

What happens at Quixote House?

Peacebuilding and the reintegration into community of released offenders

By

EDUARDO ENRIQUE SOTO PARRA

COPYRIGHT © 2018 EDUARDO ENRIQUE SOTO PARRA

Abstract

This research is an exploratory case study focused on Quixote House; an initiative developed by the non-profit sector to support offenders released into community after incarceration. The high rates of recidivism, characteristic of contemporary society, have sparked many scientific endeavours aimed at reducing what seems to be a failure of the current correctional and justice systems. Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) approaches, such as Restorative Justice, find common ground with critical theorists of modernity when addressing the negative impact of interventions without regard for places and relationships. Today, Correctional Service Canada (CSC) officers and inmates across the country know about Quixote House. About 50 men from Stony Mountain Institution, the federal penitentiary in Manitoba, all of whom committed serious crimes, have lived in this house. This book explores the experiences and perceptions of 11 of those men with regards to their reintegration and the role this house played in their success. In addition, the experiences of the two founders of the house, six CSC staff, and my own experience, as a resident of the house for the last six years, are included. The central objectives of this qualitative study are to analyze those experiences empirically, to provide a framework for better understanding Quixote House, and to propose possible improvements, from the perspective provided by PACS, with respect to theory and practice of offender reintegration into community. The findings show: (1) the lingering effects of institutionalization and stigma, (2) the importance of safety based on trusting relationships and 'home' on the road to reintegration, (3) the significance of community in the ways released offenders begin to meet their needs after incarceration, (4) the crucial role of the non-profit sector and volunteers in providing a safety net and (5) the open possibility of new kinship in which a non-judgmental approach to offenders can be experienced. All of these findings point to the positive impact Quixote House has had on released offenders in its 10 years of existence.

Key Words: Recidivism – offenders' reintegration – Home – Peacebuilding

Acknowledgements

This book has been the end of a long journey...

On this journey many have helped me to raise my veils, tighten ties, attach the rudder and check the map of the route of the tour and the way to go...

My special gratitude to those who had faith, since the beginning, in my capacity to fulfill this project: Fathers David Creamer, Peter Bisson and Arturo Peraza; my mother Haydee Parra de Soto, my sisters and brothers, my cousin Rosalinda, and my friends Rosamalia, Ana and Antonio.

For the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Justice and Peace and the University of Manitoba: my classmates, staff and especially Sean Byrne, Michelle Gallant and Maria Power. Without their words of encouragement and corrections, I would have been unable to complete this book!

My gratitude to all participants of my research, the CSC officers A, B, C, D, E, F, Sister Carol and the ex-residents of Quixote House, namely, Otter, Bear, Moose, Ram, Panther, Squirrel, Rabbit, Wolf, Tiger, Lion and Fox. Their struggles and their desire to live a different life is the reason I spent four years researching and writing. This was my honour and privilege...

To all the people who sent prayers, and 'good vibes': my family, the community of Venezuelans in Manitoba, the people of St Ignatius Church, Wayne and the McIntosh family, the people of 'Future Hope', the workers of St Paul's and St John's Colleges, as well as Marlen, AnaLuz and Yanes... who gave me a break in Spanish whenever I spent hours torturing myself with Academic English.

And last, but not least I am deeply indebted to the Jesuits of Venezuela and Canada. It is my sincere hope that the journey of this book will be experienced by many and that we may continue tightening academic excellence, fruitful dialogue and closeness to the most marginalized in order to construct a world where everyone's dignity is respected and celebrated...

Dedication

To my parents, who made a Home to me...They have always been and ever will be a source of inspiration...

(A mis padres, quienes me hicieron un Hogar...Ellos han sido y serán siempre una fuente de inspiración...)

To Panther, one of the ex-residents of Quixote House and participants in this research, who died due to a Fentanyl overdose.... and to all those ‘panthers’ who are longing for love and acceptance, in any city street of the world...

Table of Contents

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Dedication	v
Table of contents	vi
Chapter 1 – Introduction	
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Background of researcher.....	2
1.3 Statement of purpose.....	3
1.4 Guiding questions and objectives.....	4
1.5 Significance and limitations of this study.....	4
1.6 Overview of Chapters.....	6
1.7 Conclusion.....	8
Chapter 2 – Context: crime and reintegration into Canadian society	
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Canadian state, order and peace.....	9
2.3 Correctional Service Canada and released offenders.....	12
2.3.1 Parole.....	18
2.3.2 Parole as a criticized institution.....	22
2.4 Approaches to offenders’ rehabilitation.....	23
2.5 The work of civil society with released offenders.....	28
2.6 Recidivism and civil society in Manitoba.....	30
2.7 Conclusion.....	33
Chapter 3 – Context: a place called Quixote House	
3.1 Introduction.....	34
3.2 Next Step Peer Support Program.....	35
3.3 From Next Step to Quixote House.....	44
3.4 From Quixote House to Massie House Apartments.....	50
3.5 Quixote House within the third sector.....	52
3.6 Conclusion.....	53

Chapter 4 – Literature Review

4.1 Introduction.....	55
4.2. Barriers for rehabilitation in the community.....	55
4.2.1 <i>Individual</i>	57
4.2.2 <i>Structural</i>	61
4.2.3 <i>Relational</i>	65
4.3 Reintegration into community under criticism.....	71
4.4 Incarceration and the ‘us-them’ dichotomy in correctional centres.....	79
4.4.1 <i>Institutionalization</i>	80
4.4.2 <i>‘Us-them’ dichotomy as a cultural product</i>	83
4.5 Practices of everyday life.....	85
4.6 Home and the importance of place, meaning and space.....	86
4.6.1 <i>Home, identity and belonging</i>	89
4.6.2 <i>Home, family and house</i>	91
4.6.3 <i>Home in the PACS literature</i>	93
4.7 Peacebuilding applied to the criminal justice system.....	95
4.7.1 <i>Restorative Justice</i>	96
4.7.2 <i>Culture and conflict in offenders</i>	100
4.7.3 <i>Hybrid Peace</i>	101
4.7.4 <i>Narrative approaches</i>	103
4.7.5 <i>Lederach’s moral imagination</i>	107
4.7.6 <i>Home, vulnerability and conflict transformation</i>	109
4.7.7 <i>Religion in the reintegration of released offenders</i>	111
4.7.8 <i>Intentional communities</i>	113
4.8 Conclusion.....	117

Chapter 5 – Research Methodology

5.1 Introduction	119
5.2 Qualitative research strategy.....	119
5.2.1 <i>PAR methodology and Quixote House</i>	121
5.3 Geographic location of the study.....	122
5.3.1 <i>Demography and gender of the research participants</i>	123

5.3.2 Participant selection.....	124
5.3.3 Participant payment and costs.....	125
5.4 Role and position of the researcher.....	126
5.4.1 Stakeholders.....	127
5.5 Research instruments and gathering techniques.....	128
5.5.1 Ethics component.....	129
5.5.2 Informed consent.....	131
5.5.3 Protection of subjects and confidentiality.....	131
5.5.4 Challenges encountered.....	132
5.5.5 Data analysis, validity and reliability.....	134
5.6 Conclusion.....	135
Chapter 6 – The challenges of Quixote House residents	
6.1 Introduction.....	137
6.2 Main challenges to reintegration into community for Quixote House residents....	137
6.2.1 Most of the hardships are perceived as individual.....	138
6.2.2 There is a structural mistrust of offenders.....	142
6.2.3 There are ‘no second chances’.....	148
6.3 The effects of institutionalization.....	153
6.3.1 Jail rules still at work.....	154
6.3.2 The persistence of stigma.....	157
6.4 Key findings	159
6.5 Conclusion.....	167
Chapter 7 – A safe place to ground oneself	
7.1 Introduction.....	169
7.2 Quixote House as a safe place.....	170
7.2.1 Safety as clean environment and affordable housing.....	170
7.2.2 Safety is about feeling understood.....	172
7.2.3 Safety is needed to relax and move forward.....	174
7.2.4 Safety as a new way to satisfy needs.....	176
7.3 Fears and risks.....	181
7.4 Safety and inevitable tension.....	185

7.5 Key findings.....	188
7.6 Conclusion.....	200
Chapter 8 – Community and belonging at Quixote House	
8.1 Introduction.....	201
8.2 Community as life lived in ‘common’.....	201
8.3 Community as shared joy that lingers.....	202
8.4 A community in which everyone is accountable.....	208
8.5 Community and a sense of belonging.....	213
8.6 The fragility of a community built in this way.....	218
8.7 Key findings	223
8.8 Conclusion.....	237
Chapter 9 – Everyday at Quixote House: the experience of Home	
9.1 Introduction.....	239
9.2 Everyday life at Quixote House.....	240
9.3 A nonjudgmental approach.....	246
9.4 Church and spirituality at Quixote House.....	258
9.5 The simple structure at Quixote House.....	272
9.6 Experiences of home as a contribution exclusively of the third sector.....	276
9.7 Key findings.....	277
9.8 Conclusion.....	296
Chapter 10 – Conclusions	
10.1 Introduction.....	299
10.2 Overall key findings and discoveries.....	300
10.3 Recommendations.....	306
10.3.1 <i>The need for more places like Quixote House</i>	306
10.3.2 <i>Do not take the community in which offenders will be resettled for granted</i>	307
10.3.3 <i>Multitrack intervention strategy to reduce recidivism</i>	308
10.3.4 <i>Education and Social Media campaign</i>	310
10.4 Future Research.....	310
10.4.1 <i>In the area of offender rehabilitation</i>	311

10.4.2 <i>Small communities in Manitoba</i>	312
10.4.3 <i>Everyday practices</i>	312
10.5 Final remarks.....	313
Bibliography	315
Illustrations:	
Illustration 1: Indoor photos of Quixote House.....	351
Illustration 2: Outdoor photos of Quixote House.....	352

Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Spaces, houses, and homes line the streets of the inner city in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Under the three month-long tree canopies during the summer, every house has its own history, beyond the life of the owners and residents (Burley & Maunder, 2008). There is one house that is easily identifiable in the neighbourhood because in the winter the snow is shovelled right down to the cement sidewalk and in the summer it is decorated with flowers. It is a big three-storey light green clapboard and stucco house with a small fenced in lawn in front. Indoors, the smell of burnt popcorn often invades all three floors, subtly inviting everyone to leave their rooms and go down to the main floor to watch a movie together. Sometimes, especially when a movie is about second chances and love, young and not-so-young men shed tears. This becomes a good excuse for poking fun at someone and, after the laughter subsides, to start a conversation.

This house, for male adults transitioning from prison to the city of Winnipeg, was the dream of a Catholic nun, Sister Carol Peloquin and a Jesuit priest, Dr. David Creamer. Sr. Carol worked as a chaplain in the region's large federal penitentiary for men and, over the years, saw how many men never succeeded in their reinsertion into society, after serving their sentences. The priest, an emeritus Associate Professor of Education and Catholic Studies at the University of Manitoba often celebrated Mass in the prison on weekends. Both had in common their concern for the men who never seemed able to have a clean and affordable start on the outside after their experiences in prison. Their dream, for a program and housing for men transitioning out of prison, led them to contact the housing authority in town. Soon, the priest became the landlord of a house containing eight rooms open to parolees and an occasional Peace and Conflict Studies (PACS) graduate student who wanted to share their lives with each other and

build a community of support. Nowadays, correctional service officers know this house across Canada as do inmates from prisons outside Manitoba about to transition from jail back into community. About 50 men from Stony Mountain Institution, all of whom committed serious crimes, have lived in this house. More than half of these residents have not committed another crime, and are still in community as they struggle every day to become successfully reintegrated into society. This case study explores the experiences and perceptions of those men with regards to their reintegration and the role this house played in their success. In doing so, unfortunately, at the time of writing, some former house residents are back in prison. However, they still remain connected to the house and hope to have another chance at their reintegration.

1.2 Background of researcher

In 2011, I came from South America to live in this house. I was sponsored by the Jesuits of Winnipeg to learn English and pursue graduate studies in the Arthur V. Mauro Centre's PhD program in PACS at the University of Manitoba. My initial area of research was the ongoing socio-political conflict in my country of birth, Venezuela. However, my participation as "one more" citizen in the dynamics of the house, gave me the space to notice the ways in which community is built. Impressed by the quality of the conversations and the relationships among the residents every day, I decided write a book about it.

Over time, I became aware of the many links between PACS and 'what happens' in the house and the way it has impacted the lives of everyone who inhabits it. Soon, I realized that the categories used by criminologists or social workers to discuss the house weren't enough to explain its full peacebuilding and social potential. I also saw the similarities between the complexities in conflict analysis from PACS and the struggles of people returning to community after their incarceration. I experienced how the house was addressing some questions that were

not fully formulated. My research was conducted to hone in on those questions using the methodology and the categories developed in PACS. Those categories and insights are then applied to a study of this house, which has become for its residents and ex-residents a crucial component in their process of offender rehabilitation. In that sense, the most important thing is to retrieve the voices and stories of those involved in the process and the activities that happen in the house (namely, the founders of the house, parole officers and, especially, released offenders living in community) and how these have contributed to their own lives and work. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identity of the people who are living or have lived in this house, named ‘Quixote House’ by one of its early residents.

1.3 Statement of purpose

The central objectives of this research are to analyze empirically the experiences and perceptions of people associated with Quixote House, as an initiative of the non-profit sector in Manitoba to help offenders in community and reduce recidivism. This study aims to contribute to both theory and practice with respect to offender reintegration into community from the perspective provided by PACS.

Another goal of this research is to provide the opportunity for offenders and ex-offenders in community to have a voice, so that their stories can be heard, and so that the hardships that they have to face every day after being imprisoned may be a concrete reference for those interested in contributing to the solutions of the growing problem of recidivism in Manitoba and Canada.

Finally, the research seeks to provide a framework for the work done by Quixote House during its 10 years of existence, so that this kind of experience can be replicated in other

communities in Canada and elsewhere who are undoubtedly struggling with situations similar to those addressed by Quixote House and its associated programs.

1.4 Guiding questions and objectives

The central focus of this research is what happens at Quixote House and what may be learned from these experiences about building support for offenders re-entering community. Some broad questions were posed to several distinct stakeholder groups. These were followed by more specific questions, relevant to each of the three categories of participants; namely, the founders, ‘parole’ officers and residents. Whereas the main question is about understanding the house as an initiative dealing with a particular situation —i.e., the re-entry of offenders into community—the researcher also asked about how the different stakeholders recognized the situation undertaken by the house. The answer to this question not only provides context but also organizes the ideas and experiences expressed about the house by the interviewees.

The open-ended questions posed to officers and founders were very similar to those put to the residents. However, in the questions directed to residents, their stories relating to the everyday life of the house received greater attentiveness. An analysis of the description of the house shows it as providing more than just housing. According to the interviewees, Quixote House creates a unique environment, the analysis of which demands the usage of categories of PACS to offer a full understanding of the dynamics at play.

1.5 Significance and limitations of this study

High rates of recidivism are just one of the many indicators of the increased social disruption and violence that our society is facing. Recidivism is “the rearrest, reconviction, or reincarceration of an ex-offender within a given time frame” (James, 2014, p. 8). This violence and disruption can be given concrete names and stories. Although limited to Winnipeg and the residents of Quixote

House, this research explores a more precise analysis of men after their incarceration, by acknowledging their humanity and ability to build a “community of mutual support”. This study also gives voice to these concrete men who have served their sentences and are struggling to succeed in society. These voices have been contrasted with, and complemented by, the opinions coming from those who have provided the house for them, and also from officers responsible for the reintegration of offenders into community.

In terms of PACS, the outcome of this interdisciplinary research is the need to link PACS approaches to other areas such as Peacemaking, Criminal Justice, Criminology, and offenders’ rehabilitation. The research and its results will open up new possibilities for creativity and innovation in interventions that address the complex situations these disciplines and their practitioners tackle in everyday activities. The research clarifies the role as an external agent of individual agencies and the third sector of civil society organizations as they work to provide a ‘home’ for offenders as they transition back into community. In addition, this research will provide a theoretical framework for addressing everyday activities in such interventions and the studies required to build a more peaceful and integrated society.

Anchored primarily in the experiences of the individuals involved in Quixote House, this study seeks to appreciate their visions, practises, and hopes. The investigation is restricted to the house and how the different stakeholders perceive it. Therefore, the research emerges as a comprehensive case study of the place. Because Quixote House is the current home of the researcher, this inquiry has also been done in unique circumstances. It has been possible thanks to the preservation of a respectful environment and the nurturing of reciprocal relationships by combining traditional qualitative approaches such as Participatory Action Research (PAR), decolonized methodologies, and the ‘unity of means and ends’ from Gandhian inspiration.

1.6 Overview of Chapters

The book moves from the general to the particular. First, it provides the context in which the case study was conducted—a description that mainly comes from those who have participated in the experience. Then, the experience is addressed using PACS categories to highlight the insights emanating from other disciplines. This multidisciplinary approach, typical of PACS, is obvious in the way the data is treated and also in the way it is codified and categorized.

The outcome of the research and the intersectionality of the many disciplines applied to the data collected are organized as follows. Two context chapters follow Chapter 1, the Introduction.

Chapter 2 situates the theoretical and the practical context for those who have committed violence against others and have been prosecuted by the Canadian state. It also addresses matters related to offender rehabilitation and its failure (known as recidivism). Chapter 3 provides the background and the history of Quixote House and the initiatives that surrounded its creation and its current functioning. It is important to note that Quixote House also includes ‘Next-Step’, the peer support group from which Quixote House arose and Massie House (the follow-up initiative to Quixote House). The narrative of this chapter focuses on structure, personnel, funding, and changes over time.

Chapter 4 provides a review of the literature which speaks to the house and what the house intends to counteract; that is, the difficulties offenders face when re-entering community. Sections addressing home and peacebuilding theories highlight the development of PACS and how peacebuilding theories and practices are applicable to this study.

Chapter 5 addresses the methodology and criteria of analysis used for understanding the house and highlights the fresh insights provided by Quixote House. Sections are also dedicated to the research instruments utilized and participants’ selection and recruitment. The section on

ethics outlines the protocols and strategies for the protection of the subject's interviewed as well as critical issues and challenges that arose during the field research.

Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9 are the data chapters. Chapter 6 compliments and challenges, through the voices of offenders and practitioners, what the literature already says about the hardships of community reintegration. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 answer the question 'what happens at Quixote House?' in response to those challenges. They present the voices of those who have been involved with Quixote House. They explore attitudes, behaviours and situations that can be perceived positively or negatively by those who are part of this initiative. The level of the experience shared, justified the inclusion of three data chapters. Based on the data gathered, each chapter addresses what the house has arranged for the men, or what the house 'is' for them,.

Chapter 7 focuses on Quixote House as safe housing provided in response to individual needs. Chapter 8 centers its attention on the community aspect of Quixote House. The building of a community becomes an important step in supporting the structural change needed in the lives of offenders. Chapter 9 tackles the relational aspect of their reintegration into the house community. It is about Quixote House as being a home for the reintegration of offenders and the development of nonjudgmental attitudes toward residents. This leads to the application of recent categories and developments in PACS, born and validated in the international and multilateral arenas, to the conflictive situations that are addressed by Quixote House. Then, PACS provides a framework that can be useful for understanding the reintegration into community of released offenders and the 'interventions' related to them, including those coming from religious communities. The book concludes with a short chapter in which the general findings are outlined and future research areas are explored.

1.7 Conclusion

This research offers an accurate portrayal of people after their incarceration; recognizing what they are capable of doing, not only having committed a crime, but also highlighting their ability to shape the support they need in community. My hope is that through the stories in this study, experiences similar to Quixote House will become more common for men and women seeking to reintegrate into society. This book gives voice to people who have been in prison, served their sentence and who are currently struggling to live with dignity. The “transformative change” stories they recount are at risk of being “lost, denied, or dismissed” (Reimer, Schmitz, Janke, Askerov, & Matyók, 2015, p. 155). I have confidence that those who read this study will be inspired to work to change attitudes in their everyday lives towards the reintegration of those most vulnerable into mainstream society.

Chapter 2 - Context: crime and reintegration into Canadian society

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the theoretical and the practical context for those who have committed violence against others and have been prosecuted by the Canadian state. This chapter describes how a country such as Canada has the prerogative of prosecuting, punishing and rehabilitating those who have committed violence against others within its boundaries. For the residents of Quixote House, this has been their main relationship with the state. This punitive power given to the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) plays an important role in the government's social and political legitimacy.

In order to provide such a context, the constitutional and legal frameworks, and the recent studies regarding the CSC as well as the relationship between CSC and the voluntary sector, are described in light of the PACS literature. The chapter also addresses matters related to the offender's rehabilitation and its failure, known as recidivism. This failure has given rise to the involvement of the voluntary sector making it easier for released offenders to reinsert themselves into society after incarceration. Due to the scope of the topic, the description of the context focuses on the relationship between the CSC and its collaborators in the city of Winnipeg. However, this important task is often helped by other social agencies.

2.2 Canadian state, order and peace

“Peace, order and good government” are the opening words of the section that regulates the general legislative authority of the Canadian state since its first Constitution (Monahan, 2006). It follows the language employed by British colonial governments to signify matters of great importance (Monahan, 2006, p. 253). The Canadian Constitution divides, distributes and

limits the exercise of political power in order to achieve peace, order and good government within society. According to these sets of rules, Canada is a federal state, a constitutional monarchy, which guarantees individual and group rights in a concentrated, rather than separated, political power (Monahan, 2006).

In fact, federalism, as a power-sharing strategy in Canada, helps to manage the diversity in the composition of its population and the protection of its vast territory. However, the centre of the Canadian federal state retains concentrated power that has served the purposes of “national security” especially in the aftermath of 9/11. It also defines the patterns of relationships between the state and social movements and activism throughout Canada’s recent history. According to Kinsman, Buse, and Steedman (2000), national security can be “external” or “internal” (p. 281). While external security is related to the protection provided by the military to Canadian borders, internal security is “the defence of the nation-state from ‘enemies within’” (Kinsman, Buse, & Steedman, 2000, p. 281). As Harting and Kamboureli (2009) state, security may become a culture and then it demands a science, which operates in its own right. This operation pervades “different disciplinary and institutional contexts, encompassing the principles and patterns of conduct, national and international policies, and the institutional management of such codes of attitudes in relation to national security” (Harting & Kamboureli, 2009, p. 672).

The “national security” discourse, which is only managed by the state, rests in abstract notions and ideas that delimit possible “threats”, coming from the perceptions and studies of those defining “national security policy” (Kinsman, Buse, & Steedman, 2000). The engagement of the Canadian state in this kind of discourse, following patterns emanating from “leaders of the western alliance”, pervades the relationship between the state, voluntary sector and individuals,

echoing back to old “features of Canadian state formation” (Kinsman, Buse, & Steedman, 2000, p. 181).

According to Boyd, Chunn and Menzies (2000):

From the very first appearance of European colonialists on the eastern most points of the continent some five centuries ago, successive generations of state authorities, corporate organizations and elites have been carving out an impressive legacy of desecration, atrocity, exploitation, perfidy and greed. Historians, social scientists and journalists in this country have charted in detail a galaxy of harms visited by the rich and powerful upon the people and land around them (p. 13).

This pattern is present even in the accomplishment of minimum standards of peacebuilding, such as small weapons control. According to Cukier (2008), even though *Canada’s 1995 Firearms Act* is a model for legislation in other jurisdictions, the government has eroded its implementation in recent years. Consider, for example, the government’s postponing of the marking and tracing regulations of certain weapons, repealing “the necessity of registering unrestricted rifles and shotguns” and extending an amnesty for “failure to renew licenses” (Cukier, 2008, p. 5). This situation seriously questions who really makes the practical decision to possess and use firearms, despite the limited resources of police to enforce national law provisions.

Governmental policies are also seriously questioned with regard to social rights, which no longer occupy the central role as a “response and corrective to inequality and exclusion within Canada’s constitutional democracy” (Hackman & Porter, 2014, p. 29). According to Young (2014) and Rodgers and McIntyre (2010), social issues in Canada are viewed now as economic problems, so the state is no longer offering resources for social justice. Instead, “the citizen stands alone, free to succeed or fail on his own” (Young, 2014, p. 414).

In addition, poverty plays a role in the generation of criminal behaviour (Karmen, 2000). Different criminological theories have tried to explain the correlation between low income and criminal behaviour. In many such explanations, frustration and resentment caused by inequality among those economically deprived, the erosion of neighbourhood organizations, and “sharp cultural differences among transient populations who suffer chronic unemployment and welfare dependency”, increase street criminal activity (Karmen, 2000, pp. 29-30).

In Canada, according to recent studies, the eligibility rules “for provincial social assistance benefits have been tightened to encourage people to work and to restrict access mainly to people with disabilities and lone parents with young children” (Maxwell, 2006, p. 4). Welfare caseloads have dropped by almost 600,000 since 1995, although, “1. 7 million Canadians still depended on social assistance as their only source of income in 2004” (Maxwell, 2006, p. 4). Despite the way in which the state addresses social justice, thanks to the effort of the voluntary sector Canadians still take pride in the commitment to fairness and sharing established in the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Maxwell, 2006; Monahan, 2006). However, this social model is constantly under threat due to governmental policies towards the voluntary sector. Such policies may risk the social peace or ‘public safety’, which most Canadians have enjoyed in recent years. This is particularly evident in those who have participated in crime and have been impacted by the punitive power of the state. Within the structure of the Canadian State, Correctional Service Canada (CSC) is the agency which has to deal with the punishment and rehabilitation of offenders.

2.3 Correctional Service Canada and released offenders

Prisons and rehabilitation centres are a common feature in Liberal-democratic states. In such states, society entrusts the criminal justice system with a monopoly on coercion (physical force),

always used under the rule of law (Sellers, 2010; Levine, 2010). In reply, the citizens expect protection from crime, and assurances “that the criminal justice system will punish offenders in the event that the protection proves ineffective and the offenders are known” (Maltz, 1984, p. 14).

The criminal corrections agency in Canada has a unique history, even though it is influenced by external events and by geography as well as sociopolitical and cultural factors inside Canada (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994). The first Canadian penitentiary was built in 1835 as a substitute for earlier corporal and capital punishment (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 463). Since then, in order “to meet the growing number of individuals sentenced to a term of incarceration, the correctional system has grown over the last 160 years from a single facility into a large and costly system that operates on the basis of security levels” (Goff, 2001, p. 340). The obligation to provide adult correctional services is shared between the federal, provincial, and municipal levels of government (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 468).

