Violence and disorder constitute the primal problem of American history, the dark reverse of the coin of freedom and abundance.

—David T. Courtwright

Violence has accompanied virtually every stage and aspect of our national existence.

—Richard Maxwell Brown

Every society is adept at looking past its own forms of violence, and reserving its outrage for the violence of others.

—Inga Clendinnen

- Late in November 1864, a large force of cavalry soldiers led by Colonel John Chivington left Denver, Colorado, and early on the morning of November 29 ended up on the banks of Sand Creek where a large number of American Indians, mostly Cheyenne, were camped. They were flying a flag of truce in the belief that they were under the protection of the Colorado authorities. With no warning or call for surrender, Chivington’s soldiers attacked and killed around 130 Indians, many of them women and children. No prisoners were taken and many of the victims were mutilated after death. Explaining his practice of killing everybody, including children, Chivington reportedly asserted that “his policy was to kill and scalp all little and big; that nits made lice.”

- April 23, 1899, was a Sunday afternoon which allowed more than 2,000 white Southerners to gather for the lynching of Sam Hose near the town of Newman, Georgia. Sam, an African American, had killed his employer during a dispute. According to many
accounts, he had acted in self-defense since his boss had pulled a gun and threatened to shoot him, but the fact that he was an African American who had killed a white man made that justification irrelevant. On that fateful Sunday, Sam Hose was stripped, mutilated with knives, soaked in oil, and then burned alive while the crowd participated and watched. Reportedly, his only words were, “Oh, my God! Oh, Jesus” as he was burning. The onlookers fought over pieces of his burned body to take home as souvenirs.6

- On March 1, 1989, a 17-year-old girl living in Glen Ridge, New Jersey—a relatively affluent suburb—went to play basketball after school. To someone who didn’t know her well, she might appear almost normal, an outgoing teenager who loved sports. In reality, however, she was mentally retarded and extraordinarily susceptible to suggestion and manipulation. At the park, a large group of popular male high school athletes enticed the young woman into the basement of one of their homes where they brutally raped her. Thirteen star athletes were present, and four were later convicted of raping the young girl with sticks and a baseball bat.7

- On May 29, 2005, around 50 rival gang members engaged in a violent brawl at a popular camping area on Lake San Antonio in California. Evidently, members of one gang, the Sureños, wandered into the camping area of a rival gang, the Norteños, which precipitated the violent confrontation. No one was killed, but many were injured and police arrested a score of the participants.8

- On April 16, 2007, Cho Seung-Hui killed 32 students, faculty, and staff and left about 30 others injured on the campus of Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia. Cho was armed with two semiautomatic handguns that he had legally purchased and a vest-full of ammunition. As the police were closing in on the scene, he killed himself. The shooting rampage was the deadliest in U.S. history. Cho was described as a loner who was picked on through high school and never spoke to anyone, not even in classes when he was called upon to do so. In a college English course, his writings were so violent and disturbing that they prompted a professor to contact the campus police and counseling services.9 A video he sent to NBC News explaining his actions was filled with anger, with Cho blaming many for the perceived wrongs that drove him to the mass killing.10

Are these incidents of violence related? Are the factors related to the murder of Sam Hose over 100 years ago in any way related to the mass killings that occurred at Virginia Tech? While each of these incidents is separated by time, space, circumstance, number of participants, and lethality, they are all in fact linked and part of the same continuum of violent behavior. We often tend to see violence as consisting of discrete acts that are independent and separate from each other, as if each violent incident has occurred in a vacuum. But that is hardly the case. All violence is connected by a web of actions and behaviors, ideas, perceptions, and justifications. While the individual dynamics of specific violent behavior may vary somewhat, violent acts share a number of essential characteristics that bind them together into what has sometimes been termed the unity of human aggression.11 In other words, there are a number of threads that tie all violence together.

One of the primary themes of this book is therefore that all violence is connected. There are a number of commonalities that link the various types of violence we review in this book. We find, for example, that violence—regardless of the form it takes—is usually perpetrated for the same kinds of reasons. Whether it’s a bully in the schoolyard, a member
of a lynch mob or a despotict tyrant engaged in genocide, there are many commonalities in
the rationales of those engaging in violence. In other words, people perpetrate violence for
the same kinds of reasons. The white Southerners who lynched Sam Hose saw themselves
as defenders of their race and privileged way of life. By killing a white man, Hose was per-
ceived as challenging white supremacy in the South. This is essentially the same mentality
exhibited by Colonel Chivington and others like him, who defined their killing of
American Indians in much the same light. For them, American Indian resistance to the
encroachment of the settlers was seen as a threat to European and Christian civilization.12
They rationalized their violence as being justified and provoked, not as unfounded aggres-
sion. From this perspective, the American Indians, including the women and children, had
brought about their own demise. One witness to the Sand Creek massacre remembered
Colonel Chivington speaking to his men just before they went into action and saying,
“Boys, I shall not tell you what you are to kill, but remember our slaughtered women and
children.”13 Clearly, he defined the subsequent violence as defensive and justified and hoped
e to evoke the same sentiments among his men.

Cho Seung-Hui also saw his violence as justified. He had been bullied in high
school and remained an angry loner in college. In the video he left, he stated, “You had
a hundred billion changes and ways to have avoided today, but you decided to spill my
blood. You forced me into a corner and gave me only one option. The decision was
yours.”14 This kind of violence is referred to as a form of “righteous slaughter” by the
sociologist Jack Katz, who points out that in many acts of violence the perpetrator
undergoes a process in which perceived humiliation is transformed into rage that can
culminate in violence.15 Invariably, perpetrators often perceive that their violence is in
defense of some important value or principle. In none of the examples described at the
beginning of the chapter were the victims defined as being innocent. Rather, they were
perceived as having brought the violence upon themselves; in the eyes of the offenders,
the violence they inflicted was entirely appropriate and justified. These perceptions
create a potent rationale for harming others. Even some residents in Glen Ridge
blamed the young, mentally retarded woman for her own rape. Many victim-blaming
comments made it into the media, including, “She teased them into it,” “She asked for it,”
and “She was always flirting.”16 In fact, some have suggested that a great deal of violence—
especially among street criminals—stems from a desire for retaliation in which offend-
ers feel that their victim had wronged them in some way and that their violence was a
righteous form of payback.17 This commonality of motivation and perception is not
the only thread that connects violence. We also find that violence overlaps.

Just as behavior in one part of your life is related to behavior in other parts, so too
violence in one sphere of life often affects violence in another sphere. Individuals who
are violent in one setting are more likely to be violent in others. In fact, the single best
predictor for violent behavior is a history of previous violence.18 Of course, this does not
mean that an individual who engages in violence is destined for a life of violence; it sim-
ply means that those who engage in violence are more likely to do so in the future com-
pared with those without a violent history. This shouldn’t come as a surprise. People
who engage in violence have already overcome normative boundaries against aggres-
sion and are more or less experienced in its perpetration. In essence, their threshold for
using violence has been lowered which means that once someone starts using violence, it becomes easier to continue using it. The rape conviction of boxer Mike Tyson in 1992 would be an example of this. Boxers are trained in violence and Mike Tyson was certainly no exception. Speaking about an upcoming fight, Tyson once said, “My main objective is to be professional but to kill him. I want to rip out his heart and feed it to him. I want to kill people. I want to rip their stomachs out and eat their children.”19 While this might be hyperbole designed to sell tickets, Tyson’s behavior out of the ring indicates there is more than a hint of truth to his statement. Tyson has had numerous problems with the law centering around illegal violent behavior such as domestic violence and assault, as well as rape. Clearly he is an individual whose violence is not confined to socially accepted venues such as the boxing ring.

Another example of people engaging in violence in multiple spheres of their lives is illustrated by the Pentagon’s acknowledgment of the serious problem the military has been having with domestic violence among members of its armed forces. For example, at North Carolina’s Fort Bragg military base, four army wives were murdered by their husbands or ex-husbands, with a total of 10 such fatalities occurring there since 2002. Including nonfatal incidents, there were 832 victims of intimate partner assault between 2002 and 2004 at Fort Bragg alone, according to U.S. Army figures.

Violence overlaps in other ways as well. Some suggest, for example, that the more a society legitimates violence in certain situations (e.g., war, capital punishment, and justifiable homicide), the more illegitimate violence (e.g., robbery and murder) there will be. This is sometimes referred to as spillover theory, which suggests that the values and justifications for violence in socially approved settings “spill over” into other settings and result in illegitimate forms of violence.

One example of this spillover concerns the death penalty. Some have argued that, instead of decreasing rates of murder, capital punishment may actually serve to increase it. They point to the fact that the states which sentence the greatest number of people to death also tend to have the highest rates of homicide. One proponent of this argument—termed the brutalization hypothesis20—is the criminologist William Bowers, who argues, “The lesson of the execution, then, may be to devalue life by the example of human
sacrifice. Executions demonstrate that it is correct and appropriate to kill those who have gravely offended us.”21 His brutalization argument asserts that the death penalty desensitizes society to killing and devalues human life, and therefore increases tolerance toward lethal behavior which in turn results in increases in the criminal homicide rate.

War—another example of legitimate violence—has also been found to increase rates of illegitimate violence, not just by soldiers returning from the battlefield and engaging in violence in their homes, but in the larger society as well. Some scholars have argued that a nation’s involvement in wars tends to legitimate the use of lethal force to resolve conflict within that nation’s population.22 When a nation or state goes to war, all means of diplomacy are replaced by the use of violence, which is perceived as rational and justified, at least by the leaders of that nation. It is not unreasonable, then, for citizens of that society also to be more likely to choose force when confronted with conflict.23 One of the largest studies to examine the effects of war on postwar homicide across nations was conducted by Dane Archer and Rosemary Gartner, who compared national homicide rates for men and women before and after small and large wars, including the two World Wars. They also controlled for a number of factors in their comparison, including the number of combat deaths in war, whether the nations were victorious or defeated, and whether the nation’s postwar economies were improved or worsened. Archer and Gartner found that most combatant nations experienced substantial postwar increases in their rates of homicide and concluded that “the one model that appears to be fully consistent with the evidence is the legitimation of violence model, which suggests that the presence of authorized or sanctioned killing during war has a residual effect on the level of homicide in peacetime society.”24 Put another way, “It is organized violence on top which creates individual violence on the bottom.”25

A final example of the spillover thesis is something with which many of us are familiar—being spanked as a child. While most who experience this type of punishment grow up relatively unscathed, research suggests that children who are spanked are more likely to be aggressive as adults compared with children who were not spanked. Murray Straus, in his book Beating the Devil Out of Them, argues that the physical discipline of children legitimates other forms of violence in interpersonal confrontations based on his assertion that physical punishment is inescapably an act of violence.26 Straus contends that the lesson learned by children who are spanked or otherwise physically punished is that violence is an acceptable means to an end. As such, physical responses to conflict may well spill over to other relationships in which hitting is not legal, such as with an intimate partner or spouse.27

We hope this discussion has helped illustrate our belief that all violence is connected. Violence, in its many forms, is fundamentally linked through various shared qualities that we have discussed briefly here. This is not to say, however, that all violence is identical. Collective violence, for example, is not simply interpersonal violence with a large number of perpetrators and/or victims. The social and collective elements of group violence differentiate it from interpersonal violence in a number of ways. Yet both types still share a number of important commonalities that we will explore. In many ways, therefore, it can be said that acts of violence are simultaneously unique and comparable.
So far, we have looked at several examples of violence, but we have not yet defined exactly what we mean by the term “violence.” In the next section, you will see that coming up with a concrete definition of violence is not always such an easy task.

Defining Violence

If you tried to define violence on your own, you would probably find it a trickier job than might initially have been expected given our apparent familiarity with the concept. Violence is one of those words that everyone knows, but few have grappled with in any detail. Even though we use the word in many situations and contexts, we are usually fairly vague about its meaning and our perceptions can vary tremendously depending upon any number of factors. While at first glance the concept seems clear enough, the more closely we examine violence the more elusive it becomes. This situation brings to mind the statement made by the novelist Amin Maalouf, who pointed out that “a life spent writing has taught me to be wary of words. Those that seem clearest are often the most treacherous.” So before proceeding, we need to discuss some of the complexities and issues raised by other attempts to define violence.

The first thing we need to understand is that violence encompasses many different kinds of behaviors in many different kinds of situations. Recognizing all of them as being categorically part of the same phenomenon can be difficult, especially if the violence is not always evident in the act. Pulling the trigger of a gun, for example, or pressing a button that launches a missile may not be violent actions in and of themselves, but the consequences of these actions unquestionably are violent. Do we perceive and define them the same way as hitting a person or stabbing someone—acts in which the violence involves human contact and the consequences are therefore more visceral? How about instilling so much terror and instability into someone’s life that they flee their home with their children to an unknown land or refugee camp where food and safe drinking water aren’t available on a regular basis but loss and insecurity are guaranteed? What if the perpetrator of this act was someone you pledged to “love and cherish until death do you part?” So which of these acts do we consider to be violence? All of them? Or only some of them?

We must also recognize that everyone perceives and understands violence in their own way, based on their individual history and the context of their current life. Many people only use the term in reference to physical acts of aggression and harm, while others include emotional or psychological acts as well. For some, violence refers solely to human-perpetrated acts, while for others it includes other destructive natural forces such as tornadoes, storms, earthquakes, and hurricanes. Accidental acts of harm are also not always defined as violence. If someone was injured by another person who intentionally hit them, most of us would clearly see this as an act of violence. Yet if the same injury occurred unintentionally—say, as the result of a collision on a basketball court or a soccer field—many of us would not define it as violence.

The perceived legitimacy of aggressive acts also affects whether or not they are defined as violence. Some individuals only use the word to refer to illegal or illegitimate acts of aggression. Other words are often used to describe aggressive acts that are socially approved. As an illustration, take two incidents that are behaviorally similar:
1) During an attempted robbery, an offender shoots the store clerk because he perceives the clerk to be reaching down under the counter for a gun; the store clerk dies.

2) After pulling over a driver for speeding, a police officer shoots the driver who he perceives to be reaching into his coat for a gun; the driver dies.

The behavior in both scenarios is similar yet the label given to each would almost certainly be very different. The first would undoubtedly be labeled as an act of felony murder, which in some states is the most likely case to receive the death penalty. The second would most likely be ruled as the legitimate use of deadly force with no criminal label whatsoever attached. While the physical behavior is the same, the legal and social acceptability are very different and this influences which words are used to describe each act.

Keep in mind that violence is a loaded word; it is a word rich in meaning that usually evokes powerful emotions. When people think of violence, they generally attach very negative connotations to it. This makes defining violence even harder because there are numerous acts that many of us do not perceive as violent since they are perceived and defined as being acceptable, and may even be encouraged. As Friedman writes, “In part, violence is a matter of definition, or at least of perspective . . . Every society defines a sphere of legitimate private violence.” In other words, the legitimacy or illegitimacy of any particular act lies not in any intrinsic quality of the act itself, but rather in its definition. Evidence indicates that many perpetrators of crime and violence see themselves as being justified in their actions and often define their acts as a legitimate response to some behavioral or ethical breach on the part of their victim. In this sense, the offender perceives his or her violence as a form of social control, and this perception of the crime as a form of self-help serves to legitimize the act not only to the offender but perhaps to others as well. People who inflict violence on others often feel they are acting legitimately and morally to protect something they value or to exact the appropriate penalty from someone who has wronged them.

We hope you can now see that, depending upon who is doing what to whom and the reasons why, we either accept or condemn acts of violence. Our understanding is highly situational and contingent. The context is therefore extremely important in helping shape our understanding of and reaction to violent acts and actors. The context of violence is shaped in large part by several factors, including:

- the victim
- the offender
- the specific nature of the violence
- the location of the violence
- the rationale for the violence

Let’s start with the victim. If the victim is someone with whom we can identify, or someone we know and to whom we can relate, we are more likely to condemn the violence. Many factors, including gender, race/ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, and nationality, play a role here. If the victim is someone who is like us, we are more likely...
to sympathize with them and see the situation through their eyes. On the other hand, the greater the social distance between us and the victim, the less likely it is that we will empathize with them. This judgment, however, does not occur independently of the perpetrator. If we know and/or can identify more easily with the perpetrator (more than we do with the victim), we will be more willing to find ways to rationalize and even accept the violence. Figure 1.1 illustrates these relationships. Essentially, it is easier for us to rationalize, condone, and accept behavior from people who are like us, and it is easier for us to condemn and judge those who are different from us.

In the same vein, the type of violence affects how we perceive and define specific acts. Minor acts of violence are generally easier to accept than more severe forms. It is much easier to dismiss or minimize a push or a slap than a punch or a kick. The heinousness of an act of violence is also influenced by the brutality involved in the act and the number of victims. Acts of violence involving gratuitous cruelty or torture are much less likely to be perceived in a positive light. Location has also been an important variable. Historically, if violence was perpetrated in the home, it was generally conceded to be
much more acceptable than if carried out in a public or work setting. The justification
articulated for the violence is also important since it helps the social audience understand
the rationale for the aggressive behavior. If we agree and/or understand the motivation,
then it becomes easier to accept and even commend specific acts of violence.

In sum, this conceptualization recognizes that our individual perceptions and
definitions revolve around a number of variables that help shape our understanding
of the act. The fact that many different factors influence whether we call similar
behavior violence is testimony to the difficulty we have in defining it. In other words,
our relationship with violence is complex and at times contradictory. Sometimes we
condemn and punish those who inflict violence and sometimes we celebrate and
reward those who perpetrate it. We read or hear about a school shooting somewhere
and we are appalled. The idea of students being hunted down and murdered by a fel-
low classmate is horrific. The events at Virginia Tech, along with the massacre at
Columbine High School and the execution-style murders of the Amish schoolgirls in
Pennsylvania, for example, have seared themselves into our collective awareness as
horrible tragedies. Yet when Ellie Nessler shot and killed the man who had allegedly
molested her son in a courtroom in California as he awaited his pretrial hearing,
many applauded her deadly act. When police officers shoot and kill someone they
perceive as dangerous, such as when London police officers shot and killed a young
Brazilian man they suspected of being a suicide bomber after the bombings there in
July 2005, many rationalized the killing as an understandable act in a time of terror.
Yet when drug dealers kill each other in pursuit of illegal profits, we almost univer-
sally revile it. In short, we judge acts of violence selectively. Some call forth our
interest and compassion, and demand an emotional response, while others barely
stir any interest. Some receive our approval while others earn our condemnation.
We can see this at work in one study looking at attitudes toward different types of
violence. Leslie Kennedy and David Forde examined the attitudes of a sample of
Canadians to determine levels of support for the same act of violence in different sit-
uations. Their findings are summarized in Table 1.1 and reveal that the same violent
behavior receives widely disparate levels of support and approval depending upon
the situation in which it occurred. These results are consistent with earlier research
in the United States.33

By now it is likely you will agree that defining violence is a difficult task, in large
part because our understanding of its nature is so subjective. We think it is helpful at
this point to go over some definitions that have been proposed by those who study vio-
ience. Table 1.2 provides a list of some of the more popular definitions. We also include
definitions of aggression, since both terms are often used interchangeably—even within
the scholarly community.34 We should note, however, that some researchers make
distinctions between violence and aggression. For example, Bartol and Bartol contend
that all violence is aggressive, but not all aggression is violent. For them, violence only
refers to aggressive physical behavior, while aggression can also refer to behavior that
is psychologically harmful. Moreover, aggression is more often used in connection
with a person’s psychological affect, demeanor, and mindset while violence is more
specifically intended to encompass the harmful physical behavior itself. In many ways,
aggression may precede and accompany violence. For the purposes of this book, however, the terms “violence” and “aggression” are so similar in their everyday usage that we will not make this type of distinction.

Reviewing Table 1.2, we find a range of definitions that differ and overlap in some important ways. First, all definitions agree that violence and aggression are harmful. Where they differ, however, is in conceptualizing what kinds of harm qualify as violence. Some of the definitions include inflicting psychological or emotional harm as violence, while others do not. But the bottom line is that, whether perpetrated for noble reasons or for petty and selfish ones, violence is about injuring, damaging, destroying, and killing. It is invariably destructive. This is not to say that violence cannot be perpetrated for constructive reasons, but rather that the act of violence is always destructive. It is therefore important to differentiate between the intent or purpose of the act and the act itself. The behavior and the intent of the behavior are separate. The purpose of the violence may be positive or negative, or perhaps even a mixture of both.

### Table 1.1 Attitudes Toward Violent Situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation in Which One Man (assailant) Punches an Adult Stranger</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Who Approve of the Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If adult stranger was in a protest march showing opposition to the other man’s (assailant’s) views</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If adult stranger was drunk and bumped into the man (assailant) and his wife on the street</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If adult stranger had hit the man’s (assailant’s) child after the child accidentally damaged the stranger’s car</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If adult stranger was beating up a woman and the man (assailant) saw it</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If adult stranger had broken into the man’s (assailant’s) house</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation in Which Police Officer Strikes an Adult Male Citizen</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents Who Approve of the Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If the male citizen had used vulgar and obscene language against the officer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the male citizen was being questioned as a suspect in a murder case</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the male citizen was attempting to escape from custody</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the male citizen was attacking the police officer with his fists</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2 Definitions of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition of Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary</em></td>
<td>“exertion of physical force so as to injure or abuse . . . intense, turbulent, or furious and often destructive action or force”¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Panel on the Understanding and Control of Violent Behavior</td>
<td>“behaviors by individuals that intentionally threaten, attempt, or inflict physical harm on others”²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>“a series of events, the course of which or the outcomes of which, cause injury or damage to persons or property”³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iadicola and Shupe</td>
<td>“Violence is any action or structural arrangement that results in physical or nonphysical harm to one or more persons.”⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weiner, Zahn, and Sagi</td>
<td>“the threat, attempt, or use of physical force by one or more persons that results in physical or nonphysical harm to one or more persons”⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartol and Bartol</td>
<td>“destructive physical aggression intentionally directed at harming other persons or things”⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Definition of Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartol and Bartol</td>
<td>“behavior perpetrated or attempted with the intention of harming another individual physically or psychologically (as opposed to socially) or to destroy an object”⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkowitz</td>
<td>“any form of behavior that is intended to injure someone physically or psychologically”⁸</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

But the violence itself always remains the same: injurious and damaging. Second, these definitions help us understand that violence can take a number of forms. The most common difference is that between physical and emotional or psychological violence, although not everyone agrees that nonphysical forms of aggression (e.g., verbal) can be considered violence.

There are many other ways that violence can be classified and categorized. One distinction sometimes made is between expressive and instrumental acts of violence. Instrumental acts of violence are those in which violence is a means to an end. An assault during an armed robbery, for example, would fit into this category. The violence is committed to help accomplish the robbery, but it is not an end in itself. Expressive acts of violence, on the other hand, are those in which the motivations are expressive of some emotional state such as anger or jealousy. In these cases, the violence serves to fulfill some internal or intrinsic desire. As the name implies, the violence is “expressing” something.

Another way of categorizing violence is provided by Peter Iadicola and Anson Shupe, who suggest that there are three main interconnected types of violence that they label interpersonal, institutional, and structural. Interpersonal violence consists of the assaults, rapes, robberies, and murders that we often think about when conceptualizing violence. Institutional violence, on the other hand, concerns the violent behaviors that are perpetrated in organizational settings. For example, Iadicola and Shupe consider family violence a form of institutional violence because it happens within the context of the family. Also included are corporate and workplace violence, military violence, religious violence, and state-perpetrated violence, all of which occur within the context of an established social institution. Structural violence is all about discriminatory social arrangements that can also be construed as violence. Including structural arrangements in their definition allows Iadicola and Shupe to examine societal inequalities as violence in light of the negative effects that certain living conditions may have on a group. For example, they write, “Violence may be action that denies a minority group’s access to education, health care, housing, an adequate diet, and other necessities of survival and human development.” While our book does not address structural violence per se, we do underscore the inequalities related to both the collective and individual violence that we examine. In addition, the violence we examine encompasses both interpersonal and institutional types of behavior.

At this point in your reading, you must be expecting us to tell you which definition we subscribe to in this book. Rather than disappoint you, we can suggest that the definition which most closely aligns with our approach in this book is the one presented by Iadicola and Shupe, who define violence as follows: “Violence is any action or structural arrangement that results in physical or nonphysical harm to one or more persons.” That being said, we also want to acknowledge that most of the definitions presented in Table 1.2 would serve our purposes equally well. While there are many ways to define violence, most of the attempts discussed above share a number of qualities, and the types of violence we have chosen to discuss in this book fall within these broad conceptualizations. Therefore, settling on a single definition to guide our discussion is not as crucial as it might otherwise be.
In the next section, we discuss some of the measurement issues related to estimating the amount of violence that exists in our society. As you might imagine, attempting to measure the extent of violence is also a complex issue.

Measuring Violence

It is not our intention in this discussion to exhaustively review all of the sources of information on violence, nor do we provide a summation of all of the strengths and weaknesses of each data-collection method. There are far too many data sets on violence, each encompassing different specific collection methodologies and populations, and each with its own unique set of strengths and weaknesses. Instead, we simply want to provide a brief introduction to a few of the main sources of data on violence and to discuss some of the primary pitfalls and shortcomings commonly found in attempts to accurately identify the scope and magnitude of violent behavior. Additionally, throughout the book in individual chapters, more specific estimates and measurement issues related to separate forms of interpersonal violence such as murder, rape, and intimate partner violence will be covered in some detail. The present discussion, on the other hand, should give you a more general sense of the more common ways in which information on violence is gathered, and some of the important and relevant concerns attached to them. While it might seem mundane and somewhat technical, we should remember that measurement is an important issue. The accuracy of our insights and explanations about violence is largely dependent on the quality of the information that we are able to gather. Moreover, resources and strategies aimed at preventing violence and ameliorating the consequences of it when it does occur are also based on these estimates. Bad information can and does result in poor choices being made by policy makers, politicians, activists, and other concerned citizens. Depending on who is gathering the data and what methods they employ to get that information, the results can vary widely. When most students are asked about how statistics on violence are gathered, they tend to think first and foremost about police reports. You will soon see, however, that relying on reports of crime to police is somewhat problematic. That being noted, we can say that estimates of interpersonal violence are usually based on reports to the police and surveys of the general population.37

Reports to Law Enforcement Officials

The most widespread source of statistical information about violent crime in the United States is the Uniform Crime Reporting Program (UCR), compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The UCR has collected information about criminal incidents of violence reported to the police since 1930. These data rely on state, county, and city law enforcement agencies across the United States voluntarily participating in the program.

For the crime of homicide, information about both the victim and the offender (e.g., the gender and race of both, the relationship between the victim and offender, the
weapon used) is obtained in a separate reporting program called the **Supplementary Homicide Reports** (SHR). Unfortunately, such detailed information is not collected for other crimes in the UCR. To remedy this problem, in 1988 the FBI implemented a change in its collection of crime information to include more characteristics of the incident; appropriately, this is called the **National Incident Based Reporting System** (NIBRS).

NIBRS data is very specific and includes many more offenses that local agencies have to report information on. It includes detailed information on incidents, including the characteristics of the victim such as age, gender, race, ethnicity, and resident status. In all, NIBRS categorizes each incident and arrest in one of 22 basic crime categories that span 46 separate offenses. A total of 53 data elements about the victim, property, and offender are collected under NIBRS. As you can imagine, it takes a great deal of time and money to make this change and fill out this paperwork at the local police department level. Just over half of all states currently use the NIBRS format for collecting information about reported crimes.

Both the UCR and the NIBRS data-collection methods are problematic when estimating incidence rates of violence. It’s not hard to imagine why. If victimizations are not reported to police, they are never counted in either data collection effort in the first place. This is particularly problematic for certain types of violence, such as rape and violence that occurs between intimates such as spouses and boy/girlfriends. We know that a large percentage of these victimizations are never reported to police. For example, based on comparisons with national survey data, it is estimated that only about 40 to 50 percent of crimes become known to police. In sum, there is a great deal of evidence that documents the large gap between the true extent of victimization and offending and the amount of crime known to police. The major sources of this gap, according to Clayton Mosher, Terance Miethe, and Dretha Phillips, are: the inability of police to observe all criminal activity, the reluctance of crime victims and witnesses to report crime to the police, and variation in the recording of “known” crime incidents due to police discretion.

Because of this weakness in police reports, random sample surveys of the population are often used as the social science tool of choice for uncovering more accurate information on incidents of violent victimization. However, as can be imagined, surveys employing diverse methodologies and different definitions of violence have resulted in tremendously diverse estimates. Taking violence against women as an example, survey estimates of how many women experience violence from an intimate partner annually range from 9.3 per 1,000 women to 116 per 1,000 women. Further, the methodological differences across survey methodologies often preclude direct comparisons across studies.

Since we discuss surveys used to measure various types of violence within the different chapters of this book, at this point we will describe only two more general surveys. The first was designed to more accurately measure crime victimization, and is sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice. It is called the **National Crime Victimization Survey** (NCVS). Instead of focusing on
victimizations, the second survey we will discuss was designed to measure the offending behavior of adolescents, and is called the National Youth Survey (NYS).

The National Crime Victimization Survey annually interviews over 100,000 individuals aged 12 or older and is the second largest ongoing survey sponsored by the U.S. Government. It measures both violent and property crime victimizations. But asking respondents to recall incidents of victimization is a tricky business. How would you word questions to uncover incidents of violent victimization? After several changes and redesigns, the NCVS currently uses the screening questions listed in Table 1.3.

As you can see from Table 1.3, the screening questions rely on very behavior-specific wording instead of asking directly about victimizations using crime jargon such as “have you ever been robbed?” This is important. A great deal of research has demonstrated that asking questions using behavior-based wording instead of legally based phrases uncovers a significantly greater number of victimizations, particularly when

❖ Table 1.3 Screening Questions Used by the NCVS to Uncover Violent Victimization

1) Other than any incidents already mentioned, has anyone attacked or threatened you in any of these ways?
   a. With any weapon, for instance, a gun or knife
   b. With anything like a baseball bat, frying pan, scissors, or a stick
   c. By something thrown, such as a rock or bottle
   d. Include any grabbing, punching, or choking
   e. Any rape, attempted rape or other type of sexual attack
   f. Any face-to-face threats
   g. Any attack or threat or use of force by anyone at all? Please mention it even if you are not certain it was a crime.

2) Incidents involving forced or unwanted sexual acts are often difficult to talk about. Have you been forced or coerced to engage in unwanted sexual activity by:
   a. Someone you didn’t know before
   b. A casual acquaintance
   c. Someone you know well?

   If respondents reply affirmative to one of these latter questions, interviewers next ask “Do you mean forced or coerced sexual intercourse?” to determine whether the incident should be recorded as rape or as another type of sexual attack.

3) People often don’t think of incidents committed by someone they know. Did you have something stolen from you OR were you attacked or threatened by:
   a. Someone at work or school
   b. A neighbor or friend
   c. A relative or family member
   d. Any other person you’ve met or known?
victims may not self-identify themselves as crime victims. As you might imagine, asking people about their experiences in this way uncovers many more victimizations than those reported only to police.

Relying on police reports to estimate who is most likely to perpetrate acts of violence involves the same problems as using these data to estimate who is most likely to be victimized. Are offenders who are arrested for violent offending actually representative of all offenders? The quick answer is no. Not surprisingly, early self-report surveys of offending behavior in the 1940s revealed that a relatively large number of committed offenses were undetected by the police. Although police report data at the time indicated offenders were more likely to be minorities from low socioeconomic backgrounds, self-report data revealed that a great number of offenses were being reported by people from relatively privileged backgrounds, but these offenses rarely came to the attention of the police. If they did, they rarely resulted in an arrest. Based on these early studies, researchers interested in offending behavior—like those interested in victimization—began to rely on survey methodology instead of police reports. That trend continues to this day.

One of the most thorough contemporary surveys of offending behavior is the National Youth Survey, which was first collected in 1976 from a national probability sample of 11- to 17-year-olds. These youth were interviewed many times during the following years, with the last interview data collected in 1995. Table 1.4 displays some of the questions used to measure the violent offending behavior in the NYS. As you can see, here too researchers have used behavior-specific wording instead of relying on the use of crime categories and labels.

This brief description of how we measure violence should suffice to give you a better sense of how a lot of information on violence is gathered and what its weaknesses are. Keep in mind that we will be talking about measurement issues regarding particular

---

**Table 1.4** Screening Questions Used by the NYS to Uncover Self-Reported Offending

(Introduction) This section deals with our own behavior. I’d like to remind you that all your answers are confidential. I’ll read a series of behaviors to you. Please give me your best estimate of the exact number of times you’ve done each thing during the last year from Christmas a year ago to the Christmas just past.

- a. Carried a hidden weapon other than a plain pocket knife
- b. Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing him or her
- c. Been involved in gang fights
- d. Tried to take something from someone with the use of force or with the threat of force.

**NOTE:**

1. Response options were a) once a month, b) once every 2–3 weeks, c) once a week, d) 2–3 times a week, e) once a day, and f) 2–3 times a day.
types of violence more extensively throughout the book. For now, though, we want to provide you with a general overview of the scope of violence in the United States and look at how this compares with violence in other times and places.

**Violence and American Society**

When we turn on the evening news or read the local newspaper, we can’t get away from the fact that violence, in its many forms, is a common companion in our lives. We live in a violent world. Whether we acknowledge it or not, the problem of violence pervades our lives and often defines who we are as individuals, communities, and nations. This is as true for the United States as it is for any other place around the world. We experience it in our homes, at work, and in public places. In fact, many of us experience violence directly as victims. In 2003 alone, according to the National Crime Victimization Survey, 5.4 million Americans over the age of 12 were victims of violent crimes.\(^4^3\) When you consider that this type of victimization occurs every single day and that the effects of this victimization often last years, if not a lifetime, you begin to realize the impact that this violence has on our society. These high rates of violence are not a recent phenomenon.

\[\text{Figure 1.2} \quad \text{Violent Crime Rates, 1973–2003}\]
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NOTE: Murder appears as 0 because of the scale of the chart. Murders are usually calculated per 100,000, not 1,000.
Figure 1.2 illustrates rates of the most common types of violent crime in the United States. As you can see, all types of violence peaked in the early 1990s and have generally been declining since that time. Figure 1.3 reveals that, although the United States generally has very high rates of violence, we are not necessarily alone. We do, however, place second in our rate of serious assaults following Canada, and third in our rate of murder, following the Netherlands in first place and Scotland in second. Needless to say, most nations would rather fall at the bottom of such lists!

Rates of victimization are just the tip of the iceberg regarding our experiences with violence. In addition to direct victimization, we also often experience it vicariously. We thrill to violence in sports and enjoy violent video and computer games. We flock to
movies that are saturated with graphic acts of explicit and realistic violence. In fact, the average child will view 200,000 acts of violence and 16,000 murders by the time they are 18 years old.44 Our airwaves are full of violent images and research suggests that this trend is becoming more prevalent. In fact, there is evidence that media violence has become more plentiful, graphic, sexual, and sadistic.45 Can we watch these images and not be affected by them? The evidence strongly suggests that we can’t.46

We also worry about violence constantly, and change our behavior in response to perceived threats of violence. We avoid certain parts of town, add security features to our homes, and vote for “get tough” laws in order to protect ourselves from violent offenders. At the time this chapter was written, Americans were fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan and news reports were full of fallen soldiers, car bombings, torture of prisoners, and beheadings of hostages. In short, whether domestically or internationally, violence is part and parcel of American life. In fact, the sociologists Peter Iadicola and Anson Shupe assert that violence is the “overarching problem of our age” and suggest that every social problem is influenced by the problem of violence.47 James Gilligan, a medical doctor who directed the Center for the Study of Violence at Harvard Medical School, put it this way:

The more I learn about other people’s lives, the more I realize that I have yet to hear the history of any family in which there has not been at least one family member who has been overtaken by fatal or life threatening violence, as the perpetrator or the victim—whether the violence takes the form of suicide or homicide, death in combat, death from a drunken or reckless driver, or any other of the many nonnatural forms of death.48

So it’s safe to say that violence is not foreign to us, but rather is something with which we rub shoulders constantly. We know violence through our own lived experiences and the experiences of our family, friends, and neighbors, as well as through the media images we view.

At a deeper level, this means that our identities as citizens, parents, children, spouses, lovers, friends, teammates, and colleagues are often shaped by violence, at least in part. Who we are as individuals and as human beings is shaped by the culture within which we live. How we define ourselves, the ways in which we relate to others, and our notions of what we stand for and what we believe in, are all determined in large part by the influences and experiences of our lives—or, as the great English Poet Alfred Lord Tennyson once wrote, “I am a part of all that I have met.”49 In a similar vein, although a bit less poetically, the sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann suggest, “Identity is a phenomenon that emerges from the dialectic between individual and society.”50 In short, our life experiences shape who we are. Therefore, if violence is a part of our reality, then it plays a role in shaping us as human beings and influences how we understand the world around us. To acknowledge this is to understand that violence is part of who we are and central to knowing ourselves and the lives we lead.

Because of this prevalence and its impact on our lives, some have suggested that Americans have created and embraced a culture of violence. Culture is a nebulous concept that includes values, beliefs, and rules for behavior. These qualities detail what is expected, what is valued, and what is prohibited.51 Essentially, then, this argument
contends that our history and experiences have resulted in a system of values and beliefs that, to a greater extent than in some other cultures, condones, tolerates, and even expects a violent response to various and specific situations. Other scholars have further developed this theme by arguing that, instead of a culture of violence in the United States, there are subcultures of violence specific to particular regions or groups. First articulated by the criminologists Wolfgang and Ferracuti, this viewpoint suggests that members of some groups are more likely to rely on violence. As they suggest:

Quick resort to physical combat as a measure of daring, courage, or defense of status appears to be a cultural expectation... When such a cultural response is elicited from an individual engaged in social interplay with others who harbor the same response mechanism, physical assaults, altercations, and violent domestic quarrels that result in homicide are likely to be relatively common.

This argument has been applied to various subcultural groups such as Southerners, young African American males, and others. The South historically has had much higher rates of violence than other regions of the country and many have suggested that it is a consequence of Southern notions of honor that demand a violent response to certain provocations. The argument suggests that Southern culture, in other words, is more violence prone than other regional cultures. Violence, then, is something that appears to be embedded in our values and attitudes, which is why some have suggested that violence is "as American as apple pie."

Photo 1.2 Illustration of the duel between Alexander Hamilton and Aaron Burr.
Yet, for something that is so much a part of our lives, we remain remarkably ill-informed about what violence really is, how and why it is perpetrated, and what its consequences truly are. James Gilligan makes this point when he asserts that “human violence is much more complicated, ambiguous and, most of all, tragic, than is commonly realized or acknowledged.” Much of what we think we know owes as much to myth and stereotype as it does to fact. This shouldn’t be a big surprise since so much of what we think we know is based on what we see on popular television shows and in movies. In fact, up to 95 percent of Americans cite mass media sources as their main source of information on crime and violence. Unfortunately, these images have been shown to be misleading, incomplete, and erroneous. For example, on October 12, 1998, a 22-year-old gang member named Omar Sevilla, also known as “Sugar Bear,” was shot to death as he walked to a drug and alcohol treatment center. On the same day, a German tourist named Horst Fietze was shot and killed while walking with his wife only a few blocks away from the site of the “Sugar Bear” murder. While Sevilla’s death went almost completely unnoticed in the press, Fietze’s killing received a great deal of media attention. Such selective reporting is not unusual. One study of newspaper reporting on murder found that it was the atypical homicide that was reported on most frequently, while the routine type of killing was sometimes not even considered worthy of any coverage. More specifically, around 5 percent of homicides received the vast majority of all media attention. What kinds of killings constituted this 5 percent? Assassinations, mass murders, gangland killings, and particularly gruesome and sensationalistic murders received all the press coverage. Yet these types of murders are far and away the least common types of criminal homicide. To the average reader, however, who thinks that the newspaper reporting is complete, it is the atypical homicides that they perceive to be most common.

The same is true for other forms of violent crime as well. During the mid-1990s, for example, a spate of news stories appeared about the problem of workplace violence that portrayed the United States as suffering “the epidemic of workplace violence.” These reports were often full of scary statistics and language that fed into and increased fears about the dangers of the workplace. Yet, as Barry Glasner points out, the rate of workplace violence is only around 1 in 114,000, which is hardly an epidemic. Glasner also shows that, even though the term “going postal” entered popular culture as an expression of extreme workplace behavior, postal workers are actually two and a half times less likely to be killed at work than the average American worker. This misrepresentation doesn’t mean that our places of employment are absolutely 100 percent safe, but most are certainly safer than the news reports suggest. Similar kinds of media-generated “crime epidemics” have been studied in regard to serial murder, child abuse, and various other types of violent offending. Clearly, there is a need to develop a more accurate understanding of the nature and prevalence of violence, and that is the intent of this book.

**Organization of the Book**

The organization of this book is the result of an imperfect compromise on a number of different levels. First, of necessity we are not able to examine all of the varied types
of violence that exist. While some readers might disagree with our choices, we have had to pick and choose which types to include and which types to exclude, and we feel that our choices provide a broad-based understanding of the varied ways in which violence is often manifested. Second, we recognize that we have not always been able to devote the amount of attention and space to various issues, perspectives, and theories. Many of the individual topics contained in this book have had entire volumes written about them and it is simply beyond the scope of this book to address all of the relevant issues in the level of detail and depth that some may desire. Third and last, dividing this book into chapters on different types of violence regrettably contributes to the mistaken notion that the kinds of violence discussed in this book are discrete and separate events. However, for the sake of clarity and to conceptually assist the reader, we have chosen to structure the book around chapters that review specific types of violence in detail. The first chapters focus on interpersonal acts of violence, while the later chapters cover collective types of violence. The specific chapters are arranged as follows:

Chapter 2 Explaining Violence: This chapter provides a review of the various biological, psychological, and sociological theories that have explanatory power for violent behavior. Human behavior is complex and is subject to a variety of influences that are captured in the different perspectives we review in this chapter.

Chapter 3 Aiding and Abetting Violence: This chapter comprises a discussion of a number of elements that often are contributors to or correlates of violent behavior. Firearms, drugs, and alcohol are the most obvious of these, but this chapter also explores a number of other correlates, such as certain kinds of group dynamics that contribute to violent acts.

Chapter 4 Assault and Homicide: Since a large percentage of homicides occur as the result of conflict situations such as fights or arguments, this chapter discusses homicide as the most lethal outcome on a continuum of assaultive violence. The chapter provides a broad discussion of the epidemiology of murder and assault in the United States as well as a contextual discussion of the “assault event” and delineates the interactions that are most likely to lead to homicide. The chapter concludes with a discussion of capital punishment, which is the most severe mechanism of social control for some types of homicide.

Chapter 5 Violence in the Home: This chapter provides a discussion of intimate partner violence, child abuse and neglect, and elder abuse. In addition to noting that all forms of violence occur in the home—including murder, rape, and assault—the chapter also talks about the crime of stalking, which often co-occurs with other intimate partner violence. The chapter concludes by discussing the various policies aimed at preventing violence in the family, including the efficacy of mandatory arrest policies and batterer treatment programs.

Chapter 6 Stranger Danger: This chapter provides a discussion of the stranger-perpetrated assault and homicide and looks at how it differs from similar violence perpetrated by known offenders. In addition, since robbery is more likely to be perpetrated by strangers than known offenders, it also provides an in-depth analysis of robbery in the United States. The chapter relies on official statistics to present the epidemiological
overview but also offers insights into the motivations of robbery offenders from qualitative research that has been conducted with robbers themselves.

Chapter 7 Rape and Sexual Assault: This chapter reviews the major trends and patterns of rape and sexual assault. Additionally, it explores what is known about the type of individuals who perpetrate this form of violence and their rationales for doing so. Lastly, this chapter addresses rape in two contexts that rarely receive attention: rape perpetrated in America’s prisons, and rape perpetrated as a means of ethnic cleansing and genocide.

Chapter 8 Mob Violence: This chapter explores a number of examples of group violence that are largely spontaneous and involve informal and short-lived social groupings. Riots, lynchings, and vigilantism comprise the three primary types of mob violence reviewed in this chapter, with a number of different case studies reviewed within each category.

Chapter 9 Terrorism: Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Americans have become very aware of and concerned about this particular type of group violence. This chapter begins with a discussion of the difficulties in defining terrorism, followed by a review of the different typologies of terrorist groups based on their motivations. Specific examples of terrorist groups and their acts are also discussed in terms of how they fit in with the typologies and motivations discussed earlier.

Chapter 10 Genocide: Genocide is a term that is increasingly familiar to many, given its apparent prevalence. This chapter provides an overview of the concept, including a number of well-known case studies from recent history, a discussion of the reasons why it is perpetrated, and a summary of its impact on the development and application of international human rights law.

Chapter 11 Towards Violence Prevention: The concluding chapter presents a brief review of some of the costs of violence in order to highlight the need for more effective means of preventing and/or reducing the frequency and severity of violence. A major focus of this chapter stresses the utility of relying on more of a public health approach to the enduring problem of violence that confronts our communities, our society, and our world.
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Discussion Questions

1) Go to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) website, www.fbi.gov/ucr/05cius/about/aboutucr.html, and find a link to its Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. Here you will find a historical discussion of the program and how the FBI is now implementing a new program called the National Incident Based Reporting System (NIBRS). What advances does the new NIBRS reporting system have compared with the older UCR program? Will the new system address problems of under-reporting in general? Will it still be necessary to have other measures of victimization, like the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)? Why or why not?

2) Spend a few evenings watching the news on a local television network. Monitor how the network covers incidents of violence, both locally and nationally. In your opinion, do you think it has captured the reality of violence in your area or in the nation? What types of violence are most likely to be portrayed? What types of victims and offenders are most likely to be represented?

3) Without looking back at the definitions of violence presented in this chapter, come up with your own definition of interpersonal violence. What elements must a definition have to be useful? Now try your hand at defining genocide. What elements do you believe are necessary to label a case of mass killing as genocide?
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