U.C. Berkeley in the Law School, American Studies, and Native American Studies, and served as Assistant Dean of Students and Coordinator of Native American Studies. She left academia for one year to serve as Director of Indian Education for the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX, in San Francisco to develop a national curriculum on Working Effectively with Tribal Governments. She received both her B.A. and J.D. from U.C. Berkeley.

Cheryl Fairbanks (Tlingit-Tsimshian) directs the Native American Budget and Policy Institute, which through research, analysis, advocacy, and litigation works to empower Native American communities to create self-determined and systematic change that will improve their health, education, and economic well-being. Formerly a Partner at Cuddy McCarthy LLP, she had a general practice in Indian law, including tribal-state relations, personnel, tribal courts, peacemaking and family conferencing, mediation, family, school, education, and indigenous law. She has worked as a senior policy analyst with the New Mexico Office of Indian Affairs where she was instrumental in establishing the Indian Child Welfare Desk, New Mexico Office of Indian Tourism, the University of New Mexico Indian Law Clinic, and the passage of the New Mexico Indian Arts and Crafts Act. Ms. Fairbanks has served as the Walter R. Echo-Hawk Distinguished Visiting Professor of Law at Lewis and Clark and was a visiting Professor of Law at the University of New Mexico's Southwest Indian Law Clinic.

Sonya Shah is the founding Director of The Ahimsa Collective, initiated in 2016. The Ahimsa Collective works to respond to harm in ways that foster wholeness for everyone. She is also an associate professor at the California Institute of Integral Studies. Central to her core values are nurturing community belonging and collective care, healing, compassion, love and transforming harm. She is a Buddhist, a first-generation immigrant from the Northwestern part of India and feels most at home in nature. She has two amazing children who remind her what it means to be in love all of the time, and currently resides in northern California.

Brett Lee Shelton, enrolled Oglala Sioux Tribe, is the staff attorney primarily responsible for the peacemaking project at the Native American Rights Fund. He developed his interest in peacemaking and other alternative dispute resolution while still in law school at Stanford. In addition to the Indigenous Peacemaking Initiative, his work at NARF includes boarding school healing project work, sacred places protection, and other religious freedom matters. He has also worked in private practice, served Indian Tribes as a policy analyst for the National Indian Health Board, organized grassroots efforts for international indigenous peoples in biotechnology evaluation, and assisted domestic violence victims in civil court on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota and Nebraska (his home reservation). He received his law degree from Stanford University and a Master of Arts from the University of Kansas.

Carson Smith is a proud citizen of the Choctaw Nation. She is currently an MPhil student in Socio-Legal Research at the University of Oxford and recently graduated from Stanford University with her BA in Political Science. Carson has focused her research on Peacemaking and community mediation practices. In the past, she has designed student Peacemaking mechanisms and acted as a Peacemaking practitioner for multiple student-centered conflicts in university settings. She has also co-designed and co-taught courses on culturally-competent conflict resolution at the Stanford Design School.

Robert Yazzie is a citizen of and Chief Justice Emeritus of the Navajo Nation. He served as Chief Justice from 1992 through 2003. He practiced law in the Navajo Nation for 16 years and was a district judge for eight years. He was formerly the Director of the Diné Policy Institute of Diné College (Navajo Nation) developing policy using authentic Navajo thinking. He is a visiting professor at the University of New Mexico School of Law, an adjunct professor of the Department of Criminal Justice of Northern Arizona University, and a visiting member of the faculty of the National Judicial College. He recently taught Navajo law at the Crownpoint Institute of Technology. Yazzie earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from Oberlin College of Ohio, and a Juris Doctor degree from the University of New Mexico School of Law.

What is Peacemaking?

Peacemaking is an Indigenous conflict resolution process which works to address the core issues of conflict to restore balance within one's self, between peers, and among community. Peacemaking recognizes that conflict is layered and often derives from underlying problems which can cause disruption on a communal level (Akwesasne Community, 1999). The process shifts the idea of justice from getting even to getting well, recognizing that healthy relationships lead to prevention of future harm (Pranis et al., 2003, p. 10). Peacemaking recognizes that everyone has the capacity to change, but that change cannot occur in isolation.

Peacemaking brings together all impacted members of the community to reach a place of mutual understanding and respect. For if the community does not work through the conflict by reestablishing a balanced, healthy relationship, reintegration is less likely to succeed, and the core issue is likely to take root once more (Connors, 2016; Jweied, 2014). Our justice system has fostered a communal dependence on the state—long has it deprived communities the opportunity to work through conflict and grow through that process (Pranis et al., 2003, p. 12). Peacemaking is a step towards shifting dependence from the state to the community. It encourages us to sustain and build stronger, healthier relationships.

In a peacemaking process, participants strive towards a place of understanding, knowing that it will lead to meaningful demonstration of responsibility and accountability for harmful acts. As our current Punitive system has demonstrated, punishment does not actively meet the needs of the harmed party nor does it promote a positive change in behavior without causing additional harm (EX. The Justice System's response to Police violence) (Dixon, 2020, p.22; Ross, 2006). Peacemaking engages participants in intentional discussion, with behavior framed around core values (respect, honesty, trust, humility, sharing, inclusivity, empathy, courage, forgiveness, and love) that enable us to stay grounded as we work through difficult conversations (LeResche, 1993; Pranis et al., 2003; Yazzie, 1994). The focus is not on winning or losing, or facing consequences for past events, but on the future of our relationships (Dixon, 2020, p. 207; Pranis et al., 2003; Wolf, 2012; Yazzie, 1994). Instead of judging or using force, participants directly address the actions and their consequences. Peacemaking resists the urge from white culture that calls for a specific, immediate settlement (NW Indian Bar Association, 1999).

Peacemaking expects conflicts, accusations, and angry emotions to arise through the process. These expressions show that participants are speaking from their hearts about how they understand themselves and experience a situation (Biestman, Personal Communication, 2020; Pranis et al., 2003). We want everyone to be heard and to express the physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual dimensions of themselves; this is necessary to be fully open and to create outcomes that include all aspects of one's reality (Austin, 2009; Duncan & Rewi, 2018; LeResche, 1993; Meyer, 1995; Richland & Deer, 2010; Ross, 2006). In this setting, conflict is reframed as an opportunity to create understanding, respect, and a better-founded connectedness. It acknowledges conflict as a natural part of life that we can choose how to respond to, be it a good or bad, constructive or deconstructive (Pranis et al., 2003, p. 19).

Ultimately, Peacemaking “acknowledges the harm to victims, validates their pain and suffering, affirms that what happened was wrong, and attends to the victim's needs and interests” (Pranis et al., 2003, p.

27). It strives to reach a place of understanding in which the perpetrator wishes to hold themselves accountable and work to restore balance in themselves and within the community. It has us looking to the roots of our being, searching our hearts, souls, and truths, to guide us back onto the right path in life (Pranis et al. 2003, p. 80).

A Nod Towards Existing Peacemaking Programs

Variations of Peacemaking are practiced by Indigenous peoples all throughout the world. They are as varied as the cultures and practices of the communities they serve (Richland & Deer, 2010). Commonalties may be found in processes having a focus on spirituality, an aim to restore harmony and balance between broken relationships, community and relationships are centered, and healing is done through love and deep listening (LeResche, 1993).

The models which we will look at reflect thorough investigations by tribes into their own culture and practices of conflict management. They address a degree of respect and value for “the norms, structures, and practices that constitute that tribal community’s law and way of life” (Richland & Deer, 2010, p. 341). As we will see with Ho’oponopono and Navajo Peacemaking, language also plays a vital role in understanding the nature of peacemaking processes. Both English and written word often limit the extent we are able to convey the deep underpinnings of Peacemaking that derive from specific tribes.

Current communities on Turtle Island that practice a form of Peacemaking include but are not limited to: “Nez Perce of Idaho and Washington State, the Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe in Minnesota, the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho in Wyoming, the White Mountain Apache in Arizona, the Cheyenne-Arapaho and Kiowa Nations in Oklahoma, the Skokomish, Swinomish, and Sauk-Suiattle Nations of Washington, the Tlingit Indians of the Yukon region of southeastern Alaska (particularly the Organized Village of Kake), the Chickasaw Nation in Oklahoma, the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa in Michigan’s Upper Peninsula, the Little River Band of Ottawa Indians in Michigan, the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas”, Kanaka Maoli, and the Mashpee Wampanoag (Wolf & Center for Court Innovation, 2012).

Below we explore the Navajo Nation Peacemaking Courts, a nationally recognized example of institutionalized Peacemaking, and Ho’oponopono, a more localized method of Peacemaking practiced in Kanaka Maoli communities.

Navajo Nation Peacemaking

Navajo Peacemaking (**Hózhqǫǫjí Naat’áanii**) utilizes Navajo customs, traditions, and traditional procedures to arrive at consensual solutions to disputes (Austin, 2009). In the 1980’s public concerns about the Navajo Nation Court Systems arose critiquing the inherent incompatibility between traditional Navajo justice ways and Western-style litigation. In particular, they noted the following issues: the current system could not resolve certain kinds of problems in Navajo Communities; the Western form of adjudication was too expensive and time-consuming; Western methods confused and frustrated Navajo litigants; and the confrontational style of Western adjudication conflicted with Navajo justice

procedures (Austin, 2009, p. 39). The response was a call for an alternative resolution process that “would be inexpensive, rapid, simple, and meet the standards of Navajo Tradition” (Austin, 2009, p. 39). Thus, in 1982, traditional peacemaking was revived and turned into the Navajo Peacemaker Court (now called the Navajo Peacemaking Division).

The Navajo Peacemaking Division works to invoke traditional procedures and **Diné bibee haz’áanii** (Navajo Common Law)—traditional viewed as values, customs, and traditions that are passed down orally across generations and which produce and maintain right relations, right relationships, and desirable outcomes (Austin, 2009, p. 40). Today, the term **bee haz’áanii** (law) is understood as Navajo statutory law, administrative regulations, court-made law, and Navajo common law (which includes Hózhq, k’é, and k’éí, discussed later) (Austin, 2009). As Justice Robert Yazzie describes, “while anglo law is concerned with social control by humans, Navajo law comes from creation. It concerns life itself, and the means to live successfully” (Yazzie, 1994).

The Navajo Peacemaking process is community centered and accessible to all yet exists as a part of the greater Navajo Judicial system. Common types of disputes the division deals with are: problems among husband, wives, and their families; disputes between parents and children; minor problems between neighbors such as nuisances, animal trespass, and disruptive conduct; alcohol abuse; sexual misconduct; harm to people or property; and business related matters (Zion, 1999). The process can be requested by anyone by submitting a request form, which takes 1-2 minutes to complete, to the clerk of the court’s office (Zion, 1999). It is then either approved or a judge will follow-up to request additional information. Subpoenas are allowed as part of the process and there is flexibility to issue a formal court order once a judgement has been made. However, no lawyers are allowed in the Peacemaking courts (Zion, 1999).

The Peacemaking process is overseen by a **Naat’áanii** (“peacemaker”). This person is a traditional Navajo civil leader who was selected by the community due to their demonstrated abilities, wisdom, integrity, good character, and respect to and by the community (Yazzie, 1994). The Naat’áanii acts as a guide and uses their knowledge to steer participants towards consensus. They apply the values of spiritual teachings to bond disputants together and restore them to good relations (Yazzie, 1994). Naat’áanii do not impose judgement; judgement is decided upon by all who are involved.

The goal of Navajo Peacemaking is to restore harmony to relationships. Participants work to build consensus by talking openly about the problems, trying to understand what the core of the issue is and how to deal with it. The process is like bringing in a healer when someone is sick—the healer determines the illness, causes, and what ceremonies to cure it (Yazzie, 1994). Throughout the process, the Naat’áanii works to create a sense of oneness, reasserting K’é, with the belief that a focus on solidarity will replace force and coercion, ultimately restoring good relations among people and self (Yazzie, 1994). There are typically lectures on how or why “the parties have violated Navajo values, have breached solidarity, or are out of harmony” (Ross, 2006, p. 24). The product of a Peacemaking ceremony that uses apology, forgiveness, and ‘talking things out’ is **nályééh** (restitution, reparation, or compensation). This will take the shape of an agreement as to the amount of restitution that will restore participants to **Hózhq** (*Discussed below*) (Austin, 2009, p. 79).

Ho'oponopono

In the following section, we attempt to sketch out the core aspects of Ho'oponopono. We acknowledge that this is only scratching the surface of the practice and that there are limitations to describing Ho'oponopono in English and in writing. We encourage readers to delve into the work of Kanaka Maoli practitioners for a more in-depth understanding.

“Ho'oponopono (To Set Right) in this tale is a group process. It is a ritualized way to share truth, truth and more truth so that broken hearts mend and core issues are transformed into light and a memory that no longer holds emotion” (Meyer, 1995)

Ho'oponopono is a family-based process. It acknowledges that a wrong doer and wrong-er are tied together by **hala** (transgression) and the chain of events that follow (Pukui et al., 1972). This tie can be comprised of anger, revenge, old grudges, guilt, and fear of discovery or confrontation. As this grows and spreads throughout us and **'ohana** (family ties), it turns into **hihia** (a tangling of emotions that hinders forgiveness) (Meyer, n.d.).

Ho'oponopono is called on by the 'ohana upon the existence of conflict. The process begins with introducing, scrutinizing, and agreeing upon five basic principles:

1. “Each individual in the 'ohana must share a common commitment to be part of the problem-solving process.”
2. “All words and deeds that are part of a ho'oponopono will be shared in an atmosphere of **'oia i'o** (the essence of truth).”
3. “The 'ohana must share a common sense of aloha for one another or be committed to reinstating that spirit.”
4. “Everything that is said in a ho'oponopono is done in confidence and will *not* be repeated when the session is complete. “
5. “The **haku** (facilitator) must be commonly agreed on as a fair and impartial channel through which the ho'oponopono is done.” (Meyer, n.d.)

This is then followed with a **pule wehe** (opening prayer) for guidance directed towards the family **'aumakua** (family god). The **haku** (unbiased mediator) will then begin the **kukulu kumuhana**, a clear, objective statement as to why the ho'oponopono was called (Meyer, n.d.). This centers the problem at hand and works to gather together the emotional, physical, and spiritual strength of family towards a shared purpose (Meyer, 1995). It pools intention. It is a call for collective focus and the application of **aloha, pono**, and **mihi** (compassion, truth, and forgiveness). It is a pause to allow family members feeling troubled, untrusting, or resistant to exist in the spirit of aloha, and clear a pathway to forgiveness via non-judgement, trust, and compassion (Meyer, n.d.). It is a gathering of **mana** (energy) to be directed at healing (Meyer, n.d.).

Ho'oponopono then steps into the **Mahiki** phase, a process of unraveling, discussion and examination of each layer or event that has created the hihia (Meyer, n.d.). Participants go right to the heart of the perceived transgression, which often is deeper, hidden, and secret even to those involved in conflict. Participants unbind themselves from the restriction of anger and fortify ties of commitment and love (Meyer, n.d.). One can only speak when given permission by the haku, who works to deflect anger and

clarify emotions, both of which should not run unchecked. Mahiki works to bring forth **'Oia I'o** (the essence of truth, absolute truth). There are many layers to **'oia I'o**—often hiding out of fear and mistrust—and as we coax it out with love and compassion, the hala will become known, and sorrow will be better understood (Meyer, n.d.). Relative truths will become absolute truths.

As the truth becomes known, the haku works towards **mihi**, a phase of forgiveness, apology, and confession. To forgive is to reconnect through loving and understanding (Meyer, n.d.). During mihi, haku takes a step back to allow family members to talk directly to each other. It is a time of intense emotion and sincerity.

Following mihi, we experience **kala**, the releasing of conflict. Kala seeks to strip the incident of its triggering attributes and create a sense of release (Meyer 1995). This may involve a degree of repentance or restitution depending on the communal consensus. Neither will be free of hihia until kala.

Peacemaking and Balance

Peacemaking understands that all beings are intricately intertwined. It recognizes a balance that exists both within us as individuals and between all of creation. Each part of creation has a special job that is necessary to maintain balance. Peacemaking acknowledges that our reality is fluid and that fluidity is influenced by personal actions, words, and thoughts (Geniusz, 2015). What we do, speak, and even think, creates a ripple that impacts all our relations (Geniusz, 2015).

Harm, violence, misbehavior, and disagreement are results of an individual who has fallen out of balance with themselves, with their family, with their community, and with creation (Ross, 2006). Peacemaking works to restore this balance by looking towards the underlying issues which need to be resolved for lasting change. Recognizing that an individual's action affects the community, Peacemaking centers all of those impacted to foster communal healing and learning. It attempts to reestablish the individual's relationship with community and creation knowing that further isolation, judgement, and punishment only leads to greater imbalance. (Connors, 2016; Mirsky, 2004; Ross, 2006).

The statement above is just one interpretation which encapsulates central elements of balance. It is important to recognize that an understanding of balance takes different shapes with different Indigenous peoples. Below we briefly explore the Diné and Māori perspectives on attaining and living in a balanced way. These two examples were selected to display the similar, yet distinct ways balance may be understood by Indigenous peoples. They also assert the importance of Indigenous language use in Peacemaking processes. *This is followed by a value-based model that provides a more accessible framework for non-indigenous people to understand living in a balanced way.*

Hózhó: A Diné Understanding of Balance

The Diné (or Navajo) concept of **Hózhó** describes a state of being in which “everything is in its proper place and functioning in a harmonious relationship with creation” (Austin, 2009, p. 54). “Everything” refers to all components of the universe; the interconnected, interrelated, and interdependent elements that form a unified whole which resembles a web (Austin, 2009, p. 54). Hózhó is a concept that directs one's thinking, speaking, behavior and interactions with people and the natural world.

This system of relationships is mediated by **k'é**, a universal principle which facilitates relationships among all beings in the universe (Yazzie, 1994). **K'é** has been described as “love, kindness, peacefulness, friendliness, cooperation, and all the positive aspects of an intense, diffuse, and enduring solidarity” (Austin, 2009, p. 85). It is a set of values—such as respect, kindness, cooperation, friendliness, reciprocal relations, and love—that inform how Diné connect with family, clans, non-relatives, and the natural world (Austin, 2009, p. 84; Yazzie, 1994). Additionally, the concept of **k'éí** is used to describe the intricate Diné clan system which informs us of connectedness between clan relatives.

Hózhó, k'é, and k'éeí reference three distinct levels of harmonious relationships: (Austin, 2009)

- The Human level (relationships among family members, clan members, and tribe members)
- The Universal level (relationships among elements in the universe through universal law; i.e. the sun and earth together produce life)
- Spiritual level (relationships between Diné and the Holy Beings through ceremony, prayer, ritual, and offering).

Diné recognize the existence of **Hóchxq'**, as a state of disharmony caused by the maleficent force that is **naayéé'** (Austin, 2009). **Naayéé'** are the culprits which cause disharmony, friction, and discord in life. Today, Diné use **naayéé'** to metaphorically describe anything that disrupts harmony, balance, peace, order or goodness in life (Austin, 2009, p. 60). This may include criminal activity, civil disputes, and the many social and physical illnesses that plague the Navajo Nation (e.g. alcoholism, domestic violence, gangs, child abuse, student underachievement, suicide, and diabetes) (Austin, 2009).

In instance of **hóchxq'**, Peacemaking is one route which can be taken to identify and neutralize or eliminate the negative force. This process meant to restore the state of **hózhó** by entering back into a good relationship with yourself, your community, and the universe, is known as **hózhq nahasdlíi** (**hózhó** restored) (Austin, 2009).

Tikanga Maori: A Māori Understanding of Balance

Tikanga Māori means “straight, direct, tied in with the moral notions connotations of justice and fairness including notions of correct and right” (Toki, 2018, p. 35). It is a form of procedural knowledge, which is the practice of the ideas, beliefs, and knowledge of **Matauranga Māori**—the epistemological foundations of Māori Society which illustrates that all things can be traced back to the cosmogonies of the ancestors (Duncan & Rewi, 2018, p. 31). Through a legal lens, **tikanga** is the structure that gives power to ground rules and varies according to people and the circumstance (Toki, 2018, p. 35). The aim of Tikanga Māori is to preserve a positive dynamic and balance of relationships between people, the environment, and the spiritual world, as regulated by **mana** (a philosophical concept of power or prestige) and **tapu** (states of restriction and prohibition) (Toki, 2018, p. 36). Tikanga is seen as the accumulated knowledge of the ancestors brought into the physical world through its contemporary use and application.

Takahi Mana (the trampling of mana) is an act of disrespect towards others and/or a contradiction to tikanga which can result in an imbalance of mana (Duncan & Rewi, 2018). An attack on mana can come in physical, verbal, or spiritual forms which may be intentional or unintentional. When conduct that is “**hē** (a mistake or error) occurs, it causes imbalance within relationships, which constitutes a breach of tapu known as **hara** (wrongdoing), that must be rectified” (Toki, 2018, p. 36). Harm and violence, which are considered challenges to collective mana, are manifestations of **hē** and form the basis of disputes (Toki, 2018, p. 36).

The focus of a dispute resolution process is understanding the source of the problem, applying **utu**, and ultimately establishing a state of **ora** (well-being or balance) (Toki, 2018). The concept of **utu** seeks a return of balance through an act of reciprocity or restitution (Duncan & Rewi, 2018, p. 45). If this is in

response to a negative act such as *hara*, the practice of **murū** (ritual compensation via the gifting of property) may be employed (Duncan & Rewi, 2018, p. 45). Utu centers the principles of **manaakitanga** and **whanaungatanga** by forging or rebuilding relationships in a caring way. Utu recognizes the individual and collective mana that may have been disrupted, and works to reinstate, reaffirm, or reassert that mana returning participants to a position of balance and equilibrium within themselves, society, and the environment (Duncan & Rewi, 2018, p. 38-39).

Manaakitanga is the process of nurturing and fostering relationships with groups or individuals by enhancing holistic wellbeing through care and support. Manaakitanga encourages people to act in a way that demonstrates care and generosity of spirit to provide the best outcome for all concerned (Duncan & Rewi, 2018).

Whānaungatanga is the recognition of the formation of relationships through association. In contemporary society, these relationships can be based on common goals, interests, or activities which bond together a community or group (Duncan & Rewi, 2018).

A Bond That Transcends Space and Time

The three foundational Diné doctrines of *hózhó* (harmony), *k'é* (connection through values), and *k'éí* (kinship or clan system) are concepts that are similar to the foundations of *tikanga* which include *whakapapa* (genealogy), *whanaungatanga* (kinship), *rangimarie* (harmony), and *kotahitanga* (unity) (Toki, 2018, p. 207). Both concepts recognize a shared connection on a human level, spiritual level, and universal level and the sacred protocol that must be followed to sustain harmonious relationships. The origins of these beliefs were passed down through ancestors who were given these teachings by *atua* or holy peoples. These same guiding principles have been adapted to address conflict in formal and informal settings. In instances of conflict, the incorporation of these principles has helped to affirm respective cultural beliefs and produce notable, positive outcomes centered on healing and transforming relationships. Although the Māori and Diné are separated by land and sea, they both understand the sacred bond we share with each other and with creation. In order to live in harmony, that relationship must be nurtured with love and respect even in times of duress.

A Values Based Approach to Balance

For non-indigenous readers or those who may not have had cultural teachings on balance, we offer the following concept.

At the core of Peacemaking is the recognition of our interconnectedness with all living things. This concept conflicts with a widely held Eurocentric viewpoint which is human-centered, and human dominate (Ross, 2006). Thus, when practicing Peacemaking, we often ask: how can we find a common ground that all parties, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, can relate to? How can we engage with this process of cultural sharing in an ethical way?

Settler Colonization has inflicted irreparable harm upon the traditional practices of Native peoples, as such, new adaptations are being developed that draw upon traditional patterns and preserve traditional values (NW Indian Bar Association, 1999; Ross, 2006). It is these values that bind together the various approaches to Peacemaking and helps us to visualize our connectedness (Duncan & Rewi, 2018, p. 30).

For no matter the demographic, we are all able to identify and relate to values that guide us through life.

When entering a Peacemaking process, a key step is establishing the core values which will guide the process. We clarify our values to establish how we interact in the space, ultimately crafting an environment which enhances our capacity to act in value consistent ways and stay grounded in the midst of tension and change (Pranis et al., 2003). This also encourages participants to begin speaking and listening from their heart; Peacemaking values move participants beyond the positional thinking and professional roles and call forth the best in us (Pranis et al., 2003, p. 49). It gives us the courage to reach out to others, to allow our relationships to change, heal, and strengthen (Ross, 2006). We recognize the ways individuals can lose themselves in conflict, often resorting to hurtful strategies (*judging, blaming, and accusing others; being deceptive, manipulative, resentful, hostile, insensitive, arrogant, belligerent, aggressive, emotionally cold, unforgiving, or grudge bearing*) or to employing the fighting values that have been normalized in vertical justice systems (Pranis et al, 2003). However, engaging these punitive measures only furthers disharmony. As we speak life into these values and are reminded how to practice them in circle settings, we are taking necessary steps to living in a more positive, constructive, and healing way. In a balanced way.

Kay Pranis, Stuart, and Wedge (2003) identifies ten oft-named values and summarizes their implementation and impact in circle settings.



- **Respect** means honoring ourselves by acting in accord with our values, honoring others by recognizing their right to be different, and treating others with dignity. It means working to see past both offense and offender to discover humanity (35)
- **Honesty** begins with owning our thoughts, feelings, and actions. It encourages us to engage in dialogue not to defend our perspective but to question and to discover a wider truth (35)
- **Trust** begins with believing in who we are and that we can follow through on the values we center. It pushes us to take risks; to expose who we are and to begin reaching out to others. Trust creates more trust (36)
- **Humility** requires honoring another's voice by actively listening and staying present. It grows when we recognize our own limitations and calls on us to discover wider truths beyond advancing personal needs (36-37)
- **Sharing** requires opening ourselves up to others and allowing relationships to naturally develop. It calls for us to resist the urge to control people and situations. This includes the sharing of power amongst equals to elicit a more open and truthful exchange. Sharing pushes back upon expectations of "professionalism" and objectivity" that have been imposed upon us, allowing us to overcome challenges in sharing our personal hopes, fears, and stories (39).
- **Inclusivity** actively seeks to involve everyone whose interests are affected. It requires us to respect other's contributions and strives to include their concerns (40).
- **Empathy** allows us to understand each other through our stories. It shortens the distance that separates us and inspires compassion. It expresses the equality between us and those who suffer (40).
- **Courage** guides us to find our own paths and enables others to do the same. It is the ability to acknowledge fear and to move forward in spite of it. Courage helps us move past the worst to achieve something better (41).
- **Forgiveness:** Practicing all the above values moves us to a place where forgiveness becomes possible. Forgiveness is something we strive towards. We recognize that each person has their own unique path to finding inner peace and reaching a point of forgiveness. Forgiveness leads to a weakening of the grip of pain and suffering on our lives. It allows us to avoid the self-destructive effects that can come with anger and hatred, leading us and those we gifted it to, to a more balanced place (42).
- **Love** deepens our awareness that we are not separate. "All our values embolden our ability to love, while love in turn expands our ability to embrace other values". As we practice our values, our capacity to love expands (44). It is the act of love that adds quality and meaning to life.

Systems/ Mechanisms of Justice

The following section outlines current systems/ mechanisms of justice that are can be observed within the United States Judicial system, Tribal court systems, and among communities/ community-based organizations.

Horizontal Justice

Peacemaking falls under Horizontal Justice; a system based upon mending relationships and centering healing. A Horizontal Justice System engages in the following actions:

- Presents an equal process which decenters power, hierarchy, and punitive action (Hyslop and Jarrett, 2019; Ross, 2006)
- Champions a value centered process that encourages speaking and listening from the heart (Pranis et al, 2003)
- Addresses underlying causes of disagreement to mend and restore balance to broken relationships, and promote transformation on an individual and communal level (LeResche, 1993)
- Provides healing solutions that consider physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual wellness (Connors, 2016; LeResche, 1993; Ross, 2006)
- Acknowledges that disputes are not isolated; recognizes the resonating impact of an “individual” dispute upon community; reasserts connectedness and responsibility to community (Austin, 2009; Meyer, 1995; Yazzie, 1999)
- Incorporates traditions and customs commonly held by the community (Adversarial System and Peacemaking, 1999)
- Is controlled by the people and ensures everyone impacted has a voice (LeResche, 1993; Ross, 2006)

Restorative Justice

Restorative Justice is a process derived from Peacemaking which focused on the *repairing* of harm and *restoring* relationships. It is considered a form of Horizontal Justice and is identified by the following traits:

- Responds to three types of harm: 1) apologies for emotional harm, 2) restitution for property damage or loss, and 3) community service projects for communal harm. (Clark, 2014; Karp & Frank, 2016)
- Focused on the incident at hand, the impact on the community, how they will stand accountable, rather than passing judging upon the “offender” (Karp & Frank, 2016)
- The offender takes an active role in the process through listening, expressing remorse, accepting responsibility, and being reinstated (Clark, 2014)
- Works to understand the culture and context that contributed to the harms; explores what others with responsibility and authority can do to change these underlying conditions (Karp & Frank, 2016, pp. 145)
- Works to repair and reintegrate; utilizes collective problem solving with the involved parties to collectively identify and address harms, needs, and obligations to restoration (Karp & Frank, 2016)

- Meets emotional and material needs by allowing for unique and creative solutions towards reparation and reintegration (Clark, 2014)
- Runs adjunct to conventional criminal justice; does not address the racist, sexist, ableist, and classist nature of the criminal justice system, whom it benefits, and how it was developed (Toki, 2018, pp.65)

Peacemaking differs from Restorative Justice in the following ways:

- Peacemaking infers that there is an imbalance that caused disagreement; focused on restoring balance and transforming relationships by addressing underlying causes
- Includes extended communities and seeks to heal both the individual and community
- Relies upon an open-ended process; no time-limits and utilizes a broad range of tools (storytelling, lectures, cultural references, and other strategies of persuasion)
- Culture guides the process

Transformative Justice

Transformative Justice (TJ) is a political framework created to respond to violence without creating more violence. Like Peacemaking, TJ centers community accountability, holistic wellness, and the transformation of underlying conditions which cause harm. Transformative Justice actively works to build alternative structures to our current punitive systems (such as prisons, police, and I.C.E.) which utilize violence to maintain social control. (Mingus, Web)

- It was created for and is practiced by Black, Indigenous, Immigrant, and other communities of color, poor and low-income communities, people with disabilities, sex workers, queer and trans communities (Mingus, Web)
- Acknowledges the trauma and violence (deportation, harassment, state sanctioned violence, sexual violence, relocation, assimilation, etc.) State systems cause and perpetuate (Mingus, Web)
- Recognizes the need to transform conditions that create and sustain acts of violence, i.e. capitalism, poverty, trauma, isolation, heterosexism, cis-sexism, white supremacy, misogyny, ableism, mass incarceration, displacement, war, gender oppression and xenophobia (Mingus, Web)
- Uses a community accountability process in instances of harm with the goals of developing an understanding of impact on the individual and community, making apologies and amends, repairing damages, and changing behavior to prevent future harm (Mingus, Web)
- It is community based; affirms the belief that there is more possibility for transformation in communities than the state (Mingus, Web)
- Prioritizes the manifestation of healthy relationships, daily healing practices, good communication skills, skills to deescalate harm and violence, and healthy coping mechanisms (Mingus, Web)
- Cultivate countermeasures to violence such as healing, accountability, resilience, and safety (Mingus, Web)
- Works to understand the production of harm from a systemic lens, whereas peacemaking focuses on the production of harm via imbalance (Mingus, Web)

Transformative Justice differs from Peacemaking in the following ways:

- Works to address and prevent sexual abuse
- Centers socio-political injustices; has a systemic focus on transforming social conditions that perpetuate violence—systems of oppression and exploitation, domination, and state violence
- Both look to address the underlying issues of conflict to foster transformation, but TJ approaches change from a Liberation framework versus Peacemaking’s “balance” framing.
- Actively works against institutionalization and imprisonment

Mediation

The process of mediation employs a similar approach as peacemaking (utilizing questions to achieve understanding and encourages a degree of self-determination) but is distinct in the following ways: (Connors, 2016; LeResche, 1993; Meyer, 1995; Ross, 2006)

- Reflects a business model procedure in which consumer-clients “buy into” a predetermined process which they are expected to innately trust (LeResche, 1993)
- Centers on overt issues and material concerns like compensation and restitution as opposed to peacemaking’s focus on relationships, underlying causes, and ownership of the process (Ross, 2006)
- It is an inherently a “let’s get right down to business” process constrained with a set time limit and bounded by a contract (LeResche, 1993)
- Centers a third party who takes a leading role, often has not been vetted by the community, and may lack understanding around the nuances of the disagreement (LeResche, 1993; Meyer, 1995)
- Only involves immediate parties (LeResche, 1993)
- It is an inherently intellectual process (LeResche, 1993)
- Has a distinct vocabulary: Mediation uses terms such as dispute, conflict, punishment, revenge, and right. In peacemaking, such terms become stubborn disagreement, having differences, restitution, forgiveness, and truth (Meyer, n.d.)

Vertical/ Punitive Justice

The United States legal practice operates within a Vertical model of justice which is characterized by the following:

- Asserts that the solution to wrongdoing is the “teaching of a lesson” via power, force, and punishment, not accountability (Adversarial System and Peacemaking, 1999; Clark, 2014)
- Based on the values of individualism, competition, and autonomy (Connors, 2016)
- Motivated by revenge, retaliation, winning, and punishment (LeResche, 1993)
- Exists within a system of hierarchies and power (Yazzie, 1994)
 - A judge sits above all; they and their colleagues use rank and coercive power to enforce a verdict upon, what have become, objectified peoples (Adversarial System and Peacemaking, 1999; Yazzie, 1994)
 - A third party, who understands the complex system of law, speaks on behalf of the individual (Adversarial System and Peacemaking, 1999; Yazzie, 1994))

- A win/lose situation; the process is to determine who is bad and who is good, who is wrong and who is right, who is innocent and who is condemned. This disregard for one's humanity often leads to the creation of social outcasts and internalized identity struggles (Karp and Frank 2016; LeResche, 1993; Yazzie, 1994)
- Punishment (often the loss of freedom via incarceration) fosters an oppositional subculture that is counterproductive to the goals of vertical justice; this results in: pain, isolation, resentment, defiance, and ultimately recidivism (Connors, 2106; Karp and Frank, 2016, p. 21)
- Does not work to solve the underlying problems, address needs, feelings, and holistic wellness, or facilitate healing. Thus, participants often left feeling empty-handed and unsatisfied (Yazzie, 1994)
- Does not consider the impact of harm upon the community who are also considered "victims;" because the community is excluded from the process, it cannot heal (Yazzie, 1994.
- It is a system that emphasizes privilege and dishonesty (Mirsky, 2004; Yazzie, 1994))
 - Money and identity can mediate the verdict
 - Lying becomes a method to manipulate or undermine the process to one's advantage
- Does not acknowledge indigenous sovereignty.

Stanford Peacemaking Initiatives

The Native American Cultural Center at Stanford has overseen the development of various Peacemaking initiatives across campus. Their work has produced curriculum, courses, Peacemaking scholars, and institutional change.

Curriculum

Over the past four years, Stanford has hosted classes with a focus on indigenous Peacemaking, Conflict Resolution and Design Thinking. These classes have developed our students' understanding of how healing practices can strengthen a community. Many of these classes have also trained students on how to use restorative justice and Peacemaking principles in times of conflict, especially in diverse communities or settings. Students and faculty have gone on to facilitate workshops and peacemaking circles for student groups, Residential Life, and Student Affairs professionals.

Additional learning opportunities are currently being sought out with the Stanford Law School Policy Lab. A Peacemaking Policy Lab would convene both at-large Students and law students to generate a project in partnership with an organization or community to explore a specific policy related inquiry.

Previous courses dedicated to peacemaking include:

NATIVEAM 221: Peacemaking Circles

Winter 2018

Instructors: Alex Scully, Karen Biestman

Explore indigenous cultural methods of navigating and resolving conflict while developing and designing new tools to promote peace across Native America. Throughout this interactive, skills-based course students will practice and design for the art of Peacemaking and conflict-resolution. Students can expect to unpack the components of strong listening, leadership, and effective cultural competency-- abilities that are crucial in any conflict situation. By exposing students to Peacemaking, the psychology behind decision making, and design thinking, we challenge students to rethink the structures currently in place to handle conflict

NATIVEAM 221: Crafting Challenging Conversations in a Conflicted World (*a collaboration with the Design School*)

Winter 2019

Instructor: Alex Scully, Karen Biestman

In moments of divisive, time-sensitive conflict and disagreement, interdependent community groups that are we-us oriented often struggle to maintain cohesive relationships. In this interactive, project-based course, participants will dive into the art of designing new products, services, or experiences for conflict. Throughout the course, participants can expect to unpack the fundamentals of design thinking and components of strong listening, leadership, and effective cultural competency. Individual one-on-one conversations as well as indigenous forms of group-interviewing, known as Peacemaking and Ho'oponopono, will be also explored. At the end of the course, students can expect to have created a low-resolution prototype based on qualitative research that answers the question: How might we lead with community-centered approaches, rather than with independent, divisive reactions in moments of conflict?

Previous courses with a Peacemaking module

NATIVEAM 109A: Federal Indian Law

Winter 2017, 2020

Instructor: Karen Biestman

Cases, legislation, comparative justice models, and historical and cultural material. The interlocking relationships of tribal, federal, and state governments. Emphasis is on economic development, religious freedom, and environmental justice issues in Indian country.

Scholarship

Stanford alumna and Peacemaker, Carson Smith '19, current MPhil student in Socio-Legal Research at the University of Oxford, focused on peacemaking for the topic of her senior thesis. Entitled "Conflict Resolution in Tribal Societies: The Community Impact of Non-Native Americans in Peacemaking Processes", Carson's thesis explored the following:

This thesis seeks to answer how Peacemaking, can impact tribal communities when both Native American and non-Native American populations participate in the process. Her research first develops a structure to determine in which situations non-Native Americans can participate in Peacemaking. She determines that there are essentially two forms of Peacemaking: official and unofficial pathways. Through official pathways, which are connected to the tribal court, non-Native Americans can access Peacemaking through Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) cases, Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Cases, or as another participant in the Peacemaking process when the offender is Native. In unofficial pathways, which are not directly connected to the tribal court, non-Native Americans can participate in Peacemaking when a case has either a Native or non-Native offender.

Through interviews with Peacemaking experts, tribal case studies, tribal codes, and her own background as a certified Peacemaker, she determines that when non-Native Americans participate in Peacemaking through any of these types of cases, except ones relating to VAWA, there is a positive impact on the community. However, VAWA cases, because of their sensitive nature, may be unnavigable through Peacemaking and may cause continued trauma for the survivor and community. This research may suggest that increased efforts should be taken to integrate non-Native American community members into Peacemaking processes. However, further research should conduct a deeper dive into each one of these subcategories of cases to determine more detailed impacts and rule out any negative community impacts.

This toolkit, written by Niyó Moraza-Keeswood MA '20, expands upon the field of Peacemaking, providing an inclusive array of scholarship and resources for campuses who are interested learning more about this work. It is one of the first toolkits written on conflict resolution that centers Indigenous methodology and its application in educational institutions.

Programming

The Native American Cultural Center has been host to a variety of events which explore Peacemaking in a Higher Education setting. In 2018, the Cultural Center was host to a Peacemaking Colloquium with guest speakers Brett Shelton, Cheryl Fairbanks, Robert Yazzie, and Judge Abby Abinanti [See Appendix].

This Winter 2020, the NACC hosted a Peacemaking Summit featuring our partners Carson Smith, Justice Robert Yazzie, Cheryl Fairbanks, Brett Shelton, and Sonya Shah [See Appendix]. This day-long event

included a panel discussion on the principles of Peacemaking, a circle with NACC community members, and a workshop on Healing and Self-care with Peacemaking. This programming was made possible thanks to sponsorship by the Emerson Collective.

Institutional Change

Peacemaking has been utilized to engage difficult conversations between students and administrators. Stanford University was home to various landmarks honoring Junípero Serra, the Spanish missionary considered to be the architect of the California mission system, which contributed to the destruction of the cultural, economic, and religious practices of indigenous communities. In 2016, student senator LJ Bird '17, began organizing to raise the issue of renaming Serra landmarks to the Graduate Student Council and the Faculty Senate. What ensued was a burst of op-eds, conversations across campus, and a resolution being passed by both student and faculty Senates calling for the creation of a committee to consider the renaming of locations honoring Serra. This was followed by years of continued activism and discussion focused on the topic of renaming.

Ultimately, the Native student community was approached for feedback on the renaming process. They experienced tension deriving from academic arguments founded on theoretical perspectives that argued for the maintaining of Serra's name. In response, Carson Smith '19, hosted a Peacemaking circle to establish mutual understanding that centered speaking and listening from the heart. The circle was hosted in the Native American Cultural center and was comprised of students, administrators, and lawyers who were guided through a series of questions which sought to unpack how students were impacted by the renaming process. The conversation shifted focus to Serra's legacy, historical trauma, and the day-to-day impact on Indigenous students' well-being and success. Through this heartfelt sharing, the administration was able to see and hear the harm, and experience the tears, anger, and frustration of students. Beyond that, they were able to understand how all of these feelings and experiences relate directly to policy.

Upon conclusion of the Peacemaking circle, the renaming committee came to a consensus. In February 2019, Serra House building and Serra House dorm were renamed after Carolyn Lewis Attneave, an internationally renowned scholar and psychologist who was instrumental in creating the field of Native American mental health, and Sally Ride, a physicist and the first American woman in space, respectively. In November 2019, Serra Mall, the official address of Stanford, was renamed Jane Stanford Way. Considerations are also being made for the renaming of Jordan Hall, named after David Starr Jordan, and the removal of a statue at its entrance which depicts Louis Agassiz. Psychology Faculty members housed in this building have voted unanimously to request the name change and removal of the statue.

Additional Readings:

- [Stanford will seek to rename Serra Mall in honor of Jane Stanford](#)
- [Naming of Jane Stanford Way moves ahead](#)
- [Looking back on the renaming process at Stanford](#)
- [Stanford renames buildings for Sally Ride and Carolyn Lewis Attneave](#)
- [Stanford will seek to rename Serra Mall in honor of Jane Stanford](#)
- [Stanford to review requests for Jordan Hall renaming and statue removal](#)

National Recognition

Although much of the Peacemaking efforts at Stanford are localized, community members have received recognition for their work and invitation to share the practice.

In 2020, Karen Biestman was awarded the Indigenous Student Affairs Network (ISAN) Innovative Practice Award granted by the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). This award is given in recognition of the outstanding work of a campus practitioner who is innovative in their approach, and who has made a significant impact on student communities on their campus. Karen was recognized for her instrumental leadership in developing Peacemaking at Stanford in collaboration with the NACC community.

The Executive Leadership Academy, hosted by UC Berkeley, is “designed for individuals from all backgrounds, who are currently serving in administrative positions in higher education, and who are interested in preparing themselves for appointments to executive positions such as dean, vice president, provost, president, and chancellor” (Executive Leadership Academy, Web). Attendees focus on the development of 26 Executive Leadership Skills that are essential to serving as a successful higher education administrator. Karen Biestman has been invited to host a training on Peacemaking in Higher Education for participants.

Efforts continue to introduce Peacemaking, as it has been practiced at Stanford, to other administrators and conflict resolution practitioners. In the coming year, our partners plan to present at the annual ACPA conference and the annual Restorative Justice conference. In August, a three-day long Peacemaking forum will also be hosted which will convene academic partners, scholars, practitioners, and community members from across turtle island. These concerted efforts are conducted as a form of cultural sharing which centers on respect. The methodology presented is a community and placed-based approach which can be adapted in a variety of settings.

Applications of Peacemaking in Higher Education

Higher Education is comprised of interwoven living and learning communities which rely on sustainable, healthy relationships. Institutions craft codes of conduct to guide the campus on maintaining order as defined by a set of rules and regulations. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education specifies that "student conduct programs in higher education must enhance overall educational experiences by incorporating student learning and development in their mission" (Karp & Frank, 2016, p. 143). However, assessment of codes of conduct have suggested that they work against the goals of learning and development by adhering to adversarial regulations (Clark, 2014; Karp & Frank, 2016).

Current standardized codes of conduct promote removal of student from the campus community through suspension and expulsion (Clark, 2014). The term progressive exclusion recognizes that, as the offense becomes more severe, the student is further distanced from the university (Karp & Frank, 2016). The goal of this is to express community disapproval and to protect the community from further harm. But this process best serves to put further strain on relationships and increases the likelihood of isolation which can lead to academic failure and additional misconduct (Karp & Frank, 2016). Furthermore, students who go through a conduct procedure have noted that the process feels intrusively controlled by administration and that participants often engage superficially resulting in low success rates (Clark, 2014; Neumeister, 2017). Institutions are now looking towards resolution methods that are fundamentally fair and treat students in a professional and caring manner to enhance learning opportunity (Janosik & Simpson, 2017).

An ideal dispute resolution system in Higher Education will meet the following qualities: develops educated and mature citizens; perceived as fair; encourages forward thinking; promotes moral development; changes behavior; induces community healing and inclusive decision making (Clark, 2014; Janosik & Simpson, 2017; Neumeister, 2017; Karp & Frank, 2016). All these qualities are attainable through a Peacemaking process. Peacemaking encourages the development of interpersonal skills as participants genuinely listen and work to understand another's perspective (Clark, 2014). Students connect with each other on a profound level to hear the impact of their behavior, acknowledge hurt, and stand accountable to changing future behavior. Peacemaking taps into the natural support system that exists within a living and learning community (Karp & Frank, 2016), the same community which harm may impact, to ensure communal healing and eventual reintegration. The process reaffirms shared community values by all participants and ensures that everyone has a voice in the decision-making process. Participants often leave feeling supported, engaged, empowered, and accountable towards repairing harm and transforming relationships (Karp & Frank, 2016, p. 157). Peacemaking guides students towards a lifelong path of building connections, heartfelt communication, and healing.

As this is being written, we are experiencing a time of transparent racial violence and a pandemic that requires our best knowledge and practices to combat. As our definition of "normal" begins to take a new shape, so too will the Institution. This moment in time calls for change. It is time to rethink long-held institutional bureaucracies which serve to isolate and perpetuate harm within our communities. Now more than ever, we need to foster inclusive and supportive communities that can learn to grow stronger when conflict arises. Students will return to living environment where they need to learn to

coexist in ways never done before. Demands for greater equity, diversity, and justice are likely to be catalysts of intense and divisive conversations that may lay bare our raw emotions, sensibilities, and fears. It will be more imperative than before that we establish mechanisms for creating circles of understanding which ensure equity of voice, heartfelt understanding, and accountability. We strive for a cultural shift in how we respect our interrelatedness and how we respond to disagreement.

The principles of Peacemaking can be applied in most every occasion where communication is essential. Below we explore possible instances when Peacemaking could be utilized.

- Advocate for a policy change that (in)directly impacts the wellness of students
- Disputes between roommates or neighbors such as noise complaints, disorderly conduct, overstepping boundaries, etc.
- Address problematic faculty behavior and/or curriculum content
- Engage in discussions where inherent power dynamics from administration may influence honest and respectful engagement
- Unpack divisive cohort dynamics and begin rebuilding community
- Address student group leadership dynamics or misbehavior from active member
- Provide space for students to support one another's experience living and learning in a colonial institution
- Promote self-care practices and intentional reflection
- Gain guidance/feedback on a proposed program/ initiative
- Build community and trust among new classmates or dormmates
- Issues of alcohol/ substance use or abuse
- Facilitating a community or staff meeting to discuss a complicated issue
- Resolve instances of vandalism, fighting, or harassment
- Address truancy, retention, classroom engagement, academic performance
- Resolve romantic relationship conflict

Additional Resources

Introduction to Peacemaking

These videos introduce and exemplify the basic foundations of a peacemaking circle under the direction of peacemaker, Carson Smith. This training was recorded in 2019 with Stanford University Indigenous community members. Due to confidentiality that accompanies peacemaking, recording of live peace circles is often restricted. This example provides valuable insight into how circles may work in practice, with the added benefit of explanations.

Video credit: Stanford University Native American Community Center and Carson Smith

[Peacemaking Circle, Part 1: Introduction](#)



[Peacemaking Circle, Part 2: Foundation](#)



[Peacemaking Circle, Part 3: Circle](#)



[Peacemaking Circle, Part 4: Wrap-Up](#)



Additional Readings

- [Anishnabe N'oon Da Gaaziwin: An Indigenous Peacemaking Mediation Nexus](#). 2018. John Beaucage, et al.
- [A Framework for Understanding Tribal Courts and the Application of Fundamental Law: Through the Voices of Scholars in the Field of Tribal Justice](#). 2015. April L. Wilkinson.
- The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America. Chapter 9: The Trouble with Peacemaking. 2015. Sarah Deer.
- Beyond Survival: Strategies and Stories from the Transformative Justice Movement. 2020. Ejeris Dixon and Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha, eds.
- [Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook](#). 1999. National Indian Justice Center.
- Creating the Third Force: Indigenous Processes of Peacemaking. 2016. Hamdesa Tusso and Maureen Flaherty, eds.
- [The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner's Guide](#). 2012. Bernard Mayer.
- [Exit, Pursued by a Bear: Why Peacemaking Makes Sense in State Court Justice Systems | Judicial Division](#). 2016. Timothy Connors
- [Expert Working Group Report: Native American Traditional Justice Practices](#). 2014. Maha Jweied.
- Indigenous Courts, Self-Determination and Criminal Justice. 2018. Valmaine Toki.
- Intercultural and Interfaith Dialogues for Global Peacebuilding and Stability. 2019. Samuel Peleg.
- [Intercultural Dispute Resolution in Aboriginal Contexts](#). 2005. Catherine Bell.
- [Introduction to Tribal Legal Studies](#). 2004. Chapter 26; Models of Peacemaking. Justin B. Richland & Sarah Deer.
- [Justice as Healing: Indigenous Ways](#). 2005. Wanda D. McCaslin, ed.
- [Life Comes from It : Navajo Justice Concepts](#). 1994. Robert Yazzie.
- Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding Between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples. 2013. Rick Wallace.
- [Nānā I Ke Kumu Pt. 1 \(Hooponopono\)](#). 1972. Mary Kawena Pukui.
- [The Native Hawaiian Justice Task Force Report](#). 2012. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs.
- Navajo Courts and Navajo Common Law: A tradition of Tribal Self-Governance. 2009. Raymond Darrel Austin.
- Navajo Nation Peacemaking: Living Traditional Justice. 2005. James Zion and Marianne Nielsen.
- [Peacemaking Circles: From Crime to Community](#). 2003. Kay Pranis, et al.
- [The Reawakening of Sacred Justice](#). 1993. Diane LeResche.
- [Restorative Justice Practices of Native American, First Nation and Other Indigenous People of North America: Part One and Two](#). 2004. Laura Mirsky.
- Returning to the Teachings: Exploring Aboriginal Justice. 1996. Rupert Ross
- Te Koparapara: An Introduction to the Maori World. 2018. Michael Reilly, et al.
- [To Set Right Ho'oponopono: A Native Hawaiian Way of Peacemaking](#). 1995. Manu Meyer.
- [Widening the Circle: Can Peacemaking work outside of tribal communities?](#) 2012. Robert Wolf.
- [Yuuyaraq: The Way of the Human Being](#). 1996. Harold Napoleon.

Videos

[About Peacemaking NARF Playlist](#)

[Peacemaking Circles in Lummi Nation and other Native Tribes](#)

[Kake Circle Peacemaking](#)

[Kay Pranis: Using Peacemaking Circles in juvenile court, 4/22/2015](#)

[Little Earth Peacemaking Program](#)

[Our Families Our Way - Foundations of the Peacemaking Circle 2017](#)

[Circle Peacemaking with Dr. Polly Hyslop](#)

[Navajo Nation Peacemaking Demo: April 17, 2008](#)

[Native Hawaiian Peacemaking Concepts](#)

[Robert Yazzie: Native American Spirituality and Restorative Justice](#)

Tribes/ Organizations

[Indigenous Peacemaking Initiative; Native American Rights Fund](#)

[Mashpee Wampanoag Peacemakers Court](#)

[The Peacemaking Program of the Navajo Nation](#)

[Little Traverse Bay Bands of Odawa Indians Peacemaking Circles](#)

[Pokagon Band of Potawatomi Native Justice](#)

[Sakoagon Chippewa Community-Mole Lake Band Peacemaking](#)

[Chickasaw Nation Peacemaking Court](#)

[Choctaw Nation Peacemaking](#)

[Northern Arapaho Peacemaker Code](#)

[Seneca Nation Peacemaker's Court](#)

[Oneida Peacemaking and Mediation](#)

[Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians Peacemaker Court](#)

[Coleville Tribes Peacemaker Circle](#)

[Organized Village of Kake Peacemaking](#)

[Prairie Band Potawatomi Nation Peacemaking](#)

[Little Earth SCOUT: Safe Communities of United Tribes](#)

[Nez Perce Tribal Peacemaker Court](#)

[Mille Lacs Band of Ojibwe Tribal Court](#)

References

- Adversarial System and Peacemaking- 'Vertical' and 'Horizontal' Legal Systems. (1999). *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.
- Akwesasne Community PM Process: (National Conference on Traditional PM Remaking Justice). (1999). *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.
- Austin, R.D. (2009). *Navajo Courts and Navajo Common Law: A Tradition of Tribal Self-Governance*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Clark, K. L. (2014). A call for restorative justice in higher education judicial affairs. *College Student Journal* 48(4), 705-713.
- Connors, T. (2016). Exit, Pursued by a Bear: Why Peacemaking Makes Sense in State Court Justice Systems. *Judges J* 55.
- Dixon, E. (2020). Building community safety: Practical steps toward liberatory transformation. In E. Dixon & L.L. Piepezna-Samarasinha (Ed.), *Beyond survival: strategies and stories from the transformative justice movement* (pp. 15-26). AK Press.
- Dixon, E. (2020). I would like to return my TJ process. In E. Dixon & L.L. Piepezna-Samarasinha (Ed.), *Beyond survival: strategies and stories from the transformative justice movement* (pp. 205-208). AK Press.
- Duncan, S. & Rewi, P. (2018). Tikanga: How not to get told off. In M. Reilly, S. Duncan, G. Leoni, L. Paterson, L. Carter, M. Ratima, & P. Rewi (Eds.), *Te kōparapara: An introduction to the Māori world* (pp. 30-47). Auckland University Press.
- Executive Leadership Academy. (2020, June). *About ELA*. UC Berkeley. <<https://cshe.berkeley.edu/ela>>
- Geniusz, M. S. (2015). *Plants have so much to give us, all we have to do is ask: Anishinaabe botanical teachings*. U of Minnesota Press.
- Hyslop, P.E. & Brian J.N. (2019). Circle Peace-Making in Alaska: A Return to Indigenous Practice Through Intercultural Dialogue. In *Intercultural and Interfaith Dialogues for Global Peacebuilding and Stability*. IGI Global, pp. 146-164.
- Janosik, S.M. & Stimpson, M.T. (2017). The influence of the conduct system and campus environments on student learning. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice* 54(1), 28-41.
- Jweied, M. (2014). *Expert working group report: Native American traditional justice Practices*. US Department of Justice & US Department of the Interior.
- Karp, D.R. & Frank, O. (2016). Restorative justice and student development in higher education: Expanding "offender" horizons beyond punishment and rehabilitation to community engagement and personal growth. In Gavrieldies, T. (Ed.), *Offenders no more: An interdisciplinary restorative justice dialogue* (pp. 141-164). Nova Science Publishers.
- LeResche, D. (1993). The Reawakening of Sacred Justice. *Clearinghouse Rev* 27.
- Meyer, M. (n.d.). Ho'oponopono: Healing through ritualized communication. In author's possession.
- Meyer, M. (1995). To Set Right-Ho'oponopono-A Native Hawaiian Way of Peacemaking. *Compleat Law* 12.
- Mingus, M. (2020, March). *Transformative Justice: A Brief Description*. Transforming Harm. <<https://transformharm.org/transformative-justice-a-brief-description/>>.

- Mirsky, L. (2004). *Restorative justice practices of Native American, First Nation and other indigenous people of North America: Parts One & Two*. Restorative Practices eForum.
- Navajo Peacemaking Manual. (1999). *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.
- Neumeister, J. R. (2017). The model of transformational change for moral action: a conceptual framework to elevate student conduct practice in higher education. *Journal of College and Character* 18(2), 97-111.
- NW Indian Bar Association Traditional Dispute Resolution Conference. (1999). NW Intertribal Court Systems Traditional Dispute Resolution Research Project and PM Program. *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.
- Pranis, K., Stuart, B., and Wedge, M. (2003). *Peacemaking circles: From crime to community*. Living Justice Press.
- Pukui, M.K., Haertig, E.W., & Lee, C.A. (1972). Nana i ke Kumu. *Honolulu: Hui Hanai* 1, 35-40.
- Reilly, M. (2018). "Te tīmatanga mai o te ao: The beginning of the world." In M. Reilly, S. Duncan, G. Leoni, L. Paterson, L. Carter, M. Ratima, & P. Rewi (Eds.), *Te kōparapara: An introduction to the Māori world* (pp. 12-39). Auckland University Press.
- Richland, J. B., & Deer, S. (2010). *Introduction to tribal legal studies*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ross, R. (2006). *Returning to the teachings: Exploring Aboriginal Justice*. Penguin Group.
- Title XVI: Shoshone and Arapaho Peacemaker Court. (1999). *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.
- Toki, V. (2018). *Indigenous courts, self-determination and criminal justice*. Routledge.
- Wallace, R. (2013). *Merging Fires: Grassroots Peacebuilding between Indigenous and Non-Indigenous Peoples in Canada*. Fernwood Publishing.
- Wolf, R.V. & United States of America Center for Court Innovation. (2012). *Widening the Circle: Can Peacemaking Work Outside Of Tribal Communities?*. Center for Court Innovation.
- Yazzie, R. (1994). Life Comes From It: Navajo Justice Concepts. *NML Rev* 24.
- Zion, J. (1999). The Dynamics of Navajo Peacemaking. *Conflict Resolution: Mediation, Arbitration & Peacemaking: Resource Handbook*. National Indian Justice Center.

Appendix:



THE NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER
PRESENTS:

A Peacemaking Panel Discussion

January 23, 2020 | 12:00 P.m.- 2:00 p.m.
Native American Cultural Center
Lunch Provided

.....

Healing/ Self-Care Circle Workshop

January 23, 2020 | 6:30 P.M.
Old Union Clubhouse Ballroom
Dinner Provided

*Featuring Guest Practitioners: Brett Shelton, Carson Smith,
Cheryl Fairbanks, Robert Yazzie, and Sonya Shaw*

Tribal Peacemaking Colloquium

A discussion on the way tribal courts are using culturally based practices to resolve conflict

Friday, April 13th
Archaeology Center, Building 500

10:00am – 10:15am: Welcome and Introduction to Peacemaking
10:15am – 10:30am – Improvisational Bonding Exercise
10:30am – 11:45pm – Short Talks from Panel
11:45pm – 12:45pm – Lunch and Break-out Sessions with Panel
12:45pm – 1:00pm – Break
1:00pm – 2:00pm – Keynote: Judge Abby Abinanti
2:00 – 2:10pm – Break
2:15pm – 3:15pm – Stanford & Peacemaking
3:15pm – 4:15pm – Tribal Justice Film
4:15pm – 4:30pm – Closing Thoughts

Our Speakers:

Cheryl Demmert Fairbanks
(Tlingit-Tsimpshian)

Hon. Robert Yazzie
(Diné)

Chief Judge Abby Abinanti
(Yurok)

Professor Brian Jarrett (Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah
CSU, Dominguez Hills
& Ute Indian Tribe)

Nikki Borchardt Campbell
NAICJA

Brett Lee Shelton
NARF
(Oglala Sioux Tribe)



SPONSORED BY:

THE NATIVE AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER, NATIVE AMERICAN STUDIES, CSRE, STANFORD AMERICAN INDIAN ORGANIZATION, THE INSTITUTE FOR DIVERSITY IN THE ARTS & NATIVE AMERICAN LAW STUDENTS ASSOCIATION