At the federal level of government, this responsibility belongs to Correctional Service Canada (CSC). The *1992 Corrections and Conditional Release Act* states (in number 5) the following:

- ...the Correctional Service of Canada, which shall be responsible for
- (a) the care and custody of inmates;
- (b) the provision of programs that contribute to the rehabilitation of offenders and to their successful reintegration into the community;
- (c) the preparation of inmates for release;
- (d) parole, statutory release supervision and long term supervision of offenders; and
- (e) maintaining a program of public education about the operations of the Service.

These attributions have to be executed following the principles mentioned in number 3 of the same Act, which views federal correctional units as a system:

The purpose of the federal correctional system is to contribute to the maintenance of a just, peaceful and safe society by

- (a) carrying out sentences imposed by courts through the safe and humane custody and supervision of offenders; and
- (b) assisting the rehabilitation of offenders and their reintegration into the community as law-abiding citizens through the provision of programs in penitentiaries and in the community.

In this system, CSC reported that, by January 2017, it manages and maintains 43 institutions for carrying out sentences. Eleven are clustered institutions; two have maximum, medium and minimum security levels, and nine have medium and minimum security levels. Six are maximum-security institutions, nine are medium security institutions, and five (including two healing lodges) are minimum-security institutions. Twelve are multi-level security institutions. These include two healing lodges and six women's institutions. In addition, to assist in the rehabilitation of offenders, CSC is responsible for 15 community correctional centres, 91 parole offices and more than 200 community residential facilities (Canada, 2017).

Offender reintegration, then, includes “all activity and programming conducted to prepare an offender to return safely to the community and live as a law-abiding citizen” (Goff, 2001, p. 377). This broad spectrum of programs is executed according to the needs of an individual inmate because each inmate has their own story of relationships, addictions, mental health issues, and trauma. Goff (2001) presents Thruber’s summary of what CSC does for each offender:

- collects all available relevant information about the offender, including items such as the judge’s reasons for sentencing and any victim impact statements
- assesses the offender’s risk level (the likelihood that he or she will reoffend) and criminogenic needs (life functions that lead to criminal behaviour)
- reduces the offender’s risk level by increasing his or her knowledge and skills and changing the attitudes and behaviours that lead to criminal behaviour
- develops and implements programs and individual interventions that effect change in areas that contribute to criminal behaviour
- in cooperation with the offender, develops a plan to increase the likelihood that the offender will function in the community as a law-abiding citizen

- motivates and helps the offender follow the correctional plan and benefit from correctional programs and interventions
- monitors and assesses the offender's progress in learning and changing
- makes recommendations to the National Parole Board as to the offender's readiness for release and the conditions, if any, under which he and she could be released
- after release, helps the offender respect the conditions of the release and resolve day-to-day living problems
- makes required programs and interventions available in the community
- monitors the offender's behaviour to ensure that he or she is respecting the release conditions and not indulging in criminal behaviour
- if required, suspends the offender's release, carries out specific intervention, and reinstates or recommends revocation of the release as appropriate (Thurber, A. 1988, pp. 14-18; as cited in Goff, 2001, p. 377).

However, "since the major objective of correctional institutions is confinement, the primary factor in determining the classification level of an inmate is security" (Goff, 2001, p. 345). Security, on a broad level, has three components: "(1) the likelihood that an inmate will escape or attempt to escape; (2) the likelihood that an inmate will place a correctional officer or another inmate in danger; and (3) the likelihood that an inmate will attempt to violate institutional rules" (Anderson and Newman, 1993; as cited in Goff, 2001, p. 345). Therefore, the main source of information and classification of an offender is based on the "likelihood that an offender would escape from an institution and the potential harm to the community if he or she did" (Goff, 2001, p. 345).

This justifies a limitation on the rights of the inmates as citizens and an expectation that they obey the rules imposed on them in correctional institutions. This limitation and expectation can even be extended after confinement during their rehabilitation period. According to the *1994 Corrections and Conditional Released Act*, Section 4:

(d) offenders retain the rights of all members of society except those that are, as a consequence of the sentence, lawfully and necessarily removed or restricted;

.....

(h) offenders are expected to obey penitentiary rules and conditions governing temporary absences, work release, parole, statutory release and long-term supervision and to actively participate in meeting the objectives of their correctional plans, including by participating in programs designed to promote their rehabilitation and reintegration...(Section 4, letter h).

According to Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994), confinement produces “total institutions” (p. 498). This notion is taken from Erving Goffman (1961) who, in his classic treatise *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*, introduced the concept of the “total institution” for describing life inside hospitals, concentration camps, mental hospitals, and prisons. A total institution is “a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life” (Goffman, 1961, p. 6; as quoted by Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 498)

Goffman outlines the structure of daily life in total institutions as follows:

- 1) All aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority.
- 2) Each phase of the member’s daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together.
- 3) All phases of the day’s activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials.
- 4) The various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfil the official aims of the institutions (Goffman, 1961, p. 6; as cited in Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 499).

Additionally, in total institutions, the management of the relationship between staff and inmates is influenced by perceived stereotypes or, as Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994) put it, “correctional officers perceive the inmates as secretive and untrustworthy, while the inmates view correctional officers as condescending and mean” (p. 499) .

To be sure, much criticism has arisen surrounding the application of this notion to Canadian correctional institutions. Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994) consider that “the relations between the correctional staff (the keepers) and inmates (the kept) are complex and not always characterized by mutual hostility and suspicion” (p. 499). Also, the location of institutions, their size, security levels and administration “may significantly affect the patterns of interaction that occur within them” (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 500).

Experts on prisons and prison life have stated that inmates form their own world, with a unique set of norms and rules referred to as inmate subculture (Goff, 2001, p. 352). There is a unique social code of “unwritten rules and guidelines that tell inmates how to behave, think, and interact with prison staff and other inmates” (Goff, 2001, p. 352). Cooley (1992), who conducted research into prison victimization in five Canadian institutions, observed that the most important informal rules of social control are as follows:

1. Do your own time. These rules define the public and private realms of prison life. They encourage group cohesion by defining proper prison behaviour, which promotes order and minimizes friction.
2. Avoid the prison economy. These rules warn inmates of the consequences of conducting business in the informal prison economy and warn them also of the consequences of not paying debts.
3. Don't trust anyone. These rules, which caution inmates to be wary of who they associate with, are a consequence of the existing informant, or “rat,” system.
4. Show respect. This set of rules prescribes how inmates should interact with each other during their daily activities. These rules contribute to the social cohesion in the prison by defining appropriate and inappropriate conduct between prisoners. They also determine a prisoner's status within the prison hierarchy, and those who follow the rules are respected. Those who violate the rules may be physically assaulted (Cooley 1992, pp. 33-34; as cited in Goff, 2001, p. 353).

This common culture forges prison or group solidarity, which has the proven effect of reducing violence inside prison. Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994) speak of this “inmate social system” as having the following major components:

(1) code of behaviour; (2) a hierarchy of power among the inmates; (3) an ‘informal’ economic system, which provides illicit goods and services; and (4) a variety of social or “argot” roles assumed by prisoners. The convict code is designed to increase inmate solidarity and implores prisoners not to exploit one another, to be strong in confronting the deprivations of confinement, and to assume an oppositional stance toward prison authorities (p. 504).

However, prison codes and institutionalization, even though they may be helpful while prisoners are incarcerated, can actually hinder the process of re-entry into community. During the process of re-entry, public safety may be at risk. Then, CSC dedicates staff and time to the early release of offenders in the community; commonly known as ‘parole’.

2.3.1 Parole

Parole has a recent history in Canada and has been associated with civil society and religious associations since the very beginning of its implementation. According to Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994):

Parole as a release mechanism was established in 1899 with the enactment of the *Act to Provide for the Conditional Liberation of Penitentiary Convicts*, which became known as the *Ticket of Leave Act*. In the early 1900s, a remission service was created in the Department of Justice, and the Salvation Army, the John Howard Society, and the Elizabeth Fry Society became increasingly involved in supervising offenders as well as in providing “after-care” services (p. 545).

In 1958, the *Ticket of Leave Act* was replaced by the creation of the National Parole Board (NPB), which:

...reviews the cases of all inmates who are eligible for parole. Excluded from these cases are those offenders who are serving a specified minimum term of incarceration prior to being eligible for parole consideration and those offenders whose parole eligibility date was set by the sentencing judge at one-half. Eligible offenders must be reviewed for parole every year thereafter until parole is granted or until the offender is eligible for statutory release (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 545).

This kind of early release is also known as probation or conditional release (Canton, 2011). According to the *1994 Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, conditional release

programs include full parole, day parole, statutory release, and temporary absences. Goff differentiates full parole from day parole because day parole is granted only “for short periods of time, to a maximum of four months and renewable for a period of up to one year” (Goff, 2001, p. 385). All conditional release programs allow offenders to serve a portion of their sentence in the community until their time expires. In fact, according to Goff (2001):

Most inmates in the federal correctional system can apply to the National Parole Board for full parole after they have served one-third of their total sentence or seven years, whichever is shorter. Offenders who are subject to steeper eligibility requirements include those serving life sentences or sentences of preventive detention. Offenders serving a sentence of two years less a day in a provincial institution are eligible to apply for parole after serving one-third of their sentence....

Once offenders are released on full parole, they are placed under the supervision of a parole or probation officer and are required to follow general and specific conditions similar in nature to those granted probationers. As with all types of conditional release, offenders can be reincarcerated if they fail to fulfill the conditions of their parole or break the law (p. 385).

In addition, during their incarceration, offenders can also request Temporary Absence passes in order to reconnect with the community:

(TAs) are granted for four main reasons, namely medical, compassionate, administrative, and family and community contact....TAs may be either escorted or unescorted. A representative of the correctional facility must accompany an offender on an escorted TA. An escorted TA may be granted at any time after sentencing. TAs are the responsibility of the superintendent of the institution, under the authority of the Correctional Service of Canada (Goff, 2001, p. 385).

Another option for offenders seeking reconnection with the community prior to their normal release time is through the statutory release program. This happens when federal offenders are not granted parole but are actually released into the community before the expiration of their sentence (Goff, 2001, p. 386). “In contrast to parole, statutory release involves the release of offenders from the institution after serving two-thirds of their sentence, with the remaining one-third being served under supervision of the NPB in the community” (Griffiths &

Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 546). The *1994 Corrections and Conditional Release Act* also states that all inmates “leaving correctional institution on statutory supervision must, before their release, have their cases reviewed by the National Parole Board” (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 546).

Offenders can be detained at any time and may have to serve the remainder of their sentence should they breach the release conditions:

Inmates who are detained by the NPB during the period of statutory release on the grounds that they would constitute a threat to the community if released may be required to serve the remainder of their sentence in the institution. Following completion of their sentence, however, these inmates are released into the community without any supervision or assistance (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 547).

To ensure that offenders are following the conditions of their release into the community, some of the powers over inmates in custody are transferred to the release authorities over offenders. The releasing authority can impose any conditions on them “that it considers reasonable and necessary in order to protect society and to facilitate the offender’s successful reintegration into society”—normally, these include “any condition regarding the offender’s use of drugs or alcohol, including in cases when that use has been identified as a risk factor in the offender’s criminal behaviour” (*1994 Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, Section 133).

Consequently, the releasing authorities can randomly request a ‘urinalysis’ or require offenders to wear a monitoring device when released into the community. A urinalysis is a “prescribed procedure by which a person provides a urine sample, by the normal excretory process, for analysis”. In this regard:

Staff members can demand that an inmate submit to urinalysis where it is a prescribed requirement for participation in (i) a prescribed program or activity involving contact with the community, or (ii) a prescribed substance abuse treatment program.

A staff member or any other person authorized by the Service, may demand that an offender submit to urinalysis

(a) at once, where the staff member or other authorized person has reasonable grounds to suspect that the offender has breached any condition of a temporary absence, work release, parole or statutory release that requires abstention from alcohol or drugs, in order to monitor the offender's compliance with that condition; or

(b) at regular intervals, in order to monitor the offender's compliance with any condition of a temporary absence, work release, parole or statutory release that requires abstention from alcohol or drugs (Section 64).

Correctional service can demand that offenders wear a monitoring device in order to monitor their compliance with a condition that restricts "access to a person or a geographical area" (Section 57.1, number 1). They also can order frisks or room searches and request any kind of information from the prisoners. According to Section 66 (1) of the same Act, when the offender is in a community based residential facility, which is a place that provides accommodation for them, CSC can authorize its employees to:

(a) conduct a frisk search of an offender in that facility, and

(b) search an offender's room and its contents, where the employee suspects on reasonable grounds that the offender is violating or has violated a condition of the offender's parole, statutory release or temporary absence and that such a search is necessary to confirm the suspected violation.

All of these procedures are defined in the *1994 Corrections and Conditional Release Act* (Searches of Inmates, Sections 54-57.1). When parole is revoked or interrupted, offenders have to be arrested and placed again under confinement. The member of the CSC staff who is designated to extend a warrant and arrest any released offender is known as a "Peace Officer". According to Section 137 of the *1994 Corrections and Conditional Release Act*, the arrest can happen even without a warrant when an offender has committed a breach of a release condition. Peace Officers can also withdraw the arrest if there are not reasonable grounds that the person will fail to report to the parole supervisor. Once parole is broken, offenders may once again be eligible for early release at the discretion of the NPB and CSC.

2.3.2 Parole as a criticized institution

The frequent suspensions and interruptions of ‘parole’ have sparked much criticism about the effectiveness of this kind of early release of offenders (Goff, 2001). There is the notion that offenders ‘will always do it again’. The National Parole Board measures the success of early release in the following terms:

(1) the rate of success; (2) the number of charges for serious offences committed by offenders while on release in the community, by release type, in eight offence categories that emphasize violent crimes (murder, attempted murder, sexual assault, major assault, hostage taking, unlawful confinement, robbery, and so-called sensational incidents such as arson); and (3) post-warrant expiry recidivism (Goff, 2001, p. 387).

Additionally, others perceive the situation as follows:

One of the major reasons why the prison may never be successful in deterring individuals from engaging in further criminal activity is that it is not possible to predict how the individual will respond to the incarceration experience and whether the prison experience will result in the development of pro-social or anti-social attitudes and behaviours during confinement and upon release (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 503).

This suspicion allows for the possibility that an inmate will never be set free on any conditional release program. In those cases, the inmate is detained until the warrant expiry date (Goff, 2001, p. 386). The warrant expiry date is “the date a criminal sentence officially ends, as imposed by the courts at the time of sentencing” (Public Safety Canada, 2015). Those offenders who “reach this day after completing their entire sentence are no longer under the jurisdiction of CSC” (Public Safety Canada, 2015). In this case, an inmate normally leaves without a correctional plan. Such a plan, which becomes one of the conditions of any early release, according to Goff (2001),

...outlines an individualized risk management strategy for each offender and specifies those interventions and monitoring techniques required to address the risks associated with the offender’s reoffending. The correctional plan commonly involves the placing of certain restrictions on his movement and

activities, and it specifies certain constructive activities, such as jobs and counselling (p. 378).

Thus, those who are not granted early release have no correctional plan and are at greater risk to reoffend. This can become a contradiction when the numbers of those prisoners who can get parole are low (Goff, 2001, p. 378). In fact, between 2014 and 2015, just 30 percent of male federal offenders who applied for full parole were successful. In the same years, 70 percent of male federal offenders who applied were granted day parole. Of those, over 75 percent completed their terms in the community without having their parole revoked (Public Safety Canada, 2016).

Moreover, since 1974, due to an article published by criminologist Robert Martinson titled *What Works? Questions and answers in prison reform*, the very existence of programs for the rehabilitation of offenders in the US was questioned (Goff, 2001, p. 374). This has had a major impact on the work of correctional services, which normally isolates individuals from the community until their release. The relationship between criminal justice and its public has regularly been disquieting (Shapland, 2008). This tension reaches its peak when any offender has to go back to the community, as happens with parole. In recent years also, “state criminal justice has moved too far away from the concerns of ordinary people—it has become too distant, too out of touch, insufficiently reflective of different social groups in society” (Shapland, 2008, p. 1). This kind of approach sparked the interest of academics and practitioners in assessing the significance of community, social ties, and civil society in the offender’s journey out of prison (Bale & Mears, 2008).

2.4 Approaches to offenders’ rehabilitation

As we have seen in this chapter, those individuals involved in unlawful conflict who are already released into community are dealt with legally in a very specific way by the Canadian state. The

legal literature defines in detail how the inmate should be treated in community after being released from the institution. Moreover, rules and regulations are applied following certain philosophical and political assumptions. For this reason, it is necessary to address how the correctional system and the probation regime work (National Parole Board, 1994) as well as the philosophical (Amos & Newman, 1975) and political assumptions on which they are based (Street, 1967) (Zinger, 2012). Deterrence of criminal activity after serving one's sentence, according to Ross and Fabiano (1983), has become a main source of research by scholars in all branches of the social sciences.

This has brought about new ways of looking at the criminal justice system and its impact on the rehabilitation of offenders. This rehabilitation process system has been studied and criticized by many scholars, especially in the US and UK (Wang, Hay, Todak, & Bales, 2014). These studies have shown incorrect assumptions and generalizations with regards to the system for the rehabilitation of offenders (Comfort, 2007). Wadd and Maruna (2007) explain how 'rehabilitation' became a "dirty word". They also provide a comprehensive description of the two models that have been dominating the theories and practice in offender rehabilitation, namely the Risk-Need-Responsivity model (RNR) and the Good Life model (GLM). They disclose the aims, principles, values, and etiological and methodological assumptions of these models in their analyses. Their critique illustrates the lack of theoretical depth in models based only on lowering the risk of recidivism by increasing community safety, and not on the basic truth that offenders want a better life.

This distinction is followed by other theorists, such as Craig, Dixon and Gannon (2013), regarding rehabilitation in Canada, the US and UK. In this context, these researchers highlight the importance of high intensity, cognitional behavioural programs for offenders to achieve

success, more than just addressing risk factors to reduce recidivism. Nonetheless, they stress personal agency and point to “desistance” from crime as the goal in rehabilitation programs. According to Berg and Huebner (2011), in order to achieve this “desistance” through the GLM, needs such as employment, housing, new meaning, and context should be addressed.

Clearly, the Good Life model cares for the conditions of the communities from which prisoners come and to which they return. The systematic non-fulfillment of social needs in former offenders is a symptom of deep social injustice. Recent studies in the US are now considering the importance of social ecology and neighbourhood conditions on crime-related outcomes (Skubak & Vose, 2011). Following this approach, Social Support theory is developed on the assumption that instrumental and expressive needs must be addressed through stable and organized networks in the prevention of crime (Orrick, Worrall, Morris, Piquero, Bales, & Wang, 2011). However, ‘concentrated disadvantage’ in some communities cannot predict recidivism, even when it interacts with race (Wehrman, 2010). On that basis, and with the rising rates of recidivism, the path for a life free of crime remains almost impossible in practice. There needs to be a clear and conclusive academic explanation of what causes recidivism and how it can be prevented.

Wadd and Maruna (2007) advocate for a combination of the two models through which the needs of community safety and the ‘good life’ of offenders can be addressed. The authors, however, propose no concrete program to bring both models together, and so the book remains merely an academic inquiry without any practical solution to the problem. Interestingly, they do encourage further studies of current successful interventions in order to clarify the relationship between values (such as quality of life, mastery, agency, inner peace), community, and the reduction of criminal activity.

In Canada, this discussion also took place and resulted in the development of plans and strategies for achieving effective reintegration and public safety in the 21st century. The need to forge stable and organized networks in crime prevention and offender's successful reintegration was most evident. For the first time, in November 2009, CSC invited external criminal justice partners to their Executive Development Symposium (Correctional Service Canada, 2013a, p. 4). Following the symposium, reports issued by CSC stressed that the actions of CSC "span throughout the period of incarceration and into the community until the end of an offender's sentence" (Correctional Service Canada, 2011, p. vi). When the activities or operations of CSC are with the offender already released in the community, these are named "community corrections". These programmed activities include "correctional interventions, community supervision and community engagement" (Correctional Service Canada, 2011, p. 1). These activities complement "institutional management and program activities that prepare offenders for release into the community" (Correctional Service Canada, 2011, p. 1). However, more than re-naming or enhancing already existing programming with released offenders, the outcome of these meetings, reports and research resulted in the development of a Federal Community Corrections Strategy (FCCS). This policy is defined as "an overarching strategy linking CSC's primary reintegration strategies and activities with enhanced partnerships as a means to best position community corrections activities to the year 2020" (Correctional Service Canada, 2013b).

In August 2013, CSC published on its webpage the documents *Federal Community Corrections Strategy for Action: Vision to 2020* and *Federal Community Corrections: Framework for Action; August 2013*. (Correctional Service Canada, 2013a). In these documents, the Canadian state acknowledges the risk to the public safety of released offenders, who are not

adequately reintegrated into community and, more importantly, the shared responsibility between CSC, the National Parole Board (NPB) and “Community partners” in public safety and reintegration. Additionally, FCCS “provides a framework to enhance offender reintegration opportunities, including specialized populations (SIC), in the areas of employment and employability and offender support systems that include volunteers and community acceptance” (Correctional Service Canada, 2013b, p. 3).

Some of those community corrections partners come from the business sector, but most are from civil society or ‘associational life organizations’ (Edwards, 2009). These organizations become CSC partners as soon as they provide “services and activities that address individual needs and risk factors and facilitate the transition and reintegration of individuals back into the community” (Correctional Service Canada, 2013b, p. 5). These activities may include supervision strategies, interventions and programs. Therefore, the vision of CSC since 2011 is geared towards an “engagement in the collaborative working of community reintegration partners to ensure a comprehensive network” (Correctional Service Canada, 2013b, p. 5). This network “enhances linkages between CSC and community-based resources, facilitates successful reintegration, reflects the diversity of the community, reduces reoffending, and provides value for money” (Correctional Service Canada, 2013b, p. 5).

The development of this ‘network’ contrasts with what traditionally had been known as “community corrections”, namely, residential facilities in which offenders serve their sentence beyond the walls of the institution in which they were incarcerated (Correctional Service Canada, 2017). In Canada, CSC is involved in the creation of centres for hosting offender population outside prison, commonly called ‘Halfway Houses’, that are both Community Correctional Centres (CCC’s) and Community Residential Facilities (CRF’s) (Abracen, Axford, & Gileno,

2011). More than 150 community-based Halfway Houses are owned and managed directly by correctional services staff or by non-governmental agencies (Correctional Service Canada, 2013c). In addition, civil society in Canada provides other kinds of services for the released offender, which are beyond the scope of surveillance, ‘care’, and control exercised directly by CSC.

2.5 The work of civil society with released offenders

One of the unique characteristics of the Canadian criminal system is its involvement, since its inception, with organizations in the civil sector, including religion-based services. According to Griffiths and Verdun-Jones (1994) and Goff (2001), not-for-profit organizations play a major role in supplying community corrections programs and services. Among the many organizations helping out and providing services to released offenders under mandatory supervision, are the John Howard Society, the Elizabeth Fry Society, the St. Leonard’s Society, Friendship Centres, and the Salvation Army (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 555).

When an offender is released into the community, four issues must be addressed: supervision, programming, special interventions and community involvement. Supervision “is the direct monitoring of and communication with offenders once they are back in the community” (Goff, 2001, p. 379). Parole officers usually conduct this, but trained volunteers often present in the residential facility or the workplace of the offender may do this. However, supervision, and the communication strategy that comes with it, is combined with programs and access to particular interventions, which are designed to meet offender’s needs (Goff, 2001). CSC often assigns those communications, programs and intervention strategies to non-profit organizations, safeguarding community involvement in the process of offenders’ reintegration. All of these programs and services are foreseen in the “correctional plan” elaborated on by CSC

before any inmate is released into the community. Failure to observe the conditions placed by CSC or the NPB may result in the suspension and revocation of parole and a “Warrant of Apprehension and Suspension” can be issued, resulting in the parolee’s return to prison (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 555).

Researchers in this area have asked serious questions about the effectiveness of community-based corrections programs when “assisting offenders to readjust successfully in the community” (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 560). One of the situations that has sparked the most interest is the dual role played by parole officers and not-for-profit providers and their respective onus regarding recidivism. The impact on the ex-offender population ‘dwelling’ in community-based facilities has not been sufficiently addressed due to the large number of institutional programs they have access to which play a part in any offender rehabilitation (Correctional Service Canada, 2005; 2013). The impact depends largely on the condition and context in which all those services, including housing, are provided to released offenders.

According to the report *Community residential facilities in Canada* (Correctional Service Canada, 2004), most CRFs are located in large cities. Also “the physical structure varied among the facilities with many of the CRFs located in one or more storey houses with resident bedrooms, staff and program offices, and kitchen and laundry facilities. Some provided recreational areas, spiritual grounds, and visitor rooms” (Correctional Service Canada, 2004). They are “largely described as charitable and/or not for profit organizations” with no problem in staff turn-over (Correctional Service Canada, 2004).

As regards their relationship with the government sector, CRFs typically contract with CSC and receive a per diem rate per bed with the possibility of securing additional funding through charitable donations or public funds from local governments to assist them in their work.

In addition, the referrals of offenders to CRFs are largely made by CSC, and are combined with a process of frequent institutional visits (Correctional Service Canada, 2004). In contrast to personnel in many non-profit organizations, former offenders often perceive staff in these facilities as part of the criminal justice system (Mobley, 2005). This perception is also based on the fact that police authorities consider them to be their partners in addressing crime in the community, where “law enforcement collaborations under ‘community policing’ plans expand the definition of ‘police’ even more” (Mobley, 2005, p. 98).

This expansion of “police” includes all those mandated services provided through criminal justice policy. This is responsible for the perception of prison and re-entry as a “forever entwined” process in the life of ex-offenders, which may reinforce their “conflicted identity within and outside of prison” (Mobley, 2005, p. 101). It is hard to imagine that the perception of those places would shift from “beneficence” to becoming a platform for the exercise of “citizenship rights” (Brooks, 2001, p. 187). Halfway Houses are perceived more as part of a continuum from prison to community, “just one step away from going into or getting out of prison” (Ross & Richards, 2009, p. 39). This describes the two possibilities for an offender after being released: reintegration (getting out of prison) or recidivism (going back into prison).

2.6 Recidivism and civil society in Manitoba

Questions about the effectiveness of the early release of offenders, and even the whole work of CSC, are always ignited by the increasing rates of recidivism (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 560). According to Goff (2001):

A key factor in assessing the success of an offender on a conditional release program is the recidivism rate. In general, recidivism is the readmission, because of a violation, of offenders to an institution. It is usually expressed as a rate between the number of readmissions and a particular period of time, usually the period during which the offenders are still under the supervision of correctional authorities....

The two most common categories in which recidivism is measured are technical violations and convictions for new offences. A technical violation occurs when an offender breaks a condition of his release program. A technical violation does not count as a new criminal offence (p. 387).

Higher rates of recidivism show the failure of programs and activities under the sole responsibility of corrections to successfully reintegrate offenders into community after release. In Manitoba, more than 40 percent of the inmates in provincial institutions are likely to return within two years after serving their sentence (Manitoba Justice, 2017). In a study undertaken 15 years ago by the Solicitor General of Canada, the figures for federal offenders were similar (Bonta, Rugge, Dauvergne, & Cormier, 2003). However, these figures do not indicate whether or not the offender is re-incarcerated in an institution operated by another level of government (i.e., when an offender released from a Federal institution is detained or incarcerated in a Provincial or local facility, or vice versa).

At the Federal level, rates of recidivism are more difficult to calculate, due to the complex and varied ways in which an offender is released into community (Nouwens, Motiuk, & Boe, 2015). Moreover, studies and statistics focus on risk factors, programing or type of crime. Recently, studies on reconviction have linked this with substance abuse, sex offenses and violent crime. These figures focus on the predictability of violence in the community coming from released offenders. Such information has more of an impact on public opinion in defining or even advocating for a change in the policies, practices and funding with regard to offender's reintegration. To illustrate this point, the executive director of the John Howard Society of Manitoba pointed out that "figures for 2012-13 show an increase in recidivism in the area of violent crimes for those released from prison, within five years after the end of their sentence" (Hutton, 2014).

The John Howard Society of Manitoba works primarily with men who have been or may be incarcerated, as well as “their families, victims of crime and the community to address the root causes of crime” (The John Howard Society, 2013). According to its webpage, it offers programs, supports and resources to men involved with the justice system. In Winnipeg, there are several organizations whose mandate is to work with released offenders, addressing the causes of crime and seeking to prevent recidivism. These civil society organizations include the *Elizabeth Fry Society of Manitoba*, which “provides supervision to women on parole, a clothing bank, art program, educational services, as well as policy development and research” (The John Howard Society of Manitoba, 2016).

Many of these organizations are faith-based, such as the *Community Ministry with Ex-offenders (CMEO)* in Winnipeg, started by Dr. Byron Elsey in 1987. In 2002, its name was changed to *Bridging the Gap Ministry, Inc.* There are also two programs emanating from the Mennonite community; namely, *Open Circle* and *Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA)*. *Open Circle* is a program “that seeks to provide relationships of integrity and faith for prisoners and people who have committed offenses” (Initiatives for Just Communities, 2017). *Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA)* is a program that works to enhance community safety by creating circles of support and accountability for people with high-risk offense cycles after their release from a correctional institution (Initiatives for Just Communities, 2017).

The increasing demand for services that recognize substance abuse as one of the causes of recidivism resulted in the creation of ‘hybrid’ places for rehabilitation from substance abuse (alcohol and drugs) as well as reinsertion into the community. One such place is *Forward House Ministries*, which identifies itself as a “Christian Men’s residence for men and their children. The Ministry started in 1992 as an alternative to the more traditional institutional programs”

(Forward House Ministry, 2017). Acknowledging also Aboriginal ancestry and their spiritual and healing practices, organizations from the First Nations in Manitoba have extended their services to offenders before and after they come back to their own community (The John Howard Society, 2013). Those initiatives work in conjunction with CSC and deal with the causes of recidivism. These causes are addressed in greater detail in the literature review (Chapter 4), with special reference to housing.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the legal framework, processes and the general situation of released offenders in Canada. The description highlighted the terminology and the authority of Correctional Service Canada (CSC) in that process. Manitoba is quite unique due to the presence of one federal institution (Stony Mountain) and the highly praised work of the non-for-profit sector, traditionally committed to community building. While sections 2.2 to 2.5 presented a general picture, section 2.6 focused on the current work of the voluntary sector and faith-based organizations in the city of Winnipeg. The work of these organizations cannot be fully understood without addressing the general context and the different approaches for rehabilitation that exist within the system and organizations described above.

The goal of this chapter was also to engage the reader in an ongoing discussion that, more often than not, takes place without hearing the voices of offenders themselves as they make their way back to community. These voices are given direct expression in chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9. But now, it is time to complete the background provided in this chapter, by situating this study in the specific context that surrounded the creation and work of Quixote House as a place that enables offenders to build and live in community.

Chapter 3 – Context: a place called Quixote House

If there were a House where these kinds of guys, these really good guys that are trying to stay out of trouble could live, they'd have a far better chance than just coming together in an old convent on a Thursday night. (Fr. David Creamer, paraphrasing Sister Carol, both founders of Quixote House)

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the meaning of Quixote House based on the vision provided by its founders and the public information available. We dig into the history of the place and study those narratives and documents that existed before the first resident arrived. Every house, community or institution has its own history. Often people are involved in a project for years before the 'initiative' is visible and able to serve its purpose. Before a community or institution is set in place, the design of relationships and structures come, sometimes in a planned and rational way, other times in a more spontaneous and organic way. This chapter addresses the history of Quixote House and the initiatives that surrounded its creation and functioning.

The story and work of Quixote House is incomplete if it is not preceded by a consideration of 'Next-Step', the peer support group from which Quixote House and the follow-up initiative, Massie House, emerged. Accordingly, this chapter not only shares narratives around the creation of Quixote House, but also of the other two initiatives; Next-Step, the peer support program, and Massie House, the house where former offenders can live after finishing their residencies at Quixote House. These stories focus on structure, personnel, funding, and changes over time.

3.2 Next Step Peer Support Program

In 1994, a Roman Catholic nun, Sister Carol Peloquin, a Sister of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary (SNJM), shifted her mission from teaching in a private girls' high school to becoming the Roman Catholic chaplain at Stony Mountain Institution, a male federal penitentiary (opened in 1877) which houses more than 500 inmates (Creamer, 2013). Sr. Carol soon realized that many men were returning to the prison due to a lack of support in the community. In August 2000, she was given authorization to conduct a pilot project for and with released offenders. It was approved by CSC and started, under the name "Next Step".

According to Sr. Carol, Next Step is "a support Group, a peer support Group that meets regularly once a week for personal development and for sharing" (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3). This sharing Group may include not only offenders already released into community, but also men "who are interested ahead of time at the prison" and volunteers (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3). The group is meant to help "prisoners deal with the prospect of life on the outside in practical ways—driving them to appointments, finding a doctor, reconnecting with family when possible" (Swan, 2012).

In a brochure prepared by Sr. Carol for inmates interested in the program, she explained the purpose, benefits and procedures of Next Step. In terms of purpose, Next Step provides offenders with:

1. The support of weekly Group meetings where they can share struggles and accomplishments.
2. Access to personal development programming.
3. Personal support through one-to-one meetings with Sr. Carol both prior to release and during parolees' first months in the community.
4. Limited financial assistance based on resources of Next Step and the needs of the individual (Peloquin, 2003).

For the offender, being part of Next Step is not enough. It is also necessary that they have some willingness to commit to the purposes of the group. In that sense, the beneficiaries of the program should follow the seven criteria of the program.

1. Those committed to taking their lives in a new direction.
2. Those seeking a comfortable group setting conducive to open and honest sharing.
3. Those for whom Winnipeg will be a new place to live.
4. Those willing to make Thursday night meetings a top priority.
5. Those who are aware that they are in need of support.
6. Those seeking help in building community connections.
7. Those seeking fellowship and spiritual support (Peloquin, 2003).

The meeting referred to in number 4 criteria takes place in the house where the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary (SNJM) reside in Winnipeg's North End. Offenders in community living in a Halfway House or somewhere else, come to the meeting on their own initiative. Men still incarcerated may come to the meetings by requesting an Escorted Temporary Absence (ETA) pass. Often a volunteer or the group coordinator escorts them. Once offenders arrive for the meeting, the Sisters, volunteers and others welcome them. Comfortably seated in the living room of the house, coordinators, offenders and volunteers start the meeting at 7 pm every Thursday. The meeting begins with a grounding exercise and a short inspirational reading, followed by 45-50 minutes of formation on varied topics. After a break of 15 minutes, the participants share the experiences of their week until the end of the meeting at 9 pm.

At least one coordinator is present at every meeting. Volunteers are scheduled to attend every second week. These volunteers come from two main categories; namely (1) men and women in the community who are involved in prison ministry, as well as Jesuit priests who have assisted in the Prison Chaplaincy and are known to the offenders, and (2) former offenders who have finished the program and wish to keep connected to the group by receiving and offering support to new members.

The number of participants and their ages vary over the course of the year (Peloquin, 2010). Sr. Carol was always present as the founder and coordinator until she stepped down from the position in 2012. In this year, Kathleen Mico, a former volunteer, was designated as coordinator. Sr. Carol continues to serve as Kathleen's mentor; assisting her at meetings, providing support to the program and maintaining her connections with CSC (as a former Chaplain of Stony Mountain Institution).

There are normally three volunteers present at every session. In contrast, the number of offenders present depends on how many receive their ETA passes each week, or their motivation and desire to stay connected following their release. In any event, there are never more than 12 offenders regularly attending the group. In 2012, Sr. Carol pointed out that "there have been 67 men through Next Step over the last five years and three have gone back to jail for parole violations. All three were addicts and two were mental health patients. It's a pretty good track record" (Swan, 2012).

To be part of the group, an individual, offender or volunteer, has to be assessed by Sr. Carol and the coordinator of the group. To assist in the selection process, Sr. Carol often receives formal and informal phone calls from CSC staff and chaplains who refer offenders in need of support. According to Sr. Carol:

The idea was to meet with guys in the prison, try with the help of parole officers to find the right guys who, for us, were guys who needed support and didn't have it, and secondly that folks that work with the guys in the prison, agreed that these guys were doing their best.

So we had sincere effort and progress in the prison and a need of support that wasn't there in the community. And those were conditions always and they remain conditions today (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3).

Then, the journey starts. It always includes “meeting with guys, usually at Rockwood, sometimes Stony. And then, in time, giving guys a ride from the prisons, which I did. And sometimes financial support, when we could manage it” (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3).

In fact, the procedure described in the earliest brochure of the program is as follows:

1. Sr. Carol will interview you at Rockwood or Stony.
2. She will schedule a series of follow-up meetings.
3. For Rockwood residents, there will be an opportunity for ETA’s to attend Group meetings in the community.
4. For Stony Mountain residents, Sr. Carol will connect with you upon release and assist you in connecting with your Group meeting (Peloquin, 2003).

In those ‘one-on-one’ meetings, whether at Rockwood or Stony Mountain, and before becoming a formal member of Next Step, offenders have sessions with the Next Step coordinator, in which the topic of their incarceration, as well as the support they are looking for and the tools available in community for their self-improvement are always discussed. In addition, they start working on self-knowledge using ‘the Enneagram’ (Riso, 1990), a personality type exercise that “has deep spiritual roots” (Peloquin, 2010, p. 4). Once accepted into the Next Step peer support program, parolees and volunteers meet weekly to talk about their experiences, exercise compassionate listening, and take advantage of opportunities for personal development (Rosemberg, 2003, p. 4).

Next Step coordinators have a “slush fund, for coffee, bus passes or things like that” (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3). These small tokens help to motivate attendance and participation in the group. Next Step intentionally focuses on “responding to a multi-faith Group of individuals when we come together” (Peloquin, 2010, p. 4). Therefore, topics in the first part of the meeting will often draw on religious themes, such as moral issues, scripture, liturgy and prayerful reflection. At other times, topics might include programs available in the community, job and volunteering opportunities, self-knowledge, health, and every day skills such as nonviolent communication

and conflict resolution through peaceful means. Presenters may come from the community or, as is often the case, from the participants themselves; i.e., the offenders and volunteers. The first part of the meeting provides an opportunity to improve communication skills and to gain personal knowledge of others in the group, their background, interests, hobbies, and so on.

As to the question of funding, Sr. Carol noted the following:

We always from the very beginning had... we managed to get twelve sponsors that gave a few hundred dollars... So we have parishes in St Boniface and Winnipeg, the Jesuit Community, The Holy Names Community, St Mary's Academy.

And we did [that], because there is no operating budget. I received a salary from Corrections Canada, but it was just part time and it did not include programming (Peloquin, 2016, p. 3).

Accordingly, the funding of Next Step is absolutely private through the generosity of its benefactors. There are no public funds involved with the program. Even when Sister Carol and Kathleen received a salary from CSC for a period of time for their work as community chaplains, these salaries did not include any financial support for the Next Step group or any of its participants. In any event, those monies were received only until March 2013, because of the elimination of part-time chaplains, such as those coordinating Next Step in the new CSC chaplaincy strategy (Swan, 2012).

Next Step seeks to offer support to offenders released into community, apart from the programming they might receive from the state. Next Step is not perceived as part of "the system". Sister Carol described her work with parolees to her Congregation of Sisters as follows:

The transition from prison to community for many released offenders is a time of fear and self doubt. Many have little support. Some are far from home in an unfamiliar city. A few are in dire need with no immediate roof over their heads.

Frequently there is a need for the support of a person who is not perceived as part of the System, someone with whom to debrief the outcome of fledgling attempts to adjust to new and challenging circumstances.

Someone who has taken the time to build a trust relationship with these men while they were still incarcerated.

Finally, each released offender needs to experience a sense of belonging...to the community in general but, more specifically, to a smaller group where he can share his daily struggles and victories, listen and feel heard, give and gain support. Next Step is committed to respond to the above needs of its participants (Peloquin, 2010).

This outside support is also provided through networking with other organizations, individuals, and institutions. In fact, “Next Step is in touch with chaplains, program staff, and parole officers on a regular basis in order to journey more effectively with each offender” (Peloquin, 2010, p. 3). It is also connected to other faith-based and non-profit organizations, such as Open Circle which, in the opinion of Sr. Carol, “focuses on matching individual offenders with a couple, or a male member, and strives to continue this relationship in the community, offering services that dovetail nicely with the peer support and group focus offered by Next Step” (Peloquin, 2010, p. 3). With all of these people, Next Step promotes functioning as a team.

Finally, Next Step addresses family connections and the ‘significant other’ of offenders in community, by organizing events in which they might participate, “when tightening these bonds seems appropriate and beneficial” (Peloquin, 2010, p. 3). These events include a Christmas party, outdoor excursions, trips, sports and other activities, all free of charge and organized by the Next Step coordinator. Friends, significant others, partners, children and relatives are welcome to attend with the participant.

After 13 years of existence, the process of becoming a Next Step member was reviewed and enhanced according to the following terms:

1. Stony Mountain personnel, such as chaplains, parole officers, program managers refer inmates who they believe could benefit from this support Group because they will have little support upon their release and have cooperated with prison programming. On occasion, inmates have self-referred because they know someone who has benefited from participation.

2. The Next Step coordinator meets with each applicant to develop a relationship of trust and learn about his goals for the future and how he hopes to achieve these goals. The Next Step agreement is presented to the inmate and time is spent with the Enneagram, a psycho-spiritual tool for personal growth that is used extensively in Next Step programming.
3. After a few of these interviews, a meeting is scheduled with both the inmate and his parole officer to ascertain whether Next Step would seem to be a good fit. If so, escorted temporary absence passes are requested so that the inmate can attend a number of Next Step sessions and thereby come to feel comfortable in Group before his release. An ideal time for these passes to occur is six months before a statutory release or parole hearing date.
4. Each Thursday evening, the Next Step coordinator or a volunteer drives any Rockwood participants to the Next Step meeting, and later back to the prison.
5. Upon release from prison, the parolee formally becomes a member of Next Step by signing the Agreement previously reviewed. One agreement is that he make attendance at Next Step meetings a priority and will promise to attend for at least 6 months.
6. The one-to-one meetings with each participant continue after his release, usually becoming less frequent as the parolee adjusts to life in the community. As time passes, the participant and coordinator discern together when the time is right to “graduate”. At the “goodbye” celebration there is a time for roasting and toasting. Alumni members are welcome to return as guests and to attend the annual Next Step Christmas celebration (Future Hope, 2014).

Additions were made in order to acknowledge the need to include others in the selection process as well as including more detailed and precise criteria for participants. Nevertheless, Next Step remains a peer support program, such is its *raison d’etre*. Indeed, it is “a system of giving and receiving help founded on key principles of respect, shared responsibility, and mutual agreement of what is helpful” (Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001, p. 135). Peer support groups such as these are an alternative to “diagnostic criteria” in Psychiatry, because they understand,

...another’s situation empathically through the shared experience of emotional and psychological pain. When people identify with others who they feel are “like” them, they feel a connection. This connection, or affiliation, is a deep, holistic understanding based on mutual experience where people are able to “be” with each other without the constraints of

traditional (expert/patient) relationships. Further, as trust in the relationship builds, both people are able to respectfully challenge each other when they find themselves in conflict. This allows members of the peer community to try out new behavior with one another and move beyond previously held self-concepts built on disability and diagnosis (Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001, p. 135).

Examples of these “supported challenges” for change are clearly part of the principles behind Next Step. Fr. Creamer cites a presentation once made in the group by Tiger, in which the support of the group made possible a change in the confidence of the participant-presenter:

I mean, he didn't say anything at Next Step, really, and was just very quiet, very into himself, kind of thing, you know. And somehow or other, just over time he just opened up. I mean, one thing that happened at Next Step was after that I took him to India with the group one year.

That was when he was studying at the University. He could use it as credit. It was two credits actually towards his undergraduate degree. He told me that when he got to Darjeeling, and was walking around in Darjeeling he realized that nobody was looking at him, or staring at him or whatever. He said that he came to realize that he looked like the people in Nepal. He looked like a Nepali. He said that he never had that experience before in his life, because, if you remember, some family in Steinbach or something adopted them. They would be pretty odd, he and his brother, in school. They looked different, and all that.

And he wasn't different in Darjeeling, he thought he had fitted in. So that was a huge change in him. When he came back he was supposed to give a talk at Next Step about India, about being in India, and he had all these notes and everything... And he tried to start, and he was so nervous that he couldn't even stop shaking, in his hands, and he could hardly get anything out. And I thought that he was going to break down.

And at some point, he just looked around and he could see that everybody was really interested in what he was saying, they were waiting for him to tell them. And he just started to speak. It was stunning the change in him. Just stunning. From the beginning of that to the end. It is just, I don't know, something changed and he just realized that he was a person that people cared about and were interested in and wanted to relate to, and so on (Creamer, 2016, p. 14).

Next Step strives “to think creatively and nonjudgmentally about the way individuals experience and make meaning of their lives in contrast to having all actions and feelings diagnosed and labeled” by those who manage their cases (Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001, p. 135).

It seeks to create a space for “client-run rehabilitation” in the very words Chamberlain (1995) applied to mental health patients:

Rehabilitation, in its truest sense, must mean not only assisting our readaptation to society but also recognizing the ways in which social practices prevent that readaptation. Stigma and discrimination must be honestly faced and fought. Inadequate incomes and housing must be changed, or we can never live decent and comfortable lives. And unless the questions of power and powerlessness are dealt with in an open and frank way, we shall never be accorded our basic human dignity and our fundamental human and citizenship rights (Chamberlain, 1995, pp. 45-46).

These words resonate with what has been said about Next Step. Next Step is an intentionally constituted group where offenders are able to receive and give support through the dynamics of peer solidarity. It is “a natural extension and expansion of community rather than modeling professionalized caretaking of people defined as defective” (Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001, p. 136). The guiding principles of peer support groups, such as Next Step are:

1. Turning oppression into consciousness
2. Self-awareness and self-reflection
3. Creating dialogue
4. Understanding mutuality and reciprocity
5. Honest direct communication
6. Flexible boundaries
7. Shared power
8. Shared responsibility
9. Creating new ways of “making meaning”
10. Empathy and accountability
11. Respect that comes from your heart
12. Absolute belief in the recovery of everyone
13. Valuing community
14. Having fun
15. Not using symptoms as an excuse for bad behavior
16. Being held accountable
17. Mutual validation
18. Taking care of yourself
19. Giving and receiving critical feedback
20. Learning to work through conflict
21. Understanding of larger cultural and political issues (Mead, Hilton, & Curtis, 2001, pp. 137-138).

For offenders, community starts before and continues after their release from the institution. Key is their willingness to participate in the programming and options provided by Next Step. In this sense, everyone works together on the transition from prison to community. The group is not designed to directly tackle the needs of people struggling with addictions or mental health issues. That being said, it is not uncommon to see those kinds of issues surfaced by Next Step participants. Next Step was created for one clear purpose, to accompany and work with those offenders who are willing to face their personal challenges in order to be fully and happily reintegrated into society.

3.3 From Next Step to Quixote House

Sr. Carol has many connections in the city, not only because of her time as chaplain of Stony Mountain, but also because of her earlier role in Catholic High School education in Manitoba. During her chaplaincy, she solicited the services of many priests in the city. One of those who frequently assisted her by presiding at Mass in prison was Rev. Dr. David Creamer, S.J., now an Emeritus Associate Professor of Education and Religious Studies at the University of Manitoba. In Next Step meetings and conversations, the issue of clean and affordable housing was often articulated:

After she [Sr. Carol] was there for a number of years she started a Group on Thursday night that met at her house, which I guess, probably from the beginning, she called Next Step. And I knew some of those people because I met them at Mass. Even when they got out [from Stony Mountain Institution], I went out to visit a few of those people at Rockwood, at different times.

They were the people that were coming for Thursday night, to the Next Step meeting. And it worked; it helped people to stay out of jail. But what really happened was that Sr. Carol thought this was a really good thing but, it was not enough.

Just meeting for a few hours, one evening, isn't enough to keep these kinds of good guys out of jail. And that is where the idea of Quixote House came. She would say: If there was a House where these kinds of guys, these really good guys that are trying to stay out of trouble could live, they'd have

a far better chance than just coming together in an old convent on a Thursday night.

And so that's where Quixote House began... (Father) Brian Massie, S.J. was the Superior at that time, and he was obviously OK with, you know, exploring this idea, and the Jesuit Provincial thought that was fine, and her bosses did too (Creamer, 2016, p. 2).

The idea of providing a safe and affordable house for parolees attending Next Step seemed real and approachable, due to the willingness of Fr. Creamer to act as landlord for such a facility. Also, three parolees had expressed, in Next Step meetings, their willingness to move in and follow the rules of such a place. Interestingly enough, it was Ram, one of the parolees, who was highly influential in finding the building. Fr. Creamer recounted the anxiety associated with locating a suitable building in a safe neighbourhood. It seemed that all of their efforts were going nowhere until Ram shared in group about the opportunity of renting a former student residence. "We started looking, but it was actually Ram, who found the house" (Creamer, 2016, p. 2; Ram, 2016, p. 2). Sr. Carol describes the genesis of the house, in the following way:

Dave once phoned me, and said, he'd been out to Stony for a Liturgy, and he said: "It is so sad Carol because so and so and so and so is back. And they really shouldn't be back. They're guys that should make it in the community". So, he said, "you know, it is those Halfway Houses. They just don't do the job. The guys really need more support. For two cents I would rent a house and take a few guys in until they can make it. Let them see they can make it on their own...."

And I said: 'I have the two cents, come to Next Step meeting on Thursday night, because we have a few guys that are in the spot right now of worrying about where they may live'.

So he came on Thursday night, and one of the guys even had a Renter's Guide with him, and he was very worried about leaving; having to leave the Halfway House at any time and not actually having a place to go. That was Ram, the first person who moved in.

So, that very night, Ram and Dave and another guy drove by an address they found in Renter's Guide. It was the [name of the street] Street house. And it was being renovated. Formerly it had been for 8 women from the University of Winnipeg and a lady that was in charge, who had the main floor on one side of the duplex. They had that house for a number of years, and that's why it had Wi-Fi and all sorts of other benefits, but it was the first

time they advertised it. The next day, Dave followed up with the phone call (Peloquin, 2016, p. 2).

The house was christened Quixote House by one of the first parolee residents, Panther. The Next Step group agreed and the name stuck. Don Quixote is a universal symbol of how the impossible can be made possible in those who have the “eyes” to see. But dreams can end quickly if they lack concrete support. This was stated in an article in a Catholic Newspaper reporting on the foundation of the house: “Working out the details of such an endeavour has taken both patience and persistence. Ways of living that most families take for granted were formulated and practiced over many months” (Burwell, 2008, p. 7).

In fact, one of the biggest challenges for Quixote House has to do with its finances. Since its inception, it was clear that the house should not be a burden to the Jesuit community or to the Sisters. The house was set up to be maintained solely through the financial assistance of the residents “to pay its way” (Creamer, 2016, p. 2). At the same time Sr. Carol reported that:

A few days later, after he checked with the Jesuits, my Next Step program offered to support with the initial payments to get the house and so...eventually, maybe about four or five days later, in early December [2007] Dave and I went and we had a tour of the house...

We thought it was great, wonderful windows, a beautiful house. We signed together, and we signed for the house with the understanding that Dave was accepting the financial responsibility but, because I had paid the initial damage deposit and rent, we both signed (Peloquin, 2016, p. 2).

The many challenges associated with this project did not deter Sr. Carol and Fr. Creamer from opening Quixote House at the end of December 2007. As Sr. Carol notes:

...and so... we did pretty well, many people gave us things. Ram was the first one to move in and he really organized the whole place in terms of setting up the kitchen and making... well, it was already clean and then, well, that's the beginning and it was quite exciting. And a little chaotic as beginnings would be (Peloquin, 2016, p. 2).

Setting up a schedule channelled the ‘little chaos’ with simple rules for the house.

Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation (2008), the renter ,enforced some of the rules and some were discussed in group and agreed upon by the first residents and later altered due to new circumstances and insights. In 2008, the “key considerations” for residence at Quixote House, were set in the following terms:

Quixote House is a mixed Community of Jesuits, parolees, and, possibly, students. It was founded on the premise that released offenders have a right to decent and affordable housing. It offers community living for all its residents, and for parolees it offers practical and moral support for their transition from prison/halfway house to life in the community.

1. Quixote House provides a Safe Place where respect is shown for personal boundaries and personal possessions.
2. Quixote House provides private space for its residents. Bedrooms are off limits to guests. Conferences with parole officers and other professionals may be held in the common spaces on 2nd and 3rd floor.
3. Quixote is a dry house. Drinking is prohibited at this residence, but not elsewhere, except in cases where refraining from alcohol is a parole condition. Any slip not admitted promptly, so that action can be taken and support given to address the situation, will result in eviction. Returning home intoxicated will lead to eviction as well. Quixote is a smoke-free residence.
4. Quixote House strives to be a Community, not just a place to sleep and eat. Should a resident spend most of his non-working hours elsewhere, he must be invited to consider whether “home” is elsewhere, and whether it is time to change his address.
5. Next Step members will be accountable for rent and food payment to Sr. Carol who will give the rent payment to ... [name of the controller] at St. Ignatius and see to paying the monthly food bill at ... [name of the store].
6. Each resident will have his own key for Quixote House. There will be no curfew. Residents will, in consideration for their housemates and others who may need to reach them, leave notification re their absence and time of return.
7. Quixote House will hold monthly meetings led by an outside facilitator, to clear the air, share both positive and negative feelings, and problem solve.
8. Quixote House will maintain a charge account at ... [name of the store] to avoid the necessity of a large amount of cash in the house and to take advantage of the 5% reduction offered to credit customers and home delivery. Each resident will contribute \$200.00 at the beginning of each month and payment will be made by cheque from Next Step to [name of the store] at month’s end.

9. Quixote House is a beautiful residence that deserves to be carefully tended. Each resident will accept responsibility to keep a portion of the public areas shared by all clean and tidy. Tasks such as garbage disposal, recycling, turning heat down, dishes, shovelling, will be shared by all.

10. Released offenders who have reached warrant expiry status will not, ordinarily, be eligible to reside at Quixote House since it is a residence designated for parolees. Exceptions may be made for a limited time, in response to exceptional circumstances, and with permission from Fr. Dave and Sr. Carol. Specific conditions for the good of the House may apply (Peloquin, 2009, p. 1).

In her first report on the house to her religious congregation, Sr. Carol mentioned the need for some improvements to the contract agreements drawn up by the first residents themselves; as well as rules regarding furniture, the temporary duration of stay, and the importance of having someone with authority reachable in case of emergency (Peloquin, 2009). However, there would always be room for creativity and listening to the parolees in addressing the management of the house. This is shown by the priorities of the house that Sr. Carol set up during its first year of existence:

1. We will insist that rent be paid at the beginning of the month and collect a damage deposit.
2. We will continue to maintain a charge account for food at ... [name of the store] with each resident contributing \$200.00 each month, and Sr. Carol paying the Bill monthly.
3. We will continue scheduling regular House meetings.
4. We will increase our support of community building efforts.
5. We will experiment with other forms of connection to Quixote (one parolee is now paying 1/3 rent and doing chores in return for the chance to stay at Quixote on weekends he is granted passes from the Halfway House) (Peloquin, 2009, p. 6).

In Quixote House, residents are not allowed to smoke or drink alcohol. Everybody has daily and weekly chores for the upkeep of the house. A weekly schedule is posted on a board near the kitchen and residents sign up to cook one meal per week for the group. There is no set curfew but residents are required to inform the house—in direct conversation with the house manager, in a text message or by writing it down on the kitchen board—of their whereabouts.

Everybody in the house participates in dish washing and assists in preparing the list for grocery shopping. Nobody is forced to live in Quixote House, and not every parolee is suited for such an environment. Ordinarily, the coordinators of the Next Step program carefully evaluate candidates while the men are still in prison and during their participation in Next Step. In fact, everyone in Quixote House has had some association with Next Step, although not every participant in the Next Step program lives in Quixote House. Those who live in Quixote House must pay room and board each month covering utilities, a furnished room, wireless Internet, and food.

The house quickly became popular with Prison Ministry circles, volunteers, neighbourhood and housing organizations, and its influence spread throughout the surrounding community. In time, other religious congregations, Jesuits and parishes within the Catholic Church, showed concern and celebrated the launching of this initiative. As Burwell (2008) states: “One of the most surprising aspects of Quixote House is how it has elicited a profound sense of charity from the residents of Manitoba’s three archdioceses, Winnipeg, St. Boniface and Keewatin-Le Pas” (Burwell, 2008). Since it’s opening in December 2007, Quixote House has received more than 45 residents, primarily offenders, but also Jesuits and even some graduate students from the University of Manitoba.

To this very day, the house manager has been one of the Jesuit residents. He serves as a ‘landlord’ renting the rooms to parolees and students. These residents, in turn, have the opportunity to enhance their Next Step experience by living with fellow participants and volunteers of the program. The availability of regular meetings, a common shared space and sense of belonging to the house helped in the creation of a supportive environment that would endure long after parole. It was in this context that the suggestion of providing another house emerged, in order to address the needs of those leaving Quixote House, whose wings “are not

strong enough to fly alone” (Creamer, 2013). This vision nurtured the idea to create “Massie House Apartments”.

3.4 From Quixote House to Massie House Apartments

The story does not end with Next Step and Quixote House. Growing needs and circumstances necessitated the creation of another program, Massie House (or Massie House Apartments). In this regard, Sr. Carol notes:

In 2010, just two and a half years into Quixote’s existence, a crack house next door that had been the regular scene of sirens and ambulances, sported a “for sale” sign in its front yard. Parolees concerned about future housing persuaded Fr. Dave to persuade his Jesuit Order to purchase the property.

With financial contributions from SNJM’s and Next Step, Quixote residents were hired to demolish [the illegal third floor of] the house [and its interior] to prepare the way for a small apartment block of 4 one bedroom apartments...

Named after Fr. Brian Massie S.J., one of our biggest supporters who had recently died, the newly constructed Massie Apartments opened its doors on November 1, 2013, to one of our alumni members who wanted to remain connected. Today, each apartment has a resident (Peloquin, 2015, p. 1).

The main goal of the construction of Massie House, beside Quixote House, was for residents to “maintain some contact with Quixote House and serve as good examples for men newer to the program who may need to see successful models to emulate” (Future Hope, 2015).

Also, as Fr. Creamer noted:

You know, there is a whole network of people that are around and stuff. They are there and help, including the former residents of Quixote House. I think it makes... I think it is a better setup now, to have Quixote House and Massie House, because when somebody gets out and comes to Quixote House, they know that their chances of staying out of prison aren’t very good.

And yet they can see people next door who got out and have stayed out. I think that must mean something. It would to me. If I was in prison, and just knew half of the people stayed out... oh my chances wouldn’t be very good.

And yet, there are people that lived in Quixote House when they got out of jail and haven’t gone back, and they won’t go back to jail. Bear, he is not going back to jail, Squirrel is not going back to jail, you know, stuff like

that. I think that must mean something. You can see another future besides going back to jail. And there it is; they are right next door (Creamer, 2016, p. 16).

The mission statement of Massie House Apartments is “to provide clean and affordable housing and ongoing community support for ex-offenders and students who have been responsible contributing Quixote House residents for at least six months” (Future Hope, 2015). This ongoing support and connection between residents at Quixote House and Massie House also works both ways. Often times, the “newer residents” at Quixote House ‘remind’ the men in Massie of what they have been through and how to avoid that situation again. This was the experience of Wolf, who noted the following in his narrative:

So this was under construction while I was living at Quixote and it was completed in December [2013] of that year. I am wondering if it was December or January that the first fellow moved in here, who is Squirrel. The others, there are four apartments, so he moved into one and those three others opened, waiting and ready for the next guys to kind of graduate out of Quixote House.

That, you know is the ones who wanted to stay close, you know, and were still in a situation when they would be living by themselves and not with their families. That was a tough thing at Quixote House, you know, watching guys come in and leave within three months. Like after the first thirty days you can see them just chomping at the bit wanting to get out into the world.

And, because I’d been there so much myself in the past where I would stay, some place that was quite comfortable, but always for short time until I just take off and do it in my own way.

Watching those guys, just sitting at the gates just ready to run was quite difficult, but it is also one of the things that kept me, you know...that peer connexion going on within the house was...it is tremendous from so many different angles for the guys (Wolf, 2016, p. 18).

Next Step, Quixote House and Massie House Apartments, together provide a ‘safe and clean corridor’ for ex-offenders in Manitoba who are willing to change their lives and become fully human once again, and, perhaps for the first time in their adult lives, active members in a community of mutual support following incarceration. Offenders who start in prison who meet

with the coordinator of Next Step may end up living in the Massie House Apartments after a period of, at least, six months of residence in Quixote House. In fact, thanks to the construction of Massie House Apartments offenders can transition from the correctional facility to an independent living unit, surrounded by men who have similar backgrounds and are facing similar hardships as they work to reintegrate into society.

3.5 Quixote House within the third sector

In 2013, with the termination of the financial support of CSC to the Next Step coordinator, the three programs (Next Step, Quixote House, and Massie House) were placed under the umbrella of a foundation called ‘Future Hope Inc.’. According to its statutes, the Future Hope board “oversees three linked programs, Next Step, Quixote House, and Massie House, in an effort to bring a stable community-oriented environment into the lives of those in need” (Future Hope, 2015). Born to deal with the hardships faced by ex-offenders in their journey out of prison, Future Hope “is conscious of these areas and accompanies individuals leaving prison through the three aspects of the program – Next Step, Quixote House and Massie House” (Future Hope, 2015). According to its webpage:

Next Step is a community of volunteers and ex-offenders, on parole or at the end of their time in prison, who consciously reflect on healthy decision-making and deal with the issues that may come up week-to-week in the lives of individuals. The Next Step coordinator helps with the many day-to-day aspects of the transition from prison to Quixote House or halfway houses in the city. Quixote House provides an affordable, drug- and alcohol-free environment. All residents are expected to cook for each other and to participate in community-building activities in the house, including housekeeping and maintenance details. Massie House is set up as transitional apartments for “graduates” of Quixote House in good standing that may find it difficult to get on their feet financially after only one year at Quixote. These may include people who have not yet found permanent or well-paying employment, or who still have substantial debts from before their time of incarceration (Future Hope, 2015).

Therefore, the corridor for rehabilitation is under the care, not only of the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, who host the Next Step meetings in their convent, nor the Jesuits of Winnipeg, but instead, it is under a lay board. This board includes representatives of the Jesuits and the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary and works towards the stability and sustainability of these projects. The Jesuits of Winnipeg still maintain ownership of Massie House and some Jesuits still live in community with the men in Quixote House and in the Massie House Apartments.

3.6 Conclusion

Quixote House was created to fill a gap in the community in order to provide a place where the ‘good ones’ leaving prison have a better chance to avoid recidivism. This initiative started as a peer support program with a partially paid community chaplain and has since been paired with a housing solution for offenders. The subsidy of Next Step is absolutely private and charitable. There are no public monies involved with the program and, so, it is perceived to be ‘outside’ the correctional system. Offenders who opt to be part of Next Step have the benefit of becoming part of a support group that not only teaches and listens to them, but also has ties with other sources of support in the broader community. Also this group gives them a chance for further connection as volunteers and guests together in their annual celebrations, such as Christmas, Thanksgiving, Easter, Restorative Justice Week, and so on.

Quixote House was created to provide clean and affordable housing for Next Step group participants. With the resources available and the approval of their religious congregations, Sr. Carol Peloquin and Fr. David Creamer opened the house, which has received about 50 residents since 2007. The residents not only pay rent but also contribute to the operation of Quixote House with their house work and chores. Everyone takes turns cleaning, shovelling snow, shopping, disposing of garbage, recycling, gardening, cooking and doing the dishes. These tasks are

distributed according to the capacities and needs of residents. The house works under the assumption that this is the ‘home’ of the residents and, consequently, is the most important place for them to relax, have conversations, rest, and enjoys entertainment.

Massie House Apartments was opened in 2013 to provide Quixote House residents with an opportunity to remain as a neighbour to the Quixote House program in their own rented space. Offenders who start in a prison meeting with the coordinator of Next Step, may end up living in this place, which provides for them stability and credibility as renters, in their search for further housing, as their needs change. Under the direction of a Board of Directors, ‘Future Hope’ labours towards the solidity and permanence of Next Step, Quixote House and Massie House Apartments. Together, they form a ‘safe and clean corridor’ for ex-offenders as they work to reintegrate into society. Ex-offenders who strive to transform their lives through these programs have become productive and decent members of the broader community in Manitoba.

Chapter 4 - Literature Review

4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the literature and previous research on ex-offenders and their reinsertion into society, with a focus on the area of Winnipeg. It reviews the existing literature on hardship in the process of reintegration to society and its intervention, with an emphasis on alternative and faith-based interventions to reduce recidivism coming from the restorative justice field. In this area, protracted recidivism and the vulnerability of the offender population in community challenges traditional law enforcement and notions of security, calling for effective and sustainable changes so that a greater community engagement might help to alleviate the struggle of offenders released from prison.

This information comes from many disciplines which focus on the individual. Criminology, sociology and social psychology are the fields with the most extensive and relevant literature. This literature shows increasing interest in the dynamics of belonging and people's need for a home in order to address marginalization and stigmatization of certain populations. Rates of recidivism have also justified a greater interest and investment in public funded research for these kinds of issues. In this regard, the work published by Correctional Service Canada is significant.

4.2 Barriers for rehabilitation in the community

This section focuses on knowing and understanding what hinders the reinsertion into community of former offenders as part of their rehabilitation. The literature analyzed shows that it is not easy for offenders having served time in prison to return to community in Canada's highly technologized post-industrial society. Because of this, recidivism persists amidst the conflict between different rehabilitation paradigms. These difficulties in rejoining society after

incarceration have been described in recent studies (Monahan, 2006). Some studies, coming from the criminological and psychological area, link the rates of recidivism to individual characteristics, such as mental illness or conviction for certain types of offences (Collins, Vermeiren, Vahl, Markus, Broekaert, & Doreleijers, 2011; Serowik & Yanos, 2011; Langevin, et al., 2004; Webster, Gartner, & Doob, 2006).

Other studies, from the sociological and social psychological arena, focus on social and structural factors that impede “desistance from crime” in the growing convict population (Farrall, Sharpe, Hunter, & Calverley, 2011). Others emphasise that easier access to information and to the criminal record of an individual creates “a chronic and debilitating badge of shame that plagues ex-convicts and ex-offenders for the rest of their lives” (Murphy, Fuleihan, Richards, & Jones, 2011, p. 102). Of course, this kind of labeling affects not only individual ex-offenders but also their principal relationships. This is the focus of Comfort (2007) who highlights the fact that the trauma produced in an individual by incarceration can be extended to an inmate’s family and acquaintances. This kind of approach, which resembles a “transgenerational transmission of trauma” (Volkan, 2001, p. 79), also has political and social implications in terms of how the state works as the primary distributor of social services for the poor, including the poor in jails. This situation of “invisible punishments” and stigmatization, which undermines the ability of ex-offenders to succeed, was also studied by Gunnison and Helfgott (2013). In their findings, ‘desistance’ from offending is due to both internal factors (e.g., attitude) and external factors (e.g., housing, employment, mental health, aging, and religion).

Regarding social conditions, Braithwaite (1989) was an early pioneer in explaining the relationship between social context, stigmatization and recidivism. In his opinion, a high level of stigmatization encourages the formation of subgroups with “no stake in conformity, [and] no

chance of self-esteem within the terms of conventional society” (Braithwaite, 1989, p. 102). The formation of this criminal subculture is fostered by a systematic obstruction of opportunities for this critical sector of the population (Braithwaite, 1989). However, the shame coming from stigmatization can be distinguished from a “reintegrative” shame. This shame is useful for desistence and happens when the individual has a sense of belonging to a community, which cares for the individual while acknowledging the harm that she or he has done to it (Braithwaite & Braithwaite, 2001; Tangney, Stuewig, & Hafez, 2011).

Therefore, there are individual as well as socio-structural and relational factors that may hinder the process of successful offender reintegration into community (Leverentz, 2011). Leverentz’s (2011) typology is a useful tool for organizing the ideas and understanding identified as barriers for reintegration gathered in conversations with parole officers, as well as offenders and ex-offenders, in the Winnipeg area during the course of this research. In the individual realm, the barriers present are those related to mental health, finances, management of emotions, stress, loneliness, fear and stigma. From the structural point of view, proper employment, lack of community programs, criminal records and housing are mentioned as the main obstacles to successful reintegration. In the relational sphere, frequent family estrangement, lack of positive support, diminished citizenship and troubled relationships with peers and partners can be hurdles for reintegration.

4.2.1 Individual

Every offender has a unique history of deviance and trauma. Some of their individual characteristics could become factors that impede full reintegration into community. While incarcerated, many offenders have the chance to be assessed as individuals for the first time in their lives. Also, they have to learn how to live with what the system ‘has found in them’.

Nothing changes in the individual realm when an offender is out of prison. Therefore, the offender has to deal with community.

One of the first individual challenges, commonly mentioned in offenders' reintegration stories, is related to mental health. According to Abracen et al. (2014), "there has been relatively little research related to recidivism among mentally disordered offenders" (p. 766). This is surprising given that "research has suggested that the prevalence of mental illness among male prisoners is more than three times the rate of the general population, as well as the fact that certain diagnoses are associated with increased rates of violence" (Abracen, Gallo, Looman, & Goodwill, 2016, p. 1843). This kind of statistic justified the creation, in the US and abroad, of mental health courts working in the criminal justice system (Walker, Pann, Shapiro, & Van Hasselt, 2016).

In Canada, studies of 126 'parolees' hosted in residential facilities managed by CSC showed that "mental health concerns represent a significant issue among higher risk offender populations released to the community" (Abracen, et al., 2014, p. 775). These studies also show that "offenders with borderline personality disorder and attention deficit hyperactivity disorder were significantly more likely to recidivate or be suspended" (Abracen, et al., 2014, p. 765). Also, mental health issues in offenders are related to the non-completion of treatment programs that may have prevented their recidivism. According to Abracen, Gallo, Looman and Goodwill "program attrition predicted recidivism"; i.e., "offenders who did not complete programming were significantly more likely to reoffend" (2016, p. 1845). This suggests that mental health issues negatively influence the process of re-entry, by "impeding the ability of the offender to complete programming" (Abracen, Gallo, Looman, & Goodwill, 2016, p. 1845).

Another common reason for returning to prison is the “financial issue”. This financial strain “has been defined and discussed in many ways in various domains of academic inquiry, from medicine and economics to criminology and psychology” and refers to “a scarcity of money” (Martire, 2010, p. 160). According to Martire (2010):

This scarcity may be characterized as membership in a lower socioeconomic class or quintile; a failure to be able to meet basic survival needs (e.g., food or housing); seeking assistance from community/welfare organizations; unmanageable or unsecured debts; living standards lower than the national norm; and/or the necessity to engage in certain fundraising behaviors (e.g., selling property or borrowing money) (p. 160).

According to Martire (2010), based on “compelling theoretical reasons” it is not hard to believe that “financial strain may contribute directly and indirectly” to recidivism (p. 165). In addition, “the likelihood of crime is elevated among those who have fewer resources to cope, who have limited social networks, and who are more inclined towards illegal activities—all of which are common among those who have been incarcerated —these theories also make predictions for the role of financial strain in recidivism” (Martire, 2010, p. 162). However, research in these areas, is very limited and the precise relationships between financial strain and other intertwined causes of criminal activity, such as substance abuse and mental health outcomes, are not clear (Martire, 2010).

The management of emotions—also labeled as stress, loneliness, and fear—is a concern very present at the moment of “reinsertion” into the community. Taking account of “emotions people feel in the face of wrongdoing” has been identified recently in successful penal reform and policies (Frieiberg, 2001). Also, emotional management is a topic that has many new approaches and followers because emotions are part of everyday life in connection to the human pursuit of happiness. “Defining emotions”, as stated by Aubrie Horrocks and Jamie L. Callahan (2006), “and understanding how it affects us all, is crucial to success for both individuals and for

society as a whole” (p. 6). This understanding and definition of emotions is also crucial for success in rehabilitation because released offenders need a new identity in order to fit once again into society. Moreover, “the importance of emotion within the process of identity creation is apparent when concepts are specifically applied to a variety of social contexts and structures” (Horrocks & Callahan, 2006, p. 71). Parolees face a new setting for their social context and structures once they are out of prison. So, one of their first tasks in the new identity search is to find out which emotions to feel and manage, and also where and with whom to communicate these emotions (Horrocks & Callahan, 2006). According to Horrocks and Callahan (2006):

Identities are created and maintained through communication and interaction, resulting in a structure that allows individuals to feel comfortable, confident and safe in sharing their thoughts and experiences, while substantiating functionality and productivity. Through expression, we are valued and respected in both the public and private arenas of our lives (p. 71).

Therefore, managing emotions is absolutely necessary for building a new identity for parolees, and the failure to manage these emotions may lead to recidivism. In male offenders, this situation can be worsened due to the stereotypes associated with how and when men show emotions. The emotional situation of young male offenders has been identified as a cause of recidivism in recent studies in the US (Soyer, 2016). The situation is no different in Canada. As pointed out by Galek (2015), in his study of released offenders in Winnipeg, “the pressure to not show emotions in front of others weighed on the men’s minds when they minimally engaged in social spaces” (p. 61).

Significant stigmatization in the offender has been recognized recently as one of the major causes of crime deterrence; more so than the severity of formal punishment (Mungan, 2017). Easier access to information and to the criminal record of an individual creates a shame in that person for life (Murphy, Fuleihan, Richards, & Jones, 2011). This marks not only ex-

offenders but also their principal relationships with family and friends (Comfort, 2007).

However, stigma is understood to be a socially produced situation that creates an emotional response in the individual. Paraphrasing Goffman (1963), according to the *Encyclopedia of Health Communication*, “stigma is generally understood as a discrediting physical or figurative mark that is perceived as applying to an individual. Stigmatization occurs when someone perceives that an individual embodies a particular stigma” (Meisenbach, 2014, p. 1337).

In the same way, stigma is described as a major hardship in the process of reintegration into community. As Leverentz (2011) has pointed out, “The ‘convicted’ label itself shapes recidivism, especially for those who are otherwise less likely to recidivate, and perhaps they have more to lose by the label” (p. 359).

4.2.2 Structural

There is no doubt about the importance of individual agency in ‘desistance from crime’.

However, “agency is always exercised within the context of social structures, and there has been far less enquiry into the potential impact of social-structural differences—in different countries or different decades—on opportunities for and processes of desistance” (Farrall, Bottoms, & Shapland, 2010, p. 547). Therefore, in recent years, research addressing recidivism and trying to find why people stop committing crime highlighted “macro-level structures and meso-level influences whilst retaining sufficient room for individual agency” (Farrall, Sharpe, Hunter, & Calverley, 2011, p. 218).

According to Goff (2001), “one significant theory formulated by inmates is that the very nature of the correctional facility and the parole supervision system are important ‘causes’ of failure” (p. 397). This perception “comes from the inmates’ conception of prison as a place in which to be punished, not as a place in which to be rehabilitated or to solve the problems that

will likely make them reoffend on release” (Goff, 2001, p. 397). If the system is not designed for rehabilitation, this structure hinders reintegration in that those who rehabilitate do so in spite of correctional services staff (Goff, 2001, p. 398).

All those who advocate for prison reform emphasize the negative impact of the correctional institution structure (see Martinson's, 1974, classic and polemical *What works?* and Cullen, Lero Jonson and Nagin, 2011). Prison is seen ‘per se’ as a negative environment (Goff, 2001). Prison becomes a highly institutionalized environment in which offenders acclimatize.

In addition, before and after the release of inmates, correctional services are perceived as not having enough resources to assist offenders for re-entry. For example, institutions generally lack “institutional vocational training programs designed to provide inmates with marketable employment skills” (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 553). This last complaint was acknowledged in 2016 when the Canadian authority inspecting corrections recommended “a three year action plan to meet demand for meaningful work, increase vocational training skills and participation in apprenticeship programs” (The Correctional Investigator Canada, 2016, p. 53).

Employment has been mentioned in the literature as one of the key factors for an offenders’ successful re-entry to society (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2011; Dhaliwal, Porporino, & Ross, 1994). Studies show the importance of vocational and training programs in prison; not only in work skills but also in “employee behaviour” (Petersilia, 2009).

Once an offender is released into community, according to Leverentz (2011), “employment provides a stake in conformity, new routines, prosocial ties, and legal income” (p. 362). However, recent studies in the US have shown that “ex-offender job placement interventions (e.g., job-readiness classes, job training, supported work, job placement,

transitional employment, job clubs) are not evidence-based in reducing recidivism” (Moses, 2012, p. 106) . Therefore, what is key is not just the fact that ex-offenders have an occupation, but the level of motivation associated with that occupation or employment.

The access of high quality employment or proper employment is actually limited to the general population of released offenders. As pointed out by Leverantz (2011):

Those with felony convictions are legally barred from some occupations. Occupations with state or regulatory restrictions include those that work with vulnerable populations, such as childcare, home health care, or nursing, and private sector jobs such as barber, beautician, pharmacist, embalmer, optometrist, plumber, and real estate professional (p. 362).

In those jobs, the possibility of checking criminal records online has extended the stigma and the fear of released offenders not being able to find and maintain ‘proper’ or ‘legitimate’ employment that matches the aspirations, skills and training of offenders after release (Brown, 2004). A job is evaluated in terms of ‘legitimacy’ or ‘suitability’. This concrete condition makes it difficult to consider “employment” as a structural factor that hinders reinsertion; at least in Winnipeg and according to the findings of this study.

Winnipeg has a housing problem especially in low-income neighbourhoods (MacKinnon, 2017). This structural situation becomes a barrier for those ex-offenders who want to reintegrate into community. They cannot find adequate and affordable housing to ease reintegration. Lack of affordable housing and homelessness are some of the greatest challenges facing cities in the 21st century (Krigman, 2010). In fact, according to the *Winnipeg Street Census 2016: Final Report* (Maes Nino, Godoy, McCullough, Retzlaff, Wiebe, & Wurcher, 2016), there are more than 1400 persons suffering because of homelessness in Winnipeg. Former offenders are known to be a significant part of the homeless in urban populations (McNiel,

Binder, & Robinson, 2005). According to Ross and Richards (2009), the most immediate need upon release from prison is not a job but finding a suitable and affordable place to live.

The living arrangements of people journeying out from prison ought to be a major concern for the correctional system, due to the link between unsuitable accommodation and re-offending (The John Howard Society of Ontario, 2007; 2013; Griffiths, Dandurand, & Murdoch, 2007). For example, Gouman and Travis (2006), in a study of ex-offenders in the US, noted that:

For some returning prisoners, residing in the home of a family member, friend, or significant other is not an option because of interpersonal conflict, the reluctance of family members to welcome a violent individual back into their lives, or the lack of an immediate family. In some cases, additional legal restrictions further limit housing options. Conditions of parole may prohibit returning prisoners from residing with a family member or close friend if that person has a criminal record. According to a 1988 survey of conditions placed on former prisoners under parole supervision, 31 of the 51 responding parole agencies (61 percent) reported that they prohibited parolees from associating with anyone who had a criminal record (p. 396).

From the perspective of “crime prevention”, initiatives for allocating offenders in the community are encouraged by the state during the former inmates’ supervised time. In Canada, CSC has been involved in the creation of centres for hosting offender population outside of prison, namely Community Correctional Centres (CCC’s) and Community Residential Facilities (CRF’s)—commonly called ‘halfway houses’ (Abracen, Axford, & Gileno, 2011). More than 150 community-based Halfway Houses are owned and managed directly by correctional services staff or by non-governmental agencies (Correctional Service Canada, 2013c). The impact on the ex-offender population ‘dwelling’ in those facilities has not been sufficiently addressed due to the large number of institutional programs connected to the rehabilitation of offenders (Correctional Service Canada, 2005).

Even though many of these facilities are managed by non-profit organizations, former inmates often perceive staff in these facilities as part of the criminal justice system (Moble,

2005). To live and share one's living arrangements with someone who is being paid, directly or indirectly by the state, hinders the possibility of building fair and autonomous relationships with others in the same place. Moreover, this contributes to the perception of prison and re-entry as "forever entwined" processes in the life of ex-offenders, a situation that may reinforce their "conflicted identity within and outside of prison" (Mobley, 2005, p. 101).

Partnership between the many agencies involved in the re-entry process, such as correctional services, 'Halfway House' staff, medical and professional counsellors, and even some treatment program facilitators, could be perceived as a threat to the ex-offender (Mobley, 2005). Halfway Houses are seen as links connecting prison to community and community to prison, which creates in residents the instability of being "just one step away from going into or getting out of prison" (Ross & Richards, 2009, p. 39).

4.2.3. Relational

Recently, as a result of the complexity of dealing with the causes of recidivism, the 'relational' has been developed significantly in pre- and post-release offender programming. Goff (2001) points out that the greater risk of "having associates who have criminal tendencies or who are antisocial in nature; pro-criminal attitudes, values, and beliefs; generalized difficulties or trouble in relationships with others; and being male", all point to the likelihood of reoffending (p. 393). This factor combined with the reality that "most inmates had vague and ambiguous feelings about their chances of survival on the outside" (Goff, 2001, p. 398) become a formula for recidivism. Feelings of despair that can trigger the person's return to criminal behaviour are far too common. In a study of ex-offenders going to a 'boot camp' in the city of Baltimore, the only item garnering a troubling level of agreement is the one about 'the whole world being against me'. (Benson, Alarid, Burton, & Cullen, 2011, p. 389). In fact, "when they are prompted to think

just about life in general and where they are ‘at this point’ in time (that is, confined in a boot camp), they take an understandably pessimistic view of their current situation” (Benson, Alarid, Burton, & Cullen, 2011, p. 389).

In male offenders, this sensation creates a ‘barrier for change’ and impacts all relationships. Frequently, it is caused by family estrangement, lack of positive support, diminished citizenship and troubled relationships with peers and partners. All of these challenges place a hurdle on reintegration and the offenders’ change of life style, which is expected by CSC of all released offenders.

According to Leverentz (2011), “researchers also are emphasizing the importance of how offenders view themselves and their life chances and how cognitive transformations of ex-prisoners may shape their desistance. In other words, ex-prisoners may reframe how they think about their offending and what they want for their future” (p. 367). Further, he notes:

...the need for openness to change, the ability to reflect and envision an appealing conventional self, and, finally, a change in the way the person views a deviant lifestyle. ... being open to change is insufficient, but it is a minimal starting point, and a “solid replacement self” may be the most important piece in long-term behavior change (Leverentz, 2011, p. 368).

In terms of family, “little is known about whether family ties help offenders overcome obstacles in the job market and secure employment” (Berg & Huebner, 2011, p. 383). This is so, even though “prisoners’ expectations for family support overall—both emotional and financial—were generally realized after their release from prison” (Visher, Chirsty; La Vigne, Nancy; Travis, Jeremy, 2004), estrangement from family is a common cause of despair in offenders. In fact, living with or even maintaining a positive relationship with family “is not always an easy or possible choice, as family members may have victimized or been victimized or otherwise hurt by the returning person previously” (Leverentz, 2011, p. 364).

According to Koschmann and Peterson (2013), mentoring “involves volunteers who work to build trusting relationships with former inmates through consistent, nonjudgmental support and guidance” (p. 192). Even though “mentoring has received virtually no attention in the extant research literature” (Koschmann & Peterson, 2013, p. 192) recent studies in Canada have shown the difficulty in linking mentoring programs with lower rates of recidivism (Weinrath, Donatelli, & Murchison, 2016). However, it must be pointed out that the studies which show this inconsistency focus primarily on juvenile and gang related offenders, and the results are not fully applicable to a broader offender population.

Another relational barrier is the perceived social vulnerability of offenders inside and outside prison (de Beaurepaire, 2012). In fact, “both civil law and common law provided for a diminution of citizenship rights based upon misconduct” (Russell, 1992, p. 39).

These strains of incarceration were also recently identified in the literature:

Strains involve events and conditions that are physically or psychologically distressing to individuals, and they include the experience of negative or aversive treatment, the loss of things that the individual values, and the inability to achieve valued goals. Those strains most conducive to crime are high in magnitude, perceived as unjust, associated with low control, and create some pressure or incentive for criminal coping (Johnson Listwan, Sullivan, Agnew, Cullen, & Colvin, 2013, p. 148).

These strains of ‘diminished citizenship’ affect the person ‘internally’, and may also be manifested in troubled relationships with peers. In the absence of family, peers are important in the “social support network” of offenders (Weinrath, Donatelli, & Murchison, 2016, p. 301). Released offenders tend to band together socially (Winnick & Bodkin, 2008). This tendency is expedited by the prospect of societal discrimination, which causes an “increasing social distance through the creation of an ‘us versus them’ mentality among offenders, weakening social bonds to conventional society, and increasing the risk of recidivism” (Edwards & Mottarella, 2015, p.

1360). In addition, “these relationships often are fraught with tension and history related to offending and drug use” (Leverentz, 2011, p. 371). Even when positive peer support is set through programing, their effects on rates of recidivism are difficult to assess due to the complex factors involved (Caslor, 2003).

According to Leverentz (2011), “the relationships between incarcerated men, their children, and the mothers of their children are often strained, not only because of incarceration but also because of the criminal activity and drug use that preceded it” (p. 368). Also, Brown (2004) writes that:

Newly released offenders may have “difficulty reintegrating with the family” which could be a positive source of support, while others who are “returning to dysfunctional families” may be reflected in their problems “developing positive associates,” compounded by an “absence of structure,” may set them up for a number of challenges to establishing family support (p. 24).

Sometimes stress, combined with drug abuse and violent attitudes, can lead to domestic violence (Hanson & Wallace-Capretta, 2004). However, “prosocial intimate partner relationships reduced the likelihood of re-offending” (Cobbina, Huebner, & Berg, 2012, p. 348). Similarly, “evidence suggests that there is a ‘good marriage’ effect for men in part because male offenders are more likely to ‘marry up’ with women who are not involved in criminal activity” (Leverentz, 2011, p. 368).

Another hindrance to reinsertion into community is related directly to drugs and alcohol use and abuse as a relief to “stress and anxiety” (Griffiths & Verdun-Jones, 1994, p. 553). Moreover, Johnson Listwan, Sullivan, Agnew, Cullen, and Colvin (2013) mentioned the direct effect of those psychological issues on drug use:

Such strains are said to increase crime for several reasons. They lead to negative emotional states, such as anger and frustration. These emotions create pressure for corrective action, and crime is one possible response.

Crime may allow individuals to escape from or reduce their strain (e.g., run away from abusive parents, steal the money they desire), obtain revenge against the source of their strain or related targets, and alleviate their negative emotions (e.g., through illicit drug use) (p. 148).

This finding is also pointed out in Canadian research on the topic. Brown (2004) notes that:

The “con code” coupled with a “false sense of security” and “lack of motivation” reflect attitudes of offenders that are challenges to the successful completion of early days of community supervision. Parole supervisors reported that offenders may be “overcome by [the] pace of life,” feel “fear,” “loneliness,” “boredom,” “discouragement,” “lack of patience,” “lack of self-confidence,” or “shame,” that can lead to vulnerability to “peer pressure,” “self-sabotaging behavior,” “temptation,” “return to substance abuse.” They reported that offenders in their early days of release may be amenable to change, but their “difficulty expressing needs,” “difficulty trusting,” and being “too proud to ask for assistance/support” can result in “difficulty in breaking old habits (p. 28).

Drug and alcohol abuse not only result in a breach of parole, but also have specific effects on ex-offenders in terms of their ability to foster long term relationships. This also has lasting effects on family, employment and housing (Shinkfield & Graffam, 2009). Furthermore, when substance abuse is combined with mental illness, the possibility for a successful reinsertion into society diminishes dramatically.

The isolation, inside and outside the prison goes against the ex-offender changing a “deviant lifestyle” (Leverentz, 2011, p. 368). A law-abiding lifestyle in ex-offenders is the most effective way to achieve desistance from crime. Consequently Nelissen (1998) pointed out that:

...there may even be a genuine insight that changing one’s life is the only option left. Therefore it is not surprising that especially at the beginning of their incarceration detainees favour the idea of rehabilitation, and possibly this period of stronger motivation offers an interesting starting point for a process of behavioural change (Nelissen, 1998, p. 226).

Further, ex-offenders may begin this new life style in community; normally, in a residence assigned by their case management team. According to Tica and Roth (2012) “lack of

housing is a form of exclusion with negative implications upon the life quality of the person released from prison, which makes integration into the labor market more difficult, as well as the maintenance of health, [and] continuation of family life” (p. 68). CSC, the non-profit sector and the business oriented sector, which are the members of the “community”, must provide “opportunities for offenders returning to the community to secure housing, participate in community activities, access community resources, and establish bonds with prosocial community members” (Tillyer & Vose, 2011, p. 458). However, the effectiveness of the housing solutions that CSC provides in tackling the deviant life style and social exclusion faced by ex-offenders is, at least, doubtful (Public Service Foundation of Canada, 2015) and becomes another particular barrier for rehabilitation. In Canada:

...offenders released to CRFs represent the highest proportion of those released to the community. In 2002/03, more than one-half (56%) of all offenders released were released to CRFs or independent agencies. An additional 5% were released to CCCs, and 39% were released to the community without any residency.

In general, the proportion of offenders released into CRFs has increased over the last few years. In 2002/03, similar proportions of CRF residents were released to the Ontario, Quebec, Prairie, and Pacific regions. Over the years, the proportion of CRF residents released to the Quebec region have decreased, and the proportion released to the Pacific region has increased. This has implications in terms of vacancy and overcrowding, and can impact on resources for CRFs (Correctional Service Canada, 2004, p. i).

The number of offenders released into society has increased significantly in the last few years, but such is not the case in housing options available for them. In fact, recent reviews “of community-based residential facilities in Canada reported a shortage of all types of community residential facility options available to offenders in various locations across the country” (Correctional Service Canada, 2011, p. 83). In addition, as was stated above, the impact on the offender of those places has not been sufficiently addressed (Correctional Service Canada, 2005; 2013).

This lack of information becomes a critical problem, particularly when expected changes that CSC and society want to see in released offenders lifestyle depend on supportive housing. Housing mobility and instability becomes a crucial barrier in the journey out of prison for men and women (Huerbner & Pleggenkuhle, 2015). If prison and re-entry are “forever entwined” processes in the life of ex-offenders, it would be very difficult for them to find the space, time and support necessary to readdress their identity and make decisions which would ultimately lead to a socially healthier lifestyle. Hence, this often ‘forever entwined’ process of reinsertion into society of released offenders has been reproached.

4.3 Reintegration into community under criticism

In pursuing peace, sometimes the goals established by the legal system that controls correctional services do not match with the violence and the unrest that comes from former offenders and our troubled society. In Canada, specifically in Manitoba, this discrepancy has been studied with special reference to members of the Aboriginal community under CSC (Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission, 1999). However, in recent years, studies about the incongruity between how the system is perceived and the CSC’s mandate of “care” and “rehabilitation” has extended to other male offenders (Gacek, 2015). This section critiques the goals of the criminal justice system in recent literature.

Some decades ago, when criminologists and sociologists tried to explain the situation of ex-offenders finishing their sentences, the goals and efforts for re-entry into community seemed to be taken for granted. The offender, separated from family and friends, would come back to a community that was also punished for the crime committed by one of its members. The apparent retributive effect of punishment would end with a community now complete and restored as one of its members returned. This re-entry also reminded the whole community of the things they

shouldn't do (Maltz, 1984). In that sense, peace was assured, the criminal justice system accomplished its mission, and offenders had learned their lesson. However, in recent years, correctional services rely more on their own programs for rehabilitation, without addressing the impact of offenders in community (Hiram, 2014).

In fact, around the world, the lower rates of the general public's confidence in the criminal justice system have challenged its legitimacy (Tanasichuk & Wormith, 2012). This has been counteracted by providing an argument that the criminal justice system is working and so it is worthwhile to have. Two means are used for achieving this result: first, by reframing the role of criminal justice and, second, by pursuing more integration between community and the effect of the criminal justice system in society. In Canada, the second means has motivated actions within the CSC such as community corrections, which allowed for the action of CSC in the community until the end of an offender's sentence (Correctional Service Canada, 2011, p. vi). These activities also include the convocation of partners in the community, as happened in November 2009, at the CSC Executive Development Symposium (Correctional Service Canada, 2013a, p. 4). This activity is problematic because it has served to include in Corrections a way of thinking that excludes or marginalizes the role of the community in the objectives of the prison system; more than 'offender reintegration into community' what the system should pursue is offenders' 'desistance from crime'.

There is an unavoidable attention to the individual in the service provided by the criminal justice system. Indeed, the word "rehabilitation" is associated with offenders as 'people under treatment' and their need for 'correctional programs'. In this vision, which is focused on the individual, the only expectation from society is a general deterrence based on the assumption that "the threat of criminal penalty will convince potential offenders not to engage in criminal

behavior” (Maltz, 1984, p. 13). If the ex-prisoner returns to prison, this expectation is not reciprocated by the criminal justice system. Therefore, more than a community reintegration, what the criminal justice system should pursue is a desistence from crime, which is much more of an individual decision. In this approach, techniques of cognitive behaviourism would be set into place in order to achieve the change expected in the offender as an individual with a “lost sight of relationships” (Canton, 2011, p. 119). Even though this approach highlighted the importance of recognizing emotions in offenders in order to get them to desist from crime, the loss of attention to relationships has placed the community outside the scope of the goal of the correctional system. Almost three decades ago, James Byrne (1989), warned about the dangers of leaving out the notion of “communities” within so called community corrections in the US. Community, for the individual offender, had become more a place of surveillance rather than a dwelling place in which changes can happen.

According to Russell (1992), “Bentham/Foucault’s panopticon” is reproduced by correctional services when their officers reach community. In his opinion, “panoptic discipline is a metaphor for much of what really controls behavior in any post-industrial society” (Russell, 1992, p. 41). New punitive procedures have been developed and legitimized, such as “traceability” (Gacek, 2015, p. 89). Then, offenders feel they are under the “constant panoptic gaze” of CSC thanks to “surveillance mechanisms, such as GPS tracking, changes in parole conditions, and required attendance to counselling and social service resource centres” (Gacek, 2015, p. 89). Through frequent urine tests, and stripping privacy away from the offender, feudal “outlawry” is back as “surveillance becomes the common element in most of our cutting edge alternatives to incarceration” (Russell, 1992, p. 44).

In analyzing mass incarceration in the US, Wacquant (2010) also pointed to the misuse of the term ‘community’ when assessing the cycle of entry and re-entry of offenders into urban settings. The common language used by practitioners writing about the transition of offenders from prison to community “presupposes a clear separation between these two worlds, whereas they increasingly interpenetrate one another under the current regime of hyperincarceration targeted at neighborhoods of relegation” (Wacquant, 2010). This “continual flow of people moving in and out of correctional facilities” has created “various networks that traverse carceral borders and that are subjected to punitive measures in the domestic and communal spheres” (Comfort, 2008, p. 186). Given this situation, the notion of community, often associated with “positive and moral features” becomes irrelevant (Wacquant, 2010, p. 611). Therefore, offenders not only have to reintegrate into community but they even need to restore it (Gacek, 2015).

In any event, the blurred notion of community and the increasing surveillance of released offenders have justified a shift in the purpose of correctional services. Now, the efforts of rehabilitation are focused more on the individual’s desistance from crime, rather than on a successful relationship between the offenders and members of the community. In an era of massive incarceration and the erosion of communities in urban areas, offender rehabilitation programs tend to focus more on developing coping strategies in the individual offender, notwithstanding the absence of community.

This approach is criticized by Canton (2011), Ward (2011), and Koschmann and Peterson (2013), who still consider as very relevant the role of “networks and meaningful relationships that provide the necessary social capital needed for successful reintegration” (Koschmann & Peterson, 2013, pp. 189-190). Therefore, what is demanded is an integrative approach in which community is present and active. According to McNeill, “[r]ehabilitation, therefore, is not just

about sorting out the individual's readiness for or fitness for reintegration; it is as much about rebuilding the social relationships without which reintegration is impossible" (McNeill, 2012, p. 14). McNeill goes on and insists that "rehabilitation is a social project as well as a personal one" (2012, p. 14). The increasing number of homeless people shows by itself the failure of this social project in most urban societies.

Former offenders are known to be a significant part of the homeless in urban populations (McNiel, Binder, & Robinson, 2005). From this perspective, the provision of housing is seen as part of the Good Life Model (GLM) based on the assumption that ex-offenders want a better life and that this cannot be guaranteed in the absence of a roof over their heads. This provision distinguishes the 'houses' in which Correctional Residential Facilities (CRFs) are located, from what can be considered a 'home'. In this sense, former offenders in CCC's and CRF's have a house or a shelter, but they probably do not have a 'home'. To live and share living arrangements with someone who is being paid, directly or indirectly by the state, hinders the possibility of building autonomy. This autonomy in fairness and rules is what distinguishes the relationships at 'home' from those of other 'housing' solutions. Moreover, the lack of autonomy contributes to the perception of prison and re-entry into society as "forever entwined" processes in the life of ex-offenders. This further reinforces their "conflicted identity within and outside of prison" (Moble, 2005, p. 101).

Halfway Houses are perceived as a link connecting prison to community and community to prison, symptomatic of the unhelpful notion that residents are "just one step away from going into or getting out of prison" (Ross & Richards, 2009, p. 39). Hence, partnerships between the many agencies involved in the re-entry process—such as CSC, Halfway House staff, medical and professional counsellors, and even some treatment program facilitators—are perceived by

the ex-offender as a threat. They may provide physical safety, but hardly achieve the level of trust that a home provides for the development of personal identity and as a step out into ‘normal community living’.

Even though there is scant literature addressing power and space in relation to friendship, a recent publication by Bowlby (2011) considered ‘home’ a significant place for the building and practice of friendships. Shared memories and spaces raise the question of “whether and how repeated meetings with friends within the home contribute to people’s sense of identity and ontological security” (Bowlby, 2011, p. 316). A positive identity and ‘ontological security’ are the main objectives of any process of reinsertion of former offenders, even within the retributive model. According to Jamieson and Simpson (2013), the notion of ontological security “derived from psychology has often been linked with the idea of a home” (p. 90). Moreover, “a person has ontological security when he or she has a secure sense of self and agency without constant crushing doubts about the continuity of his or her being, self-determination or place in the world; he or she has a basic trust in others and in a world in which people usually are, and the world mostly is, as it seems” (Jamieson & Simpson, 2013, p. 90).

For these reasons, according to Jamieson and Simpson (2013), home is the place where people acquire ‘ontological security’:

Different theoretical traditions within social science emphasize different ways of sustaining ‘ontological security’, but a diverse body of authors agrees on the importance, at least in Euro-North American cultures, of a sense of having a home and of following taken-for-granted routines. Houses as homes potentially create a sense of protection from the social or public ‘outside’, through enabling the experience of space as if the occupier controls entry, and privacy is assured, enabling what happens there to feel under their control. A home offers a place, the relevant equipment and time for being enveloped in mundane social routines including around performing the biological necessities of self-maintenance, eating, washing and sleeping with reference to culturally accepted getting-up and meal times. Houses are constructed with layouts and furnishing that suit these cultural routines (p. 91).

Although highly trained staff immersed in law enforcement matters of CSC are primarily and almost exclusively responsible for the process of the re-entry or “resettlement” of offenders into Canadian society, the voluntary sector can be a highly influential and important contributor. One of its main contributions is the personalization of institutionalized people journeying out of prison through the provision of a home in which to live—or at the very least, a more appropriate kind of environment than what is currently being provided in the correctional facilities.

In his short article “Counterblast: A Copernican correction for community sentences?”, Criminologist Fergus MacNeill (2012) advocates for a Copernican revolution in the field of offender rehabilitation. In his opinion, the rehabilitation or reinsertion into society of offenders has focused on ‘desistance from crime’. Yet, as McNeill has noted, those ‘desistance theorists’ have changed. At the outset, they were “mainly concerned with understanding ‘natural’ or spontaneous processes of development and change. Relatively little attention was paid, until recently, on how one might ‘force the plant’; that is, how criminal justice services might accelerate the ‘natural’ process of growing out of crime” (McNeill, 2012, p. 94)

Additionally, the studies and programs related to offender’s rehabilitation in the last 30 years have stressed the following themes:

1. Since desistance is an inherently individualised and subjective process, approaches to supervision must accommodate and exploit issues of identity and diversity. There are, therefore, important limitations for one-size-fits-all approaches to rehabilitation.
2. The development and maintenance not just of motivation but also of hope becomes a key task for probation staff.
3. Desistance can only be understood within the context of human relationships; not just relationships between workers and those they supervise (though these matter a great deal) but also between probationers and those who matter to them.
4. Although we tend to focus on probationers’ risk factors and needs, they also have strengths and resources that they can use to overcome obstacles to desistance—both personal strengths and resources and strengths and

resources in their social networks. Supervision needs to support and develop these capacities.

5. Since desistance is about discovering agency, interventions need to encourage and respect self-determination; this means working with people, not on them.

6. Interventions based only on human capital (or developing people's capacities and skills) will not be enough. Probation needs to work on social capital issues with communities and offenders (McNeill, 2012, pp. 95-96).

It is clear, in the above quotation, that this all still refers to the individual offender and the programing, which are both controlled and mandated by the correctional authority. Even though the words 'hope', 'relationships', 'identity' and 'diversity' are highlighted, the role of home, neighbours and communities in the process of reintegration remain marginal. However, when offenders are given the opportunity to have a home where they can develop and understand their relationships, find a new identity, and appreciate their diversity as a group, even though they are often stigmatized, the chances of 'desistance from crime' are higher.

Even in the field of Criminology there is an emerging interest in social contexts, neighbourhood and family, even though the role of "deviant peers" and "freenemies" have been underestimated (Bahr, 2015, p. 94). Recent research shows that it is highly unlikely for individuals to get involved in illegal activity without the negative "encouragement and rewards from peers" (Bahr, 2015, p. 94). New friendships are crucial to a desired change in the life style of the offender. However, if these relationships are left to the offender's old friends and places, this "could increase the risk of the individual becoming involved in criminal behavior again" (Bahr, 2015, p. 97). And the same happens with loneliness, which has become a recidivist factor. According to Bahr's qualitative study "the unsuccessful parolees had fewer friends and exhibited more loneliness. Consequently, they were less selective in choosing friends" (Bahr, 2015, p. 97).

In response to these recidivist factors, the third sector has traditionally provided spaces in which former offenders, trying to reinsert into the broader community, can discover and keep

new relationships. More than ever this voluntary support is decisive, considering that the work of CSC has now been seriously affected by federal budget cuts (Munn & Bruckert, 2013, p. 6).

Even the aid of the not-for-profit sector has diminished due to the risk oriented approach and less public funding allotted for these initiatives (Evans & Shields, 2010). However, it is within this sector that PACS become applicable. Under this frame:

...individual-level psychological theories, analysis, and prescriptions are best seen as a necessary but insufficient part of developing an integrated theory of rehabilitation. Such a theory also needs to draw on criminology's developing understandings of how to assist desistance from crime, which in turn draws on *both* psychological and sociological research, as well as on the knowledge and insights of ex-offenders and practitioners (McNeill, 2012, p. 14).

One of the first innovations that the PACS holistic approach has provided for addressing the situation of offenders is the 'us-them' framework. Recently, this dichotomy has been emphasised in response to the higher rates of recidivism. Once this framework, caused by the mere existence of the correctional system, is identified and described, it is easier to understand the situation of offenders in community as 'conflicted' and, accordingly, in need of a PACS approach.

4.4 Incarceration and the 'us-them' dichotomy in correctional centres

In the last decades, higher rates of recidivism have caught the attention not only of anthropologists, criminologists and social psychologists, but also of PACS scholars. In their studies, recidivism is seen to be linked to the satisfaction of human needs and social justice issues. This research is an example of how PACS addresses the need for intervention among former offenders, leading to the avoidance of recidivism and the prevention of violence in people who have been subjected to supervision by correctional services.

4.4.1 Institutionalization

In his classic essay, *Asylums*, Goffman (1961) puts forth the notion of ‘total institutions’. When grouping those institutions in society, he refers to the third type of total institution as “organized to protect the community against what are felt to be intentional dangers to it, with the welfare of the persons thus sequestered not the immediate issue: jails, penitentiaries, P.O.W. camps, and concentration camps” (Goffman, 1961, p. 4). Prisons and penitentiaries are classic ‘total institutions’. These institutions contradict what comes from a “basic social arrangement in modern society”, which is that “the individual tends to sleep, play, and work in different places, with different co-participants, under different authorities, and without an over-all rational plan” (Goffman, 1961, p. 5). Hence, “the central feature of total institutions can be described as a breakdown of the barriers ordinarily separating these three spheres of life” (Goffman, 1961, p.

5). The main characteristics of total institutions are:

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member’s daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day’s activities are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading at a prearranged time into the next, the whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution (Goffman, 1961, pp. 5-6).

Diversity, unpredictability and complexity, which normally occur in society, are replaced by a rational structure and plan through which those who are part of the institution necessarily or enforcedly follow. This creates a distinction among people who participate in such institutions:

In total institutions there is a basic split between a large managed group, conveniently called inmates, and a small supervisory staff. Inmates typically live in the institution and have restricted contact with the world outside the walls; staff often operate on an eight-hour day and are socially integrated into the outside world. Each grouping tends to conceive of the other in terms

of narrow hostile stereotypes, staff often seeing inmates as bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy, while inmates often see staff as condescending, highhanded, and mean. Staff tends to feel superior and righteous; inmates tend, in some ways at least, to feel inferior, weak, blameworthy and guilty. (Goffman, 1961, p. 7).

In addition, family is identified as one of the groups in society most affected by ‘total institutions’. The trauma produced in an individual through incarceration can easily be extended to an inmate’s family and acquaintances (Comfort, 2007; Gaskew, 2014). According to Goffman, the roles and structures of ‘total institutions’ pervade family and homes, as places in which domestic activities occur:

There is an incompatibility, then, between total institutions and the basic work-payment structure of our society. Total institutions are also incompatible with another crucial element of our society, the family. Family life is sometimes contrasted with solitary living, but in fact the more pertinent contrast is with batch living, for those who eat and sleep at work, with a group of fellow workers, can hardly sustain a meaningful domestic existence (Goffman, 1961, p. 11).

Recent research on institutionalization has addressed the impact of total institutions on individuals. According to Troshynski and Magnus (2014), institutionalization is “a process by which inmates are shaped by the prison environment and become dependent upon its strict and often abrasive culture” (p. 482). Even though the conditions that produce institutionalization end with the termination of incarceration, individuals remain ‘institutionalized’ even after leaving prison due to the prison’s socialization process. Chris Haney (2001) explored, for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the psychological consequences of prison in individuals. He concludes:

To be sure, then, not everyone who is incarcerated is disabled or psychologically harmed by it. But few people are completely unchanged or unscathed by the experience. At the very least, prison is painful, and incarcerated persons often suffer long-term consequences from having been subjected to pain, deprivation, and extremely atypical patterns and norms of living and interacting with others (Haney, 2001, pp. 4-5).

In the case of male prisoners, institutionalization and prison culture can hinder their capacity for forging healthy relationships in their process of re-entry to society:

In men's prisons it may promote a kind of hypermasculinity in which force and domination are glorified as essential components of personal identity. In an environment characterized by enforced powerlessness and deprivation, men and women prisoners confront distorted norms of sexuality in which dominance and submission become entangled with and mistaken for the basis of intimate relations....

Of course, embracing these values too fully can create enormous barriers to meaningful interpersonal contact in the free world, preclude seeking appropriate help for one's problems, and a generalized unwillingness to trust others out of fear of exploitation. It can also lead to what appears to be impulsive overreaction, striking out at people in response to minimal provocation that occurs particularly with persons who have not been socialized into the norms of inmate culture in which the maintenance of interpersonal respect and personal space are so inviolate. Yet these things are often as much a part of the process of prisonization as adapting to the formal rules that are imposed in the institution, and they are as difficult to relinquish upon release (Haney, 2001, p. 11).

Recent studies emphasize, with special attention given to women, the end of a 'benevolent community' waiting for prisoners who re-enter society (MaDonna Rose, 2006). Even though Munn and Bruckert (2013) rarely use the word 'institutionalization', according to their study of Canadian ex-prisoners, the stigma associated with incarceration is kept alive by the attitudes engrained in prisoners when 'resettling' in community (Munn & Bruckert, 2013, p. 115). These attitudes, more than just psychological effects on individuals are collective consequences of their institutionalization. According to a study published by Prior (1993) on institutionalized mental health patients, moving to community has not necessarily disallowed institutionalization from happening (cited in Yuill, Crinson, & Duncan, 2011). As Yuill, Crinson and Duncan (2011) point out while commenting on Prior's work, institutionalization leaves a mark on individuals, in that they have been stigmatized by the framework of the legal system, a

kind of “us-them” dichotomy, which further leads to unrest and conflict with broader society and hinders the possibilities of reintegration.

4.4.2 ‘Us-them’ dichotomy as a cultural product

‘Us and them’ is a cultural product created by the legal system. It is part of prison culture in response to the institutionalization process—a code that remains in one’s psyche. ‘Us and them’ works for the staff and for the prisoners as well, with different consequences, as per the stigma attached to each one of these groups. According to Zimbardo (2007), in his recollection of the scandalous ‘Stanford Prison Experiment’, humans are vulnerable to subtle but powerful situational forces. These situational forces, typical from prison environments are subtle to:

Group pressures, authority symbols, dehumanization of others, imposed anonymity, dominant ideologies that enable spurious ends to justify immoral means, lack of surveillance, and other situational forces can work to transform even some of the best of us into Mr. Hyde monsters, without the benefit of Dr. Jekyll's chemical elixir (Zimbardo, 2007, p. 1).

The stigma associated with staff (condescending, highhanded, and mean) and prisoners (bitter, secretive, and untrustworthy) accompanies them when they return to community. The interactions among them in community tend to mirror the ‘superiority and righteousness’ of the staff, and the ‘inferiority, weakness, blameworthiness, and guilt’ of offenders (Goffman, 1961, p. 7).

When Scheff (2006) recently criticized Goffman’s approach to stigma, he developed a connection between shame, emotions and violence that could be applicable to stigmatized men feeling shame in Western societies. The first result is the suppression of emotions (Scheff, 2006, p. 114). This may lead to animosity and violence towards the ‘them’ that in Scheff’s (2006) view is identified as the ‘rejector’ (p. 125). Then, when conflict arises among offenders in community, this conflict exhibits similar characteristics to ethnic, cultural and identity-based forms of

conflict, where the framework ‘us and them’ is also present. This further creates ‘dyadic identities’ as Korostelina (2007) describes in her work addressing the correlation of ‘social identities’ and ‘conflicts’: “A dyadic identity develops when a person describes oneself in terms of a particular category and intensely engages in the corresponding interpersonal relations” (p. 84). This leads to a collective identity among staff, and in inmates outside of prison. A collective identity happens:

...when a person identifies himself or herself with a group, belongs to this group, shares its beliefs and values, follows its norms and customs, and shows loyalty and deep attachment to its goals and expectations. Thus, a person can be a member of an ethnic, religious, or national group, share a common history or expectations, fight for ingroup goals, and thus perceive the world in terms of group relationships (Korostelina, 2007, p. 84).

Moreover, when normative order and virtues are associated with one group and not with the other, a low axiological balance is shaped, which is often a source of violent conflict (Korostelina, 2007, p. 89). However, Berreby (2005) articulates that everyone can “make and remake” his/her own version every day with regards to the framework “us/them” (p. 331). In his words: “Human nature shaped that power, with its special opportunities and vulnerabilities, but it’s you who wield it. Your human-kind code makes nothing happen, for good or ill, unless you choose to act” (Berreby, 2005, p. 331). Scheff (2006) also sees the individual’s freedom in showing her/his vulnerabilities as a safety valve to avoid conflict. Consequently Scheff (2006) notes that in Western societies gratuitous hostility and violence in men emanates from “the particular emotional/relational configuration” (p. 161). He even describes a pattern that shows how suppressed emotions and silence produce violence. The challenge, then, is to provide an environment where this everyday re-shaping of the ‘us-them’ mindset and particular emotional configuration, produced and perpetuated by institutionalization, can change.

4.5 Practices of everyday life

Recently the sociological and political fields have witnessed a growing interest in addressing ‘practices of everyday life’ (De Certau, 1988). This interest has impacted PACS due to the failure of many traditional neoliberal approaches to achieve peace. This is the result of a failure to appreciate the often unnoticed work of resistance in small local communities during international peacekeeping and peacebuilding interventions (Richmond & Mitchell, 2012). Resistance is often seen in religious communities and in homes. This process presumes and produces citizen-subjects able to think about habitability and ecology; agents are able to valorize the ‘precious little’ in critical interventions. According to Michel De Certau (1988) “everyday practices or ‘ways of operating’ or doing things, no longer appear as merely the obscure background of social activity” (p. xi). For this reason it is necessary to articulate them “by penetrating this obscurity” with “a body of theoretical questions, methods, categories, and perspectives” (De Certau, 1988, p. xi).

In fact, De Certau (1998) critically opposes both the fragmentation of analytical and statistical approaches to social reality and the discourse based on the ideas of Foucault, who described how “the violence of order is transmuted into a disciplinary technology” (p. xiv). Instead, De Certau (1998) tries to “bring to light the clandestine forms taken by the dispersed, tactical, and make-shift creativity of groups or individuals already caught in the nets of ‘discipline’” (pp. xiv-xv). These groups or individuals re-appropriate the ‘product-system’ and become a source of ‘therapeutics for deteriorating social relations’ recognizable in the way they conduct everyday practices (De Certau, 1988, p. xxiv). These practices may describe:

A new form of conviviality ... organized within the circle of regulars, and thus perception becomes refined, then the critical judgment of viewers or listeners who return twenty times to an image, a fragment of a melody, who

repeat a sequence, dissect it, and end up penetrating its secrets (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 254).

According to De Certau (1998), practices of everyday life reveal three cultural facets. The first is aesthetic, “an everyday practice opens up a unique space within an imposed order, as does the poetic gesture that bends the use of common language to its own desire in a transforming reuse” (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 254). The second is polemical: “the everyday practice is relative to the power relations that structure the social field as well as the field of knowledge” (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 254). And the third is ethical:

...everyday practice patiently and tenaciously restores a space for play, an interval of freedom, a resistance to what is imposed (from a model, a system, or an order). To be able to do something is to establish distance, to defend the autonomy of what comes from one’s own personality (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 255).

Hence, it is necessary to take into serious account the experience of ‘dwelling’ and ‘mediation’ in everyday life. In the 21st century, this academic challenge has been taken up with special attention to the social environment by authors such as Feit and Wodarski (2004), or to the pedagogy of kitchen practices by Scicluna (2017), and on ‘home’ by authors such as Blunt and Dowling (2006), and Michael Allen Fox (2016).

4.6 Home and the importance of place, meaning and space

Home is an omnipresent theme in informal discussions, music, cinema, and literature (Gilman, 1972 [1903]). To avoid any misunderstanding regarding ‘home’, it is necessary to be precise about the meaning of such a ubiquitous word. Moreover, in order to establish the relationship between home and processes for the reintegration of former offenders into society, it is critical to offer a clear picture of what home means. For this reason, words associated with the term ‘home’, such as place, space and meaning, are defined and serve as a basis for discussing the impact of home on identity. Finally, a brief review of contemporary approaches regarding home

is offered to show how meaning, place and identity are intertwined in the idea and how the term is to be differentiated from two other concepts often associated with home; i.e., house and family (Fox, 2016).

Recent philosophical literature addresses the role of place, the difference between place and space, and the importance of the “elusive phenomenon of place”—to borrow from Heidegger and Bachelard (Casey, 2009). In his book, *Getting back into place*, Edward Casey (2009) articulates an exact and engaged analysis of place, including its philosophical consequences. In this work, he criticizes the modern self, for whom all places are essentially the same in that they are interchangeable. This uniformity has replaced the priority of place. Further, the modern self does not understand the role of place as having the power to direct, stabilize, memorialize and identify us. Instead, the ‘power’ that place can exercise on us is addressed as a pathology and estrangement (Casey, 2009, p. 38).

In the same line of criticism, Andermatt Conley (2012) brings to her work the heritage of space as a critical concept in the French philosophers (p. 2). She notes that these philosophers criticize the notion of space that comes from modern approaches to place. Instead of place as something fixed and measurable, space is seen as a production, invention, or area in between; a continuum in transition (Andermatt, 2012, p. 5). Thus, these philosophers share a sense of the precariousness of ‘condition’ and ‘conviction’ with regard to the notion of place.

Other authors in contemporary philosophy address the importance of place through the lens of experience. In 1945, Merleau-Ponty was the first to recognize the importance of the “spatial level” (Casey, 2009, p. 80). According to Casey’s reading of Derrida, horizon is always virtually present in every experience, for it is at once the unity and the incompleteness for that experience—the anticipated unity in every incompleteness (Casey, 2009, p. 62). Also, Casey

(2009) finds in his reading of Heidegger that “the relationship between man and space is none other than dwelling, strictly thought and spoken” (p. 109).

Regarding dwelling, recent French critical thinkers base their analyses on Heidegger’s phenomenological approach, which holds that only when we dwell can we build, and then picture and imagine (Andermatt, 2012, p. 6). Consequently, it is argued that ideas about place and space are preceded by an experience of dwelling. This is not necessarily applicable to the modern idea of space, which is measurable and then reduced to formulas and numbers (Andermatt, 2012).

In consequence, the priority of place is ontological in any effort to understand and find the meaning of any experience (Casey, 2009, p. 313). Hence, we must take into account the power of place, action and thought, feeling and expression (Casey, 2009, p. 341). Place becomes integral to everyday life in the world. This explains the recent development of spatial studies, which work towards the recognition of the formative presence of place in people’s lives and thought (Casey, 2009, p. xxi).

In these processes, home and neighbourhood become important as one of the closest circles of meaningful places in which the process is embedded. Home becomes “a place of rest, of food, warmth, safety, and belonging, a place to be our ‘real’ selves. Or so the story goes” (Gaard, 2007, p. 6). In fact, the localized forms of belonging and social connections, such as home and neighbourhood, are crucial for the satisfaction of needs and having a voice in everyday life (Jack, 2012). At home “the routines of daily life are connected to, and influenced by, global events and interactions, but they are perceived to be mediated in an environment that is private and largely beyond the control of others” (Perkins & Thorns, 2012, p. 88). Everyday life and place are strongly related when a house is called ‘home’.

4.6.1 Home, identity and belonging

The problematic relationship between home and identity is not a novelty of the 21st century academic literature. The use of the metaphor of home to characterize identity as “safe, unified and secured” was visited by feminist scholars at the end of the 1980’s, as they addressed home as a site for the oppression of women (Weir, 2008). In the fall of 1990, the New School of Social Research organized a multidisciplinary conference at New York University (Mack, 1993). The topics and perspectives were wide and further articulated the understanding of “home” in contemporary society. The basis of their assertions is found in Ralph Waldo Emerson and the transcendentalist movement of the mid-19th century. However, they softened the individualism present in that kind of approach. Indeed, even though the authors had the same prescient critique of the countervailing pressures of Emerson's society, they focused more on a communitarian and cultural manner.

These authors addressed home in a diverse way because they came from different backgrounds and disciplines such as anthropology, literature, history, politics, aesthetics, family studies and so on. This diversity shows the complexity of the idea of home and the difficulty of defining it solely through one perspective or discipline. It is necessary to listen to the many voices implied in the construction of the idea of home and also to distinguish its many references (Wright, 1993). That being said, certain adjectives are common in their descriptions. One of the formal relationships in common, regardless of the cultural and philosophical background of any society is the understanding of home as a place integral to everyday life and identity (Sarup, 2005).

At the same 1990 New York University conference, Kateb (1993) and Bromwich (1993) addressed ‘belonging’ as the opposite of ‘alienation’; i.e., it is a healthy functioning, socially

useful, self-understanding and self-esteem. Belonging brings about one's capacity to participate in a free act of sympathy, a feeling of an impersonal sort, without any expectation of reciprocal feeling—a "recognition of someone else under the rubric of a common humanity" (Bromwich, 1993, p. 139). This resembles what Michel De Certeau (1988) says about the "ethical" component in everyday life (p. 255). Home becomes a place of personalization against institutionalization.

The life of one person is more valuable than any structure or idea. Ideas and structures contradicting the value of each person's life and supporting stigma and segregation are then protested at home, as has been pointed out in the work of bell hooks (1990). In *Homeplace, a site of resistance* (1990) hooks invites the reader to approach racism, exclusion, detachment and segregation, through the narration and explanation of her own experience as a black girl in the 1960s. Through her insightful conversations with people from rural Kentucky, she addresses the importance of home as a community of care, where everyone can be a subject and love can be shown and exercised freely.

The simple task of greeting every neighbour on their porch provides, according to hooks (2009), an intimacy within the community, which humanizes despite a dehumanizing social framework. A simple everyday activity builds up a person's self-esteem, which does not come from a feeling of superiority but, rather, emanates through relationships (hooks, 2009). A community of belonging with the characteristics described above allows its members to escape from addictions because its members can conceive of themselves not just as victims but also as people who can exercise gratitude and love "around a table" (hooks, 2009). In this sense, as Douglas (1993) pointed out, there is a mixture of nostalgia and resistance when reflecting on home. More than a place, home is a pattern of regular doing, an embryonic community that

makes solidarity possible. Home is linked with “strategies that people adopt when they try to create solidarity” (Douglas, 1993, p. 262).

4.6.2 Home, family and house

According to Douglas (1993), as cited by Mallet (2004), home can also be seen as the place where domestic ‘communitarian practices’ are realized (p. 66). For this reason, home is located in space, but not necessarily a fixed space. It starts by bringing some space under control. Happiness and safety are not guaranteed, but institutionalized memory is capable of anticipating future events. The home determines its rhythms “in response to outside pressures” (Douglas, 1993, p. 268). In one sense, “home is the place for the realization of ideas” (Douglas, 1993, p. 264).

According to Douglas (1993) and Rykwert (1991) ‘home’ is different from ‘shelter’ and different from ‘house’. ‘House’ essentially means shelter, and implies edges, walls, doors, and roofs, and the whole repertory of the fabric. “Home requires no building”, even if a house always does (Rykwert, 1991, p. 50). Likewise, household is different than home. According to Rykwert (1991), eating and sleeping together have come to define the household (p. 47). Home has its own space and structure in time, and its own aesthetic and moral dimensions. It has its own ideas about fairness, related to the tasks at home, where nothing is meaningless. It is definitely “not-for-profit” (Douglas, 1993, p. 272). Home may simply be a space where people feel at ease and are able to express and fulfill their unique selves or identities (Mallet, 2004, p. 82). This allows home to become an inalienable source of identity.

In this same line of thought, home can also be perceived as a haven, providing a sense of place and belonging in an increasingly alienating world (Mallet, 2004). The idea is related not only to the design of the building where the haven is located, but also to the relationships that

provide that sense of belonging. Home is a place but it is also a space inhabited by family, people, things and belongings—a familiar, if not comfortable, space where particular activities and relationships are lived (Mallet, 2004, p. 63). Those who do not have this are said to be ‘home-less’. Home and homelessness exist in a dynamic, dialectical relationship (Mallet, 2004, p. 80).

According to Casey (2009), places are not only built for such obvious purposes as shelter, comfort, or prestige. They also foster experiences that appear purposeless at first glance (Casey, 2009, p. 121). Someone can feel at home right away in certain places, whereas in other places, a life time of residence might never lead to any comparable “sense of at-homeness” (Casey, 2009, p. 179). At home, people do not usually have to confront questions such as “where am I?”, or “Where is my next meal coming from?”, or “Do I have friends in the world?” (Casey, 2009, p. 121). Home is localized caring, “always somewhere in particular, somewhere in. The void is a limbo between past and future home” (Casey, 2009, p. 299). At home, life makes sense and inhabitants find meaning.

Home is also linked with emotions, as was stated recently by Jamieson and Simpson (2013) in their study of the increasing urban phenomenon of people living alone. Consequently, home is a ‘place’, but it is more than just a place. It is related to people who are often family, but not always, even though the relationship among those who share the place are always ‘familial’. Its idea evokes caring and solidarity. It becomes a place in which anyone can expect to be understood, a place where needs are addressed, and a milieu in which peace can be found and preserved. Valued relationships are pivotal in any definition of ‘home’. As Jamieson and Simpson (2013) state:

The types of personal relationships most valued by ‘locals’ who feel part of a community are not necessarily markedly different from those who feel no such

sense of community: for the majority of people, wherever they live, including 'the community local', their main sociability is with an inner circle of friends and kin. (p. 155).

This image applies to a small group to be sure, but is often used as an adjective for neighbourhoods, cities and even countries. Indeed, those addressing "homeland security" after the 9/11 attacks in New York City appropriated the term 'home' (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2014).

However, in addressing the question of violence, the role of home as it has been applied to small groups has been minimized; particularly in those studies that focus more accurately on the individual or on global society. Consequently, the meaning and the role of home in the life of those affected by, or who are perpetrators of, violence is neglected (Gellert, 1997). This point calls for a revision of the literature on how home has been treated by PACS. This revision needs to show how the idea of a place for care is related to peace, and in what way some authors stress the link between home and care, all sparked by the challenging and uncomfortably growing number of homeless persons in the world.

4.6.3 Home in the PACS literature

Broadly measured, a significant portion of the PACS literature is dedicated to international and ethnic conflicts. Understood as a multidisciplinary approach to addressing war and achieving long lasting world peace, many of these works focus on personal and structural processes in which violence can escalate or de-escalate. The idea of home is commonly associated with privacy and intimacy, and in this place conflicts are transformed or resolved in nonviolent ways. Conversely, conflict resolution, as a method, is developed to be mainly applicable in social and public settings, and not in the home. As an illustration of this point, in the early work of distinguished scholars and practitioners such as DeMott (1987), Jeong (2000, 2002, 2005),

Lederach (1995, 1997) , Galtung (1990), and Boulding (2000), the word ‘home’ is rarely mentioned, often only for naming the smallest place within the society where violence is found and should be prevented (also see Gellert, 1997).

This situation has changed in recent years, as the scope of PACS has expanded its interest to include interfamilial violence (Byrne & Senehi, 2012). This new reality demands multidisciplinary approaches due to the growing and pervasive effects of “violent homes” in society (Prothrow-Stith & Spivak, 2004; Kurst-Swanger & Petcosky, 2003; Morrison & Biehl, 1999). In addition, the changes in family due to the 21th century major social changes in the Western world (Heinemann, 2012), and the development of feminist approaches which address some traditional family dynamics as perpetrators of patriarchal oppression, demand a new way to frame community as a place where people may have a sense of belonging (hooks, 2009). Regardless of its composition or culturally-given structures, however, home refers to a place of care and compassion and an institution of meaning in the humanization of agents in conflict.

PACS scholars, in their research into political conflict and the role played by grassroots’ populations, routinely address home as a place where stories are collected. In such stories, the disruption, invasion and elimination of the privacy, control and constancy that a home provides are a consequence of living under political violence (Sousa, Kemp, & El-Zuhairi, 2014). In the aftermath of conflict, home is also a place for peace and care for refugees (Hammond, 2004; Boccagni, 2007). In North America, home is addressed in post-colonial and Aboriginal literature, which identifies the negative impact of colonial state policies on First Nations communities (Bussidor & Bilgen-Reinart, 2006) as well as highlighting the importance of context and space in peacemaking (Schirch, 2005). Accordingly, human beings miss ‘home’ “because it provides rituals, rhythms, and the sounds and pace which create an ‘oasis for peace’”

(Schirch, 2005, p. 67). The absence of ‘home’ or ‘homeland’ is the absence of a space where peace is attainable.

In addition, home becomes a place in which virtues of care and compassion are employed as people are no longer afraid to show their vulnerability. Accordingly, Muhl Nickel (2010) affirms that “vulnerability is constitutive of our biological kind but the social processes by which we develop virtues are pervasive” (p. 15). If individuals do not discover their own vulnerability, care cannot be exercised (Muhl Nickel, 2010). The role of the peacemaker is to transform vulnerability, so that what has heretofore been shameful becomes a source of pride (Muhl Nickel, 2010, p. 20). That being said, to exercise care also demands courage. Here courage is to be understood not in the sense of dominating another person as the militaristic approach suggests but as the ‘strengthening’ of others by “self-domination” and so a “courageous person endures the loneliness of isolation for the sake of correcting a wrong or rejecting the common wisdom to assert an unwelcomed truth” (Muhl Nickel, 2010, p. 21). Loneliness is one of the main characteristics of released offenders in community. This loneliness can be mitigated by the experience of home, as a place where care, mutual understanding and compassion are exercised to build peace.

4.7 Peacebuilding applied to the criminal justice system

The field of PACS has blurred borders and content, and it is also currently expanding its definitions. For this reason, according to Senehi (2015), one of the challenges for educators, academics and practitioners is to ‘discover themselves in PACS’, because often the composition of this multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary field is not clear (p. 10). One of the most popular ways of mapping the field of Peacebuilding, or PACS, is the ‘Strategic Peacebuilding Pathways’, a well-known pictorial graphic elaborated by Lederach and Mansfield (2010). This diagram has

an inner and an outer circle, which can be described as follows: The inner circle highlights the three major areas of strategic peacebuilding: 1) efforts to prevent, respond to, and transform violent conflict; 2) efforts to promote justice and healing; and 3) efforts to promote structural and institutional change. The outer circle highlights sub-areas of practice and career focus within those three areas (Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 2017).

4.7.1 Restorative justice

One of the PACS ‘sub-areas of practice’ is ‘restorative justice’, which is the only one that addresses the reality of prison and imprisonment, and advocates for prison system reform (Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, 2017). In fact, restorative justice is often seen as the application of peacebuilding approaches to the field of criminal justice, so as to ensure that justice will develop open, honest, more communicative and supportive relationships (Hurlbert & Greenbert, 2011). However, this perception does not sufficiently reflect the complexity of the relationship between restorative justice and peacebuilding as different disciplines within PACS. In fact, different approaches to justice—such as restorative, punitive and transitional—find themselves working alongside each other in pursuing peace in conflicted societies. Beyond that, restorative justice approaches are pervasive in all social sectors; such as family, school and communities.

The values and practices of restorative justice open up alternative approaches to the rehabilitation of former inmates. Even though restorative justice practices are not primarily designed to reduce repeating offences (Zehr, 2002), their new theoretical concern highlights the importance of new relationships and new identity, which in former offenders may counteract the causes of the current high rates of recidivism. In the existing mainstream criminal justice system, justice is conceived of as ‘retributive’ and ‘therapeutic’. In contrast, restorative justice is

based on traditional values and practices in which the needs of the victim are viewed as more important than the punishment of the offender, and the role of the community as more important than the role of the state in addressing crime (Johnstone, 2011). In this regard, the “offender” is expected to be more active in meeting the needs of victims, and in dealing with the harm caused to the community by his or her crime. Authors such as Johnstone (2011), Braithwaite and Braithwaite (2001), and Sullivan and Tifft (2005) advocate for a more active role for the offender in addressing shame and building community with others regarding rehabilitation.

According to Liebmann (2007), the principles of restorative justice emphasize the possibility of offenders ‘restoring’ their dignity and place in the community by taking responsibility for, and dialoguing about, what they have done. In this sense, restorative justice seeks to reframe the relationship between victim, offender, and community. In this new framework, the individual “learns” from his or her own experience and cooperates, as much as possible, in a process that seeks to heal those affected and, at the same time, hopes to reinforce accountability structures of the “natural community” (Braswell, Fuller, & Lozoff, 2001, p. 144).

Focusing on offender recidivism, restorative justice has developed two kinds of relationships with the criminal justice field. The first is about the impact of processes of restorative justice on rates of recidivism in offenders who have chosen this process (when the option is possible) instead of “traditional criminal justice mechanisms” (Strickland, 2004). The second has to do with the application of principles of restorative justice to an offender’s reintegration into society.

Regarding the first dimension, recent literature is not optimistic about the impact of restorative justice programs as an alternative to traditional criminal justice in reducing recidivism (Robinson & Shapland, 2008). To put it simply, more conferencing and rituals involving victims

and offenders, instead of court processes, do not necessarily reduce reoffending. According to Matthews (2006), the results are mixed, disappointing and far from convincing. However, Zehr (2002) argues that those practices are not meant to replace the legal system or build an alternative to incarceration, but are intended to address the needs and roles of all implicated in crime and wrongdoing such as victims, offenders and community.

The second, related dimension, applies the values of restorative justice to offenders already sentenced in the process of their re-entry into community. See, for example, the policies designed to complement or address the needs of offenders recently released and under probation (Sullivan & Tifft, 2005), known also as “rehabilitative programing” (Veysey, Christian, & Martinez, 2009). Here, “treatment or rehabilitation and reintegration can be distinguished” (Swanson, 2009, p. 173).

While rehabilitation or treatment still focuses on the individual and presumes that the other members of society will at least tolerate her or him, reintegration pursues the full acceptance of the individual within the community (Swanson, 2009). In this sense, the restorative approach recognizes the various levels of need and seeks “to reconnect offenders and victims with their respective communities in meaningful and satisfying ways” (Swanson, 2009, p. 179). Therefore, whenever programs and activities pursue the reintegration of offenders by addressing their needs and the restoration of their dignity and place in the community, by dialoguing about and learning from their wrongdoings, those practices belong to the restorative justice approach.

Klenowsky (2009), Mc Evoy and Newburn (2003), and Benson et al. (2011) stress the highly theoretical content of restorative justice in addressing philosophical and structural prolegomena while developing a new narrative of some successful practices of “peacemaking criminology” in diverse areas. However, with respect to released offenders, the situation has not

changed. In fact, current high rates of re-offending are not part of the authors' purview. They do not explicitly address how recidivism may be perpetuated by the adversarial frame (dyadic identity) between offender and community, an issue at the heart of restorative justice.

Nevertheless, the principles, ideas and concepts of restorative justice can inform new paradigms in addressing recidivism and the reintegration of former offenders into community. An illustration of this is the practice of storytelling in "peacemaking circles" as commonly practiced in Aboriginal communities (Pranis, Stuart, & Wedge, 2003). Also, peer support groups fit into this category, by 'treating everyone as having value no matter what they may have done', and working alongside the justice system to develop "honest, more communicative and supportive relationships" (Hurlbert & Greenbert, 2011).

Even though restorative justice practices and peacebuilding strategies share common values and goals, the differences between them are more than just a time frame. In fact, restorative justice practices are more occasional. Although they also seek to reframe relationships, the outcome of the practice, at least when it is institutionalized, can be mandated ultimately by the state entrusted with the monopoly of enforcement (Roach, 2006). By contrast, peacebuilding, designed primarily to address post-war situations, incorporates multiple actors, including the state, and allows for long term and continued intervention to achieve peace. This peace is conceived not as a one-time achievement, but as the ongoing building of a new identity and the transformation of relationships in the everyday life of those involved in conflict. In this way, any effort "to prevent, respond to, and transform violent conflict, promote justice and healing, and structural and institutional change" within the criminal justice system, or specifically among former offenders, can be part of peacebuilding pathways, labeled or not as

‘restorative justice practices’. This assertion is better understood when PACS categories and concepts are applied to understand the conflicted reality behind rates of recidivism.

4.7.2 Culture and conflict in offenders

The central role of culture in conflict is one of the most important ideas that PACS practitioners and academics have developed in their proposals for resolving social conflict (LeBaron, 2003, p. 4); a contribution relatively recent in history (Dubinskas, 1991). It is so, not because cultural causes of social conflict are new, but because recent technological advances in communication and transportation have made more frequent encounters of individuals and groups with cultural differences possible (Augsburger, 1992, p. 7). These encounters often result in conflict and have come to the attention of scholars in the PACS field.

Cultural applications have to be taken into consideration when addressing the conflict between former inmates and authority figures in society because they may be perceived by offenders as being ‘married’ to the ‘system’ due to the persistent presence of prison culture being transferred into the community. Miscommunication, lack of understanding, or ignorance of cultural and personal dynamicity, may perpetuate tension and conflict in released offenders. This conflict can even extend to the rest of a society through stereotyping. However, this provides an opportunity to maximize the use of identity-based conflict analysis. The tools offered by this analytical approach are also useful in helping released offenders to understand why socially constructed stigma is a major barrier in their process of reintegration (Leverentz, 2011). In fact, in everyday life, the ‘personal’ stigmatization of offenders in community becomes ‘political’ (Harris, 1991, p. 85). It perpetuates a ‘dyadic social identity’ (Korostelina, 2007), which is convenient for those who wield power in society, but risks the welfare and mental health of those most vulnerable groups or individuals who are frequently stigmatized.

One of the tools used to identify the causes of ethnopolitical conflict is the ‘social cubism analytical model’ (Byrne & Senehi, 2012, p. 140). This model considers the relationships among six social forces; namely, demographics, economics, history, politics, psychoculture and religion (Byrne & Senehi, 2012, p. 141). This approach provides a “multidimensional analytical model that considers how the relationships among the six social forces or factors are important in the understanding of the complex dynamics that fuel and drive ethnopolitical conflicts if a constructive, lasting peace is to be built” (Byrne & Senehi, 2012, p. 141).

Applying this tool to the local context, it is clear how psychological, political, economic and cultural factors are present in the conflict between offenders and the rest of the community in Winnipeg. It is worth noting that members of certain ethnic communities—for example First Nations, Metis, or immigrants—might have stronger ties to their historical and religious roots, which further influences how they participate in conflict. These variables can fuel the conflict both inside prison between inmates and staff, and outside the prison walls. Through the application of ‘social cubism’, it becomes increasingly clear how the particularities of conflict affect released offenders in community, and how this finds credence in the rates of recidivism in Manitoba.

4.7.3 Hybrid peace

According to Richmond and Mitchell (2012), “... hybrid forms of peace arise when the strategies, institutions and norms of international, largely liberal-democratic peacebuilding interventions collide with the everyday practices and agencies of local actors affected by conflict” (p.33). Even though this notion is created to assess how power is exercised within international peacebuilding, hybridity also can be applied in local peace systems since it “invites us to scrutinize the contents of categories and to be aware of the fluidity within categories. This

in itself is liberating, as many analyses of conflict, particularly those applied to deeply divided societies, rest on a broad labelling of whole communities” (Mac Ginty, 2012, p. 209). Indeed, “the concept of hybridity encourages a more holistic view of power, which contains both the formal and informal”—critical when communities are “excluded (or feel excluded) from the locus of formal power” (Mac Ginty, 2012, p. 210).

Therefore, the notion of hybrid peace is closely related to the study and understanding of practices of everyday life, in which the power exercised by a few is challenged by local and grassroots actors through the way they behave in every day life. In this new redistribution of power, peace becomes possible. In the case of the offenders in community, and following Mac Ginty’s insights, everyday practices can create a restructure in how power is exercised on them.

In fact:

... attentiveness to everyday life promises to uncover some of the unexpected forms of agency and ways of exercising it that may emerge at the interfaces formed by peacebuilding interventions. By identifying the everyday as a realm of enhanced quality of life, these approaches suggest that there is something qualitatively distinct about the space, practices and ethics of the everyday in contrast to those of more abstract realms (Richmond & Mitchell, 2012, p. 21).

This contrast between “more abstract realms” (on which the legal system is built) and “spaces, practices and ethics” toward peace, demands an understanding of the everyday life in which practices of integrative power are implemented. In fact, when integrative power is practiced, it communicates appealing images of the future in an effort to persuade other people that these are valid, despite other discourses (Boulding K., 1990, p. 122). Everyday practices show that every form of peace “is unique, dynamic, contextualized and contested” (Richmond & Mitchell, 2012, p. 33). However, “more abstract realms” set aside everyday practices of peace by labeling them as a “utopian experiment” (Boulding E., 2000, p. 87).

4.7.4 Narrative Approaches

According to Senehi (2009), storytelling is an innovative intervention or methodology in peacebuilding and conflict resolution. This intervention method is based on the importance of narratives in shaping cultural attitudes about how groups and individuals address conflict. Storytelling is a “universal experience” that is related to the truth, meanings and intentions of the participants, no matter what the sources, media, situations and audiences in which stories are told (p. 202). For this reason, participants can readdress their condition through storytelling, raise awareness about the structures that have led them into conflict, and even serve as a resource for transmitting new understandings; further giving way to a more peaceful movement into society. It is also recognized as a source of healing (Palmary, Clacherty, Núñez, & Ndlovu, 2015).

Based on Foucault’s idea that discourses may serve power within society, as long as the power is shared (Senehi, 2009, p.203), storytelling is accessible to everyone. However, destructive stories may bring with them stereotypes that jeopardize the identity and mutual recognition of the groups involved in conflict (p. 204). So, regarding identity, storytellers with their intention of building peace have to balance the different experiences, world views and meanings brought about in those stories and channel them in order to gain mutual recognition and respect (p. 205). Yet sharing stories also fuels emotions and may even perpetuate hatred and antagonism. Hence, storytelling confronts the dilemma of how to comprehend these emotions and to learn from them without being stalemated by ‘strong feelings’ (p. 206).

Storytelling must also face the morality that underlies any story. In the underpinnings of any story, religion, values and world views play a somewhat conflicted double role. On the one hand, they rationalize discrimination and rejection; yet, on the other hand, they advocate for higher values, typically connected to unselfish behaviour. For this reason, dealing with the

different perceptions and cultural values shaping stories becomes problematic. Thus, storytelling may help any particular dynamic situation in order for the participant to discover non-prescriptive ways to embrace values that support a more peaceful life (p. 207). Stories play a vital role in conflict resolution or transformation processes, peace education, violence prevention and community empowerment (p. 210).

The storytelling process can counteract the effects of prescriptive approaches to a parolee's conflicted identity and help to humanize the process of their transformation; not just into "law-abiding citizens", but into full and active members of the community. Narrative Therapy researchers Cade D. Mansfield, Kate C. McLean and Jennifer P. Lilgendahl (2010) have recently exposed how individuals are able to process their 'difficult times in life' through storytelling by linking those events to the self in creative ways; an experience "especially important to self development and to well-being" (Mansfield et al., 2010, p. 249). Stories inside and outside of prison can provide offenders with an alternative mechanism to deal with the labels that society, law, officers, and professional treatment providers place on them.

Emotion is a reliable indicator of how a person deals with really significant issues in the shape of identity. Studies concerning the strong relationship between one's identity and emotions are abundant. Ultimately, one's personal identity is characterized by how and what leads one to express emotions. Emotional management is a topic that has many new approaches and followers, most probably because emotions are part of everyday experiences and connected to the human pursuit of happiness. As stated by Aubrie Horrocks and Jamie L. Callahan (2006), "defining emotions and understanding how it affects us all, is crucial to success for both individuals and for society as a whole" (p.6).

This understanding and delineation of emotion is decisive for success in rehabilitation, because released offenders need to construct a new identity in order to become fully resettled into society. Moreover, “the importance of emotion within the process of identity creation is apparent when concepts are specifically applied to a variety of social contexts and structures” (p.71). Parolees, upon release from prison, are immediately confronted with a new social context and structures. This challenge presupposes the taking on of a new identity. According to Horrocks and Callahan (2006):

Identities are created and maintained through communication and interaction, resulting in a structure that allows individuals to feel comfortable, confident and safe in sharing their thoughts and experiences, while substantiating functionality and productivity. Through expression, we are valued and respected in both the public and private arenas of our lives (p. 71).

Parolees need to display this new identity; one of willingness and readiness to re-enter society. They must learn how to manage their emotions effectively, and also with whom and where to communicate these emotions (p. 71). Although it is indispensable for parolees to manage their emotions ‘appropriately’ in front of correctional service officers, this ‘qualified’ assessment is clearly not enough. Rates of recidivism may in fact indicate that the place in which a ‘new identity’ is actually forged and emotions managed, is not just the medical or parole office but where parolees share their ordinary lives; those places where conversations take place, work is shared in community, new stories emerge, and fuelled emotions are understood without prejudice but truly heard. If parolees and other people in rehabilitation are empathically heard and supported in the recognition and acceptance of the emotions produced by their stories, according to Carl Rogers (1940 [1992]), “healing is possible” (pp. 163-164).

Parolee’s ideas that come with feelings and emotions expressed in everyday communication and storytelling start to build a sense of “who I am” through this private

experience, that can be complemented with what is said by other agencies in that process. Hence, “interactions influence our thoughts and, likewise, our thoughts influence our behaviour. It is this cyclical process, influenced by emotion, which builds an identity.” (Horrocks & Callahan, 2006, p. 73). Authenticity and functionality in the individual:

... is produced through balancing emotion management with identity management, maintaining it all through story telling. The way we communicate our emotions builds a history of identity, and we can rely on this history of experience to determine an individualized balance of authentic expression (Horrocks & Callahan, 2006, p. 73)

Based on this same idea, Mariana Souto-Manning (2014) considers the importance of conversational narratives in identity building and behavioural changes. Through conversational narratives, individuals can question their realities, identify the influences that have brought them to the situation they are currently facing and an understanding of how their worldviews were conceived and the role they played *vis a vis* systemic and institutional discourses (Souto-Manning, 2014, p. 3).

More in depth narrative therapists “believe that people give meaning to their lives and relationships through stories” (Combs & Friedman, 2012, p. 1034). Based on Michel Foucault’s (1977) concept of power, in narrative therapy:

... even in the most disempowered of lives, there is always lived experience that is obscured when we measure those lives against abstract, universalized norms. Narrative therapists seek to continually develop ways of thinking and working that bring forth the stories of specific people in specific contexts so that they can lay claim to and inhabit preferred possibilities for their lives (cited in Combs & Freedman, 2012, p.1039).

Also, narrative therapy addresses identity as a fluid matter within people’s relationships. All persons are performers of their own story and have the task to merge and add meaning to all the stories distributed in the many places they act. Although parolees are permanently confronted by institutional and abstract discourse, through conversational narratives they can discover a

more authentic expression of themselves. This task should be confronted every day, in spite of the stereotypes, strategies or “vulnerability armor” they might have developed for self-protection or ‘combating shame’ during their incarceration (Brown, 2012). It is in the telling of their stories, their expression of their emotions, and in the presence of a concerned other, that their stories are heard and new identities emerge and flourish.

4.7.5 Lederach’s moral imagination

Lederach (2005) defined peacebuilding, as an “enormously complex endeavor in the extremely complex, dynamic, and more often than not destructive settings of violence” (p. 33). Creativity becomes the great challenge of peacebuilding in responding to patterns of self-perpetuating violence “in a complex system made up of multiple actors, with activities that are happening at the same time” (Lederach, 2005, p. 33). The core “essences” of peacebuilding are (1) the centralities of relationship, (2) the practice of paradoxical curiosity, and (3) the provision of space for the creative act and the willingness to risk. With regards to the centrality of relationships, breaking violence requires that people embrace a more fundamental truth: who we have been, are, and will become, emerges and shapes itself in a context of relational interdependency. A second and equally important attitude that emerges from the centrality of relationship is found in an act of simple humility and self-recognition. While the justification of violent response has many sources, the “moral imagination” that rises beyond violence has two: taking personal responsibility and acknowledging relational mutuality (Lederach, 2005, pp. 34-35).

In paradoxical curiosity, Lederach speaks of moral imagination as being built on a quality of interaction with reality that respects complexity and refuses to fall into forced containers of dualism and either-or categories. Even though released, offenders in community often find

themselves trapped in their prison culture, and dyadic identity (us/them) as they struggle with the stigma that considers them useless or harmful to the rest of society (Winnick & Bodkin, 2008).

Paradoxical curiosity is indeed “the *cura* that attends to and takes care of the health of greater humanity” (Lederach, 2005, p. 37). If this “greater humanity” is fully experienced at home, even in little moments, it can be manifested to the rest of the society. Subsequently, in the provision of space for the creative act, inventiveness moves beyond what exists toward something new and unexpected while rising from and speaking to the everyday. According to Pink (2012), everyday life is a context of human creativity, innovation and change, and a site where processes towards a sustainable future might be initiated and nurtured. It also “involves sets of practices and processes that are inevitably both experiential at a personal level, embodied and social as well as political and intended to lead to forms of change” (Pink, 2012, p. 5). Providing space requires a predisposition, a kind of attitude and perspective that opens up, even invokes, the spirit and belief that creativity is humanly possible (Lederach, 2005, p. 38). In Lederach’s experience, people who face the worst situations of human degradation, violence, and abuse often see the challenge of genuine constructive change with piercing vision (Lederach, 2005, p. 42). This vision, required for creativity, is realized in released offenders who not only have committed a crime but have also survived the harmful process of incarceration.

Finally, there is the whole question of one’s willingness to risk. Risking involves stepping into the unknown without any guarantee of success or even safety. “Risk by its very nature is mysterious. It is mystery lived, for it ventures into lands that are not controlled or charted” (Lederach, 2005, p. 39). Constructive social change requires risk, in order to build the social fabric, relationships, and relational spaces (Lederach, 2005, p. 76). In addition, beyond this intuition, it is important to look at the relationship between places, risk, vocation and

vulnerability. In fact, the builder of peace is vulnerable when she or he risks stepping into unknown and unpredictable territory. To go there, practitioners or researchers should seek “constructive engagement with the people and things that inhabit those places in terms of dwelling” (Mallet, 2004, p. 83), despite misunderstanding and fear. Only from there, is it more feasible to “find a way back to humanity” and “the building of genuine community” (Lederach, 2005, p. 173).

4.7.6 Home, vulnerability and conflict transformation

Home is not a “utopian” ideal. In fact, the experience of home, as much as it is a common experience, becomes an institution present in all societies and extends beyond all cultures. It provides meaning to recognized practices. Home provides an experience where its members establish their own relationships, allowing words, actions and behaviours to have their own unique associations and specific meanings. Commonly, this happens in the early stages of life. However, it can happen later on, as in the case when released offenders come together consciously to build a home for readdressing their identity in society and forging solidarity. This is possible, according to Descombes (2014), because beyond impersonal thoughts and reflexive personal thoughts, there is a class of “social thoughts” (p. 333), in which people can think about society as a whole, without falling into the atomist assumptions of psychology and cognitivism within human sciences, which deny the possibility of relationships among different subjective minds (p. xvii). Descombes’ theory about ‘institutions of meaning’ alerts us to the way in which researchers and practitioners discern meaning in a given social activity, including peacebuilding and conflict resolution practices. Also, it invites us to be open to new ways of understanding the relationship between institutions and human freedom.

Understanding the relationship between institutions and human freedom by paying attention to everyday practices, challenges the thoughts of Michel Foucault (1977) and his idea of “dynamic nominalism”, which has been very influential in PACS. According to Foucault, concepts are held to be pure human creations destined to serve certain needs (Descombes, 2014, p. 45). Hacking (1986) criticizes this because, within any academic discipline, word and object can be distinguished from one another, which is also the case in ‘intentional’ changes and ‘real’ ones. To maintain Foucault’s (1977) nominalism would be to give the authors of a discourse a strange ‘demiurgic’ power over people’s conduct by putting into circulation classifications and symptoms that can thereafter be taken up by the general public, such as the discourse about the phenomena of madness and criminal conduct (Descombes, 2014, p. 46). Hence, this “destructive narrative” (Senehi, 2009) about madness and criminal conduct and its authors can be counteracted in another social or spiritual institution, such as home, where another meaning can be found and liberation can be achieved by individuals, despite other discourses or rules. This liberation is understood in terms of full realization of one’s vocation as a human being, which is found in the human meaning that everyday practice provides to offenders. This practice is exercised in a place where everyone can realize their own vulnerability, and thereby become the subjects and agents of care for themselves and others. Home is at the centre of human existence, “the essence of who we are and our location in the world” (Pink, 2012, p. 143). This process presumes and produces citizen-subjects, able to think about habitability and valorize the ‘precious little’ in critical interventions (Andermatt, 2012, p. 153).

This elected conviviality prevents, in fact, the current phenomenon of social ‘disengagement’. According to Brene Brown, “disengagement is the issue underlying the majority of the problems [seen] in families, school, communities, and organizations” (2012, p.

176). She finds the key to changing these situations in the courage to be vulnerable (Brown B., 2012, p. 238). Vulnerability demands courage and truth, which are always uncomfortable, but never a sign of weakness (Brown B., 2012, p. 37). Often, these notions are addressed in the work of religious practitioners with offenders.

4.7.7 Religion in the reintegration of released offenders

In the western world, religion has always been linked with crime prevention, prison and rehabilitation (Lages Ribeiro & de Souza Minayo, 2013). However, the institutional role of religion often ends as the offender is released into the community. The high rates of recidivism have justified an extension of the scope of offender rehabilitation research into the process of reintegration, by adding their experiences in community after they are released. One of the factors that have attracted the attention of researchers and academics in this area is the impact of religion and faith-based programs on the process of reinsertion into community (O'Connor, 2002; Olfa Mandhouj, Aubin, Amirouche, Perroud, & Huguelet, 2014).

It is of interest that Canada, during the 1980's, became a pioneer in this area with the establishment of "community chaplaincies". Similar programs were later incorporated into chaplaincies in England and Wales (Whitehead, 2011, p. 28). Johnson (2004) distinguishes three ways of understanding religion when researching its role in society: intentional, organic and ecological (p. 330). When the religious intervention is "designed to address some problem area", it is intentional (Johnson, 2004, p. 332). "In relationship to crime and delinquency, certain religious or spiritual interventions come to mind: faith-based drug treatment, conversion-based offender rehabilitation programs, spiritual restorative justice programs, and church-based gang intervention strategies" (Johnson, 2004, p. 332).

Organic religion, in contrast:

... provides a conceptual way to think about research that examines the relationship between measures of religiosity (e.g., attendance, activities, and other commitments) and measures of deviance (e.g., delinquency, drug use, or violent crime). It represents the influence of religion practiced over time, such as being raised and nurtured in a religious home. Religious activities, involvements, practices, and beliefs, therefore, tend to be very much a part of everyday life (Johnson, 2004, p. 331)

Finally, ecological religion “refers to the impact religion might have on people who may not be religious at all, are unlikely to attend religious services, or participate in religious activities, but are still exposed to the possible influence of religion” (Johnson, 2004, p. 330). In his study of religion’s influence on released offenders, Johnson (2004) declares that studies have focused more on organic than intentional or ecological religion. In fact, only a few scholars have studied the impact of ecological religion on recidivism.

In addressing the ‘religion-offender-rehabilitation’ relationship, Johnson (2004), along with other studies, concludes that the impact of intentional religion on rehabilitation is low. Even though Johnson (2004), in his study on the participation of offenders in faith-based initiatives, such as *Prison Fellowship*, shows no significant impact in long-term recidivism, he still advocates for a greater ‘organic’ presence of religion in the community for supporting released offenders who are in the process of reintegration into the community. Indeed, “organic religion” has proven to be successful in crime prevention and rehabilitation, especially when religiosity is combined with “shame” (Jensen & Gibbons, 2002, p. 223). Then, it is important to comprehend “how organic and intentional religion might be related to one another, and how, if at all, either is related to issues like offender rehabilitation, inmate adjustment, and prisoner re-entry” (Johnson, 2004, p. 352).

Some organic religious studies that link religiosity and shame, often focus only on the individual. This is also true of similar studies concerning the prevention of suicide, in which

religiosity is addressed as a psychological factor of deterrence (Joshi & Billick, 2017). Without question, further study needs to include the impact of religion as ‘community bonding’ because the more the religious community is involved in helping to resolve basic needs, the greater the probabilities of success for released offenders’ re-entry into society (Roberts & Stacer, 2016, p. 479). A study made by Cox and Matthews (2007) has likewise demonstrated how pro-social relationships, which are highly valued by participants in the faith-based approaches for juveniles, rather than individual religiousness, reduce a youth's likelihood of delinquency (p. 36).

In this context, Whitehead (2011) advocates for a return of religion in an ‘organic way’ rather than an ‘intentional way’, the latter of which seems to be focused on the individual and not on small community relationships. It is these relationships, which forge trust with others and are highly influential in ensuring offenders success upon leaving prison. According to Whitehead (2011), community chaplaincy should “provide supportive relationships within a pro-social context to people leaving prison, and ... draw attention to the unpropitious economic environment into which they will be released” (p. 27). That being said, the work of ‘community chaplains’ should not be restricted solely to providing rituals or teaching doctrine, but should include their efforts to provide concrete supportive and pro-social relationships, which can take the shape of a community of support around or with the released offender.

4.7.8 Intentional communities

Theoretical discussions about community “can be traced back as early as Plato and Aristotle” (Leung, 2018, p. 6). The term ‘intentional community’ has been more recently used within the academic literature and is often associated with faith-based initiatives. Some authors link intentional communities with wide social processes, such as a cultural movement in opposition to “individualistic urban culture” (Guzman Bouvard, 1975) or the renewal of

churches (Steward, 2013). Others have narrower goals, such as personal growth and spiritual development (Smith, 1994). Recently, anthropologists and architects have used the term to identify alternative communal lifestyles, such as “eco-villages” (Christian & Adams, 2003). Meijering, Huigen and Van Hoven (2007) list their understanding of intentional communities, as follows:

1. No bonds by familial relationships only.
2. A minimum of three to five adult members.
3. Members join voluntarily.
4. Geographical and psychological separation from mainstream society.
5. A common ideology that is adhered to by all members.
6. Sharing of (a part of) one’s property.
7. The interest of the Group prevails over individual interests (p. 42).

According to the *Fellowship of Intentional Community*, Canada has 84 self-identified intentional communities, most of them faith-based, which provide housing and an alternative lifestyle in both urban and rural settings. In Manitoba, examples of this kind of community are *Flatlanders Inn* and *Twelve Tribes Community in Winnipeg* (Fellowship of Intentional Community, 2016).

However, facilities which offer care and healing to the elderly or disabled have also come to be known as Intentional Communities (Berdes, 2005). The following is a list of examples of this kind of intentional community in Canada: *Rougemont Cooperative* in Durhan Region ON, *Camphill Villages or Communities* and *L’Arche* (Saskatoon Housing Initiatives Partnership and Saskatchewan Association for Community Living, 2000, pp. 13-14). In the opinion of the Canada Housing and Mortgage Corporation (CHMC), (2000):

What sets the intentional community apart from other housing options is the shared vision between community members in regard to the community values. Typically, intentional communities stress the need for inclusion of all community members within governance and decision making processes (Saskatoon Housing Initiatives Partnership and Saskatchewan Association for Community Living, 2000, p. 5).

These initiatives are also experienced in ‘houses of hospitality’ within religious communities. The term ‘hospitality’, as a value and practice, has a long history. Hospitality has received renewed attention due to the current rate of massive human migration. Welcoming a stranger and providing shelter to those in need are central to the teachings of world religions. This view is at the centre of work towards social justice within churches, like the Roman Catholic Church, that is committed to offer genuine hospitality, which “must promote both the common good (the good understood collectively) and the good of each person (the good understood distributively)” (Pineda, 2012, p. 308).

In the US, the well-known social justice activist and founder of The Catholic Worker newspaper, Dorothy Day, established houses of hospitality. As Presbey (2014) notes, in those places, the ‘guest’ was received without any expectation of “rehabilitation” (pp. 25-26). Houses of hospitality were conceived of more for the workers, so that they would have an opportunity of being merciful and compassionate towards the guest. Deines (2008) summarized the five characteristics of these houses which, according to Murray (1990), are influenced strongly by Emmanuel Mounier’s (1952) ‘personalism’—a philosophy developed within the Roman Catholic Church. The characteristics are as follows: inherent dignity of members, individuals are simultaneously wounded and wounded healers, few written rules to ensure safety, everybody works together every day, and everyone assumes personal responsibility in promoting social change (Deines, 2008, p. 437).

Inspired by these very initiatives, the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) in Spain founded and sponsored more than 15 “communities of hospitality” in order to receive those living on the margins of society. The Jesuits identified five characteristics of these communities: (1) to share life in proximity to the most vulnerable and excluded, (2) a welcoming and inclusive communal

lifestyle, (3) an open way through mutual listening and shared learning, (4) the importance of reconciliation, healing, discernment and celebration in these communities, and (5) an invitation to be witnesses of hope (Jesuitas Social, 2015).

Interestingly enough, this kind of peacebuilding—religious in nature, spiritually focused, and emanating from grassroots communities—has been underestimated in PACS, according to Mac Ginty (2013). He goes so far as to warn of the danger to giving credibility only to institutionalized and professionalized peacebuilding initiatives:

While institutions, large and small, do have a crucial role to play in peacebuilding, ultimately it is people who experience peace and conflict in their homes, workplaces, schools and everyday lives. There is a danger that the professionalisation of peacebuilding gives too much authority to ‘experts’ and ‘peacebuilding professionals’. It is often individuals, families and communities who have to do the ‘heavy lifting’ of peacebuilding by learning to live with their neighbour from another religious group or learning to work alongside someone who shares very different political views. This everyday tolerance and diplomacy is hugely overlooked in the peacebuilding literature (Mac Ginty, 2013, p. 6).

It is through the effort of these local grassroots communities, work done in ‘lowercase’ letters and without headlines in newspapers, which forges peace (Gonzalez Buelta, 2015). Unfortunately, as prolific as this work may be, it can still be threatened by individualisation and consumerism (Gauthier, Woodhead, & Martikainen, 2013). This poses a challenge to religious communities, as they resist the imposition of a utilitarian value-system on people (Montemaggi, 2013).

The work of religious peacebuilders in the modern era must also address the challenges presented by fundamentalism, according to PACS academics and practitioners (Carter & Smith, 2004). For Green (2003), fundamentalism happens within communities when they lack deep human relationships. So, for the sake of their self-determination, a “particularistic and prescriptive narrative” erupts for forging common identification and filling the “emotional” void

(Green, 2003, p. 3). This narrative provides and maintains the basis for common rights, a common past—expressed in myths, shared legal duties, and a common economy, culture and territory (Green, 2003, p. 6). At the same time, this narrative could justify intolerance to those outside the “boundaries” of the community. For this reason, Green (2003) advocates for a critical attitude in distinguishing imposition and resistance in which the voices in the margins of the community have to be heard. By listening in everyday life to those voices, deep human relationships among communities can be restored and the fundamentalist discourse will not find any “emotional” void to fill (Callahan & Elliot, 1996). This has happened, for example, with Dorothy Day’s communities of hospitality in the US (Day, 1997), and it is the hope for other initiatives such as the *Peaceline Ecumenical Communities* (Power, 2007a; 2007b), *Nation of Islam* (SpearIt, 2012, p. 512) and organizations like *Homeboys Industries* (Boyle, 2010). Civil society voluntary organizations, like these, provide spaces in which “many people connect with one another in activities that enrich their spirits: All can be crucial in healing, creating community, giving back and teaching” (SpearIt, 2012, p. 514).

4.8 Conclusion

The variety of sources in this literature review illustrates the importance of having a multidisciplinary approach in addressing the situation of offenders in community and evaluating the impact of a place like Quixote House in their reinsertion into society. As was addressed above, the lack of appropriate housing is clearly one of the structural factors that contribute to homelessness and violence, thereby hindering the reinsertion of offenders after incarceration (Leverentz, 2011). As housing is intertwined with the relational barriers in offender’s rehabilitation, it is important to ask whether the home provides a place for building constructive and positive relationships in the community. From a relational perspective, offenders often

perceive Halfway Houses as a mere extension of prison in community (Edwards & Mottarella, 2015). Is this true or not?

While major offender stigmatization has been recognized recently as a substantial contributor to criminal deterrence (Mungan, 2017), it also has the repercussion of creating a ‘badge of shame’ in convicted offenders. The ‘us-them’ dichotomy existing in correctional centres continues to haunt offenders, even in community. The stigma barrier preventing change in offenders can be reduced when their everyday life practices become community-oriented (Bakken, DeCamp, & Visser, 2014). The literature shows how shared living in community creates a home-like environment and further points to the importance of this kind of ‘home’ in readdressing the identity of those who would live in it.

The research studied in this chapter highlighted the role of the third sector in providing the space for this home-like environment, since the State (Correctional) and business sectors are not in a position to provide these specific relationships in everyday life. In recent years—even in Canada—the voluntary sector has been seriously limited in its capacity to change policy and to promote peacebuilding (Levasseur, 2015). Hence, opportunities to apply peacebuilding to the criminal justice system, such as restorative justice interventions, have been affected by these shrinking efforts via civil society organizations. Only those initiatives sponsored by the state or incorporated into its system have had some chance of continuity and support (Roach, 2006; Aertsen, Daems, & Robert, 2006). In contrast, initiatives emanating solely from the third sector, and specifically from faith-based organizations, have been poorly studied and often remain exceptional or even marginalized in studies addressing the path of reinsertion of Canadian offenders into society (Munn & Bruckert, 2013).

Chapter 5 - Research Methodology

5.1 Introduction

This qualitative study focuses on how peacebuilding approaches practiced in ordinary everyday life can build a home for former offenders and reduce the possibility of their re-offending.

Accordingly, the research methodology should take into account the specific situation of released offenders in society, and the study of space and the everyday practices in which they have been immersed at Quixote House. I began by interviewing people knowledgeable about the creation and functioning of Quixote House to listen to their perceptions, experiences and ideas about the impact of this house on the reinsertion of offenders into society after incarceration.

I conducted 19 semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions to collect the stories of people directly involved with the house; such as residents, founders and correctional officers. I also kept a journal in which I took copious notes about my own experience of living in the house. Inductively, I analyzed all of this data and found some commonalities, which sparked interesting insights about the importance of a ‘home’ for the reinsertion of offenders into society. This chapter describes how the research was conducted and completed. It also includes a description of the people interviewed, how ethical and confidentiality concerns were handled, as well as how the data was analyzed and used in this study.

5.2 Qualitative research strategy

The research is based primarily on the shared experiences and aspirations of the people involved with Quixote House. The study is limited to the house, and how the people involved in its creation and functioning perceive it. The research, therefore, emerges as a detailed case study in which qualitative methods provide the main source of data. Hence, the research methodology

takes into account the specific situation of released offenders in society, and the study of the space and everyday practices in which they have been immersed at Quixote House.

The methodologies and instruments of this research reflect the goals and principles of Participatory Action Research (PAR), that is to say “participation/*vivencia*, action/*praxis* and research/*concientization*” (Glassman & Erdem, 2014, p. 212). According to Richmond and Mitchell (2012), the study of space and everyday practices in PACS “requires a major methodological shift, which is needed to enable us to see and account for the everyday in the discipline” (p. 27). This inquiry is also about a supportive place, Quixote House, where I have lived for the last six years. The methodology and the questions posed to participants reflect the importance of examining the effects of meaning making in ordinary daily activities. Instead of focusing on the efficacy of programs or extraordinary activities, questions and research were oriented to ensure a close analysis *in situ* of the daily practices of participants as individuals struggling to live together in a common space, because they are “key to understanding the productive elements of the spatial” (Kuntz, 2010, p. 150).

The main sources for studying the practices, dynamics and the relationships built in this house in everyday life are its residents, including myself. Those who have been in prison and have faced the struggle of reintegrating into society after incarceration were the primary source of information. This data was compared and contrasted with my own knowledge, as well as the data coming from parole officers, and both founders of the house. For these reasons, this qualitative study combines hegemonic and “counter-hegemonic approaches to knowledge production” (Kendon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007, p. 9). For this qualitative study, I made the conscious decision to conduct my research according to PAR methodologies and principles.

5.2.1 PAR methodology and Quixote House

In PAR, participation is understood as *vivencia*, a Spanish word that refers to an immediate experience of the ‘life world’. In this regard, for six years, I observed, felt, lived, and shared the conditions of the people affected by the ongoing action under study. I have lived under the same conditions and shared the same context as those who are the source of data and other stakeholders in the dialogue promoted by this methodology. However, my housemates only knew me as a researcher after the approval of my book proposal in December 2015. Since then, I became more conscious of the practice of ideas in participants and I tried not to impose my own ideas on the ongoing action and *vivencia* under study. This required that I withdraw, to a certain degree, from some of the ongoing activities at Quixote House.

In fact, my main contribution in the house was listening, which I believe sharpened my capacity to reflect critically about the situation of the offenders residing in the house. Often, it was hard for me to identify my co-residents and some of my interviewees as ‘marginalized’ or ‘oppressed’, especially when some of them deliberately rejected the aid given by others, since much of this help was not given ‘in the way they wanted it’. However, PAR provided a continuous learning process through which the researcher and those ‘marginalized’ developed together an action that reflected, not just my ideas, but also those coming from other participants in the research. PAR transformed and enhanced my capabilities as an agent of social and personal change as well as many of the participants in this research. This insight, emerging from the application of PAR methodologies, was possible when the participants and I were able to look at ourselves as ‘residents or former residents of Quixote House’. The place connected us and made us members of the same community of interest. Hence, Otter, Bear, Moose, Ram, Fox,

Squirrel, Rabbit, Tiger, Lion, Panther and Wolf are the “community of interest” in this research; that is “people with similar experience or shared problems” (Barnsley & Ellis, 1992, p. 10).

Even though the participants shared many experiences, places and stories, I focused my research on those pertaining exclusively to Quixote House. The lived experience of this house after incarceration was the ‘similar or shared situation’ that assisted in narrowing the object of study and conversation during the process of data gathering. Hence, every interview referred to the same place and circumstances. Shared narratives improved perspectives on the significance of this house as a place but also as a set of relationships. All of the interviews were analyzed and codified to construct the case study of Quixote House.

5.3 Geographic location of the study

Quixote House is located on one of the side streets in Winnipeg’s West End and the study is focused on the situation of released offenders in this area of Winnipeg. Community Corrections even restricts the perimeter of released offenders during their time of parole or, at least, in the first months of ‘stat release’ (release of offenders without parole). They have to reside in Winnipeg even when their families or friends are located in other areas of Manitoba. Furthermore, the study is focused on the relationships and dynamics that occur at Quixote House.

Although the officers of CSC that I interviewed have federal jurisdiction, their competence and activities are restricted to the area of Winnipeg, Manitoba. This restriction makes them specialists in the particularities of Manitoba’s released offenders, which differ from those of offenders in other areas of Canada. Winnipeg, in fact, provides unique challenges around the way in which the larger urban community has received offenders.

All released offenders and ex-offenders interviewed have in common their experience of living at Quixote House. The interview questions focused on this place and their residency.

However, when recruited, some had moved from Winnipeg to other provinces in Canada; namely, Ontario and British Columbia. In these cases, the interviews were conducted in the area of their new residence. Out of a total of 19 interviews, four were conducted outside Manitoba (one in British Columbia and three in Ontario). However, the interviews and the stories were about Quixote House, so that all of the data reflects Winnipeg and, more broadly, Manitoba. Nevertheless, some of the interviewees used expressions such as ‘I haven’t found a house like that’ or ‘there is nothing like that here’. Clearly, they were referring to their experiences, not only at Quixote House in Manitoba, but also in other areas of Canada.

5.3.1 Demography and gender of the research participants

The research focused on the situation of male offenders living in community at Quixote House. While women also face challenges in their reinsertion to society after being incarcerated, Quixote House only has male residents and, so, the research and its findings are limited and applicable only to this male population of offenders. Men outnumber women within the offender population, worldwide and in Canada. The offender population in Canada consists on average of 120,568 adults (Canada, 2017, p. 3). According to the report ‘Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2015/2016’ (Canada, 2017), at the Federal level in the year 2015-2016, women accounted for 7 percent of admissions to custody and 8 percent of admissions to sentenced custody, with similar percentages in women’s admissions to community supervision (p. 5).

In Manitoba, over the last six years, more than seven thousand adults have been in Community Supervision, which includes offenders in community on probation, conditional sentences, provincial parole, full parole, day parole, statutory release, and long-term supervision (Canada, 2017, p. 12). This is precisely the number of potential ‘candidates’ who had the option

to live at Quixote House, which can only receive about 7 men per year. In almost 10 years of activity, the house has had more than 50 residents.

Although all of the ex-residents I interviewed were male, the rest of the groups of interest I interviewed had gender balance. The founders of the house are one male and one female. This balance is also found in the participants from CSC. From this group, I interviewed 3 male and 3 female correctional officers.

The demographics of those who have been incarcerated in Manitoba show that “Aboriginal adults in federal correctional services accounted for 28% of admissions to custody and 26% to community supervision in 2015/2016” (Canada, 2017, p. 5). This percentage also applies to the residents of Quixote House and specifically to those I interviewed. Indeed, they showed diverse ethnic backgrounds (Caucasian, Asian, First Nations, Metis). However, it was never my intent to represent ethnic origin as a variable in this research. Only two conditions were required to be a participant in the research with respect to ex-offenders; namely, conviction on serious federal crimes with incarceration in a federal institution, and residency in Quixote House for an extended period of time between 2008 and 2014.

5.3.2 Participant selection

This research focuses on various persons who support or are related to ‘Quixote House’. Three types of people were approached and interviewed:

- Founders of the house.
- Ex-residents of Quixote House: All of them were at one time or another ‘parolees’ under CSC supervision in the community. Some of them are now fully integrated into society, with no supervision, and some of them are back in correctional institutions—because they broke parole or re-offended.

- CSC staff: only those who worked with ex-residents of Quixote House in their successful (or not) reintegration into community.

Recruitment varied depending on the group of people I interviewed. The founders of the house were contacted directly. Once they signed their letters of consent, I conducted the interviews. The situation was different with the other two groups. Potential participants were only identified and contacted by the social worker (Ms. Kathleen Mico) and the admissions manager of Quixote House (Sr. Carol Peloquin). On April 13, 2016, I sent an email and letters of recruitment asking them for help in contacting the participants to be interviewed. Sr. Carol and Kathleen mailed letters to all of those who had been associated with Quixote House asking that they contact me if they were interested in receiving more information on the study and/or participating in the research.

The social worker or the admissions manager of Quixote House who knew about the objective of the research and its importance contacted all potential participants. They were told that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any moment of the study without repercussions. Without an offer to participate directed to me, or initial contact coming from the participant, I never spoke to anyone connected to Quixote House about this research.

5.3.3 Participant payment and costs

There was no direct compensation for participating in the study, only the satisfaction of contributing and having their voices heard with regards to the situation of released offenders in community in Manitoba. The researcher bore all of the costs associated with the study. Expenses incurred were approximately \$1,500. They included a high-quality microphone (\$100), storage and transcription devices (\$450), stationery (\$50), gas and parking, travel to Toronto (\$450),

Travel to BC (\$400) and miscellaneous (\$100). I received no funding to cover any of these expenses.

5.4 Role and position of the researcher

I am a Roman Catholic priest and member of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) who was interested in researching about the same place in which I was living as a ‘voluntary house manager’. I see Quixote House as part of my Jesuit ministry, without salary or stipend. I am also fully aware that as a Jesuit priest conducting this study, there is a certain power imbalance, specifically with those participants who were residents of Quixote House. For this reason, in the first letter of recruitment, I indicated that if ex-residents were uncomfortable with my role as a priest, they could choose not to participate in the study.

Once they agreed to participate, I carefully prepared spaces for dialoguing, where open-ended interviews could be conducted, enabling the interview process to become a “living conversation” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 192). If the participant chose to be interviewed at Quixote House, I ensured that the room in which the interview was conducted was private, clean and comfortable, so that the conversation could flow without major interruptions. In any event for every interview, I had to prepare a space within myself, in order to fully engage in the exchange and at the same time refrain from commenting on the conversation.

Throughout these conversations, the creativity, singularity and humanity of the stakeholders were encouraged. I practiced bracketed interview techniques (Lewis & Staehler, 2010) in order not to repeat patterns of oppression or power asymmetries in the researcher/research relationship. This strategy follows the phenomenological approach (Lauer, 1965) and is employed to meet the needs of reflexivity. This refers to the engagement by the

researcher in continuous self-critique, self-appraisal and the provision of an explanation of how my own experience does or doesn't influence the stages of the research process.

I ensured that the sessions were carefully planned to guarantee the productive use of time and the accuracy of the topic to be discussed in direct relation to the research questions. Also, clear guidelines about the use of the data and the possibility of withdrawal were given to confirm the interviewee's commitment to the research.

5.4.1 Stakeholders

The research focuses on 'Quixote House' and the people involved in this initiative. These individuals come from different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, age and gender. All of the participants were 18 years or older. Four different kinds of stakeholders can be distinguished: The founders of the house, ex-resident offenders of the house, CSC staff who had connection with those released offenders, and myself.

The most important people to be heard from were the ex-offenders, because they form the community of interest of "people with similar experience or shared problems" (Barnsley & Ellis, 1992, p. 10). In other words, Otter, Bear, Moose, Ram, Fox, Squirrel, Rabbit, Tiger, Lion, Panther and Wolf are the 'community of interest'. They have only two things in common: all have been incarcerated in Stony Mountain Institution, the Federal Penitentiary of Manitoba, after being convicted of serious federal crimes, and all have lived in Quixote House for lengthy periods of time between 2008 and 2014. The times varied according to the needs of the individual, from four to five months (Panther, Rabbit), from six months to a year (Moose, Ram, Lion), or more than a year (Bear, Tiger, Squirrel, Otter, Fox, Wolf).

The experiences of the 11 participant ex-residents of Quixote House is complemented and contrasted with the data emanating from both founders of the house, six Correctional Service

Canada officers (parole officers, psychologists, community workers) and myself. I have lived in the house since July 21st, 2011 first, as just one more resident and, since October 2014, as voluntary house manager. Although I am part of the community of interest (residents of Quixote House), I am not an offender but a volunteer who has been residing at Quixote House for a lengthy period of time.

5.5 Research instruments and gathering techniques

To collect the information or data, face-to-face, in-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted and transcribed by me. These interviews took place at a location and time selected by the interviewee. The interview data was collected by note taking and audio recording, with the acknowledgment and permission of the interviewee. One interview was conducted by mail. These interviews focused on the house and its impact (not on the past criminal activity of the former offenders interviewed). Key questions in the interviews were: (1) a description of the house and its dynamics in everyday life; (2) access to housing and Quixote House, (3) housing, home and other needs addressed by Quixote House, and (4) perceptions of risk to one's safety and identity while living in Quixote House.

As a current resident of 'Quixote House' since July 2011, I applied an auto-ethnographic approach and kept a journal based on my personal experiences in the house as a source of data. Autoethnography is "an approach to research and writing that seeks to describe and systematically analyze personal experience in order to understand cultural experience" (Ellis, Adam, & Bochner, 2011, p. 273). One of the biggest challenges for the researcher/interviewer, with this kind of approach, has to do with the following question: How does one "maintain and value interpersonal ties with their participants, thus making relational ethics more complicated"? (Ellis, Adam, & Bochner, 2011, p. 281).

In order to prevent any conflict of interest, I included none of the current residents of Quixote House for interviews. All data is limited to situations and experiences that took place before the approval of my research proposal. Also, my journal notes describe only facts (no subject is identified) and focus on the impact those facts had on me. Hence, I included in my journal a brief description of what happened in the house every day, along with my personal feelings, insights and attitudes in reference to those situations and experiences. I also used pseudonyms and letters in my personal notes to assure anonymity.

I kept a journal from August 15 to October 11, 2016, in which I recorded descriptive and reflective field notes. The descriptive daily field notes indicated what was objectively happening in the field. These notes described conversations, narrations of particular events, behaviours and reactions of the people in Quixote House (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 121). Everything in the journal was related to the house and the experiences recorded in the descriptive field notes. I believe I was aware of my feelings and prejudices as a “possible source of bias” (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 101).

5.5.1 Ethical component

Since the very beginning, I was aware of the Ethical implication of a study addressing the life of offenders in community. For this reason I needed the institutional support of the University and of academics in the area of Social Science and Humanity. I got the approval of my proposed research from professors and experienced researchers such as Rev. Dr. David Creamer, S.J., Dr. Sean Byrne, at that time Director of the Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, and Dr. Michelle Gallant from the Faculty of Law of the University of Manitoba, Canada. In addition, the University’s Joint-Faculty Research Ethics Board (JFREB) approved the research taking into account guidelines established in the Tri-Council Policy Statement; Ethical Conduct for

Research Involving Human Subjects, established in 2001 by Canada's three main federal research agencies: (1) the Canadian Institute of Health Research, (2) the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and (3) the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I got an Ethics approval certificate from the JFREB of the University of Manitoba granted on March 28, 2016 for one year, and renewed on March 13, 2017.

In addition to the University of Manitoba Research Ethics Board approval and renewal, it was necessary to get the endorsement of the CSC National Headquarters Assistant Commissioner (NHQ-AC) Research Branch. This permission was needed in order to interview staff and men still under supervision or custody. This step was initiated on May 12, 2016 and the signature of permission was granted on September 19, 2016.

The process unfolded as follows. During and after the time of recruitment, I met by chance some of the possible participants at a function. Often, they manifested their willingness to participate, and others remained silent. That attitude was always respected. On May 11, 2016, one of the CSC recruited by Sr. Carol and Kathleen Mico contacted me. She told me about her willingness to participate but also told me that I needed to have an authorization from CSC National Headquarters Assistant Commissioner (NHQ-AC) Research Branch in order to interview staff and men still under supervision or custody. On May 12, 2016, I sent a request to the CSC research branch to request my interviewing of officers and men under their supervision. On May 16, 2016, they answered by requesting that I complete a form. They further indicated that I could not interview officers or men under supervision until CSC granted research approval. In the interim, I could only conduct interviews with the founders of the house and men fully integrated into society who had no supervision. After four months meeting the entire requirement of the CSC National Headquarters Assistant Commissioner (NHQ-AC) Research Branch, on

September 19, 2016, I received the signature of approval on my research form. From this day to December 7, 2016, I gave consent forms to the other participants and conducted the remaining interviews for this research.

5.5.2 Informed consent

On April 28, 2016, I received the first contact from ‘Otter’, followed by other ex-residents on subsequent days. As soon as I received their agreements to participate, I provided each interviewee with a written consent form; signed by all participants before the interview. These consent forms accurately addressed the expectations of participants in the three target groups. I conducted eighteen interviews personally. In a single case, I sent the questions and I received a letter with the consent form signed from the participant (currently incarcerated).

5.5.3 Protection of subjects and confidentiality

The study in general, and the interview process in particular, did not place the participants in any direct harm. However, breach of confidentiality could represent risk to some participants.

Although there were no direct questions regarding emotional or physical trauma, the interviews often evoked some stress or discomfort in ex-residents, as they discussed their experiences during and after incarceration. None of these circumstances demanded any external intervention or a suggestion from me to visit a community-run mental health centre to deal with possible post-traumatic stress symptoms (a situation foreseen in the research proposal).

With regards to anonymity and confidentiality, only the founders of the house agreed that their names and background be used. On the website www.futurehope.ca, the founders of the house are clearly identified. They are also referred to in articles, such as those published by *New Wine Press* (http://www.archwinnipeg.ca/docs/New_Wine_Press_08_04.pdf) and *The Catholic*

Register (<http://www.catholicregister.org/home/canada/item/15378-axing-chaplains-puts-prisoners-at-risk>).

Regarding the rest of the participants (ex-residents and correctional service staff), this research assumed confidentiality. For this reason, no names are used to identify participants in the notes or audio recordings. Instead, I assigned pseudonyms (Otter, Bear, Moose, Ram, Fox, Squirrel, Rabbit, Tiger, Lion, Panther and Wolf) to the ex-residents and letters in upper case (A, B, C, D, E, F) to the correctional service staff participants in notes and recordings. Immediately after each interview, all notes and audio recordings were uploaded to a password protected personal computer. This computer and the interview transcripts were stored at all times in my office (St. Paul's College at the University of Manitoba). All transcripts and consent forms will be shredded and destroyed by the end of August 2018.

5.5.4 Challenges encountered

This project presented many challenges to me, as a researcher; not only in terms of the novelty of the inquiry, but also because I have lived for more than six years at the site of the field study and have been part of the lives of some of the people interviewed. Even though I am a Roman Catholic priest, the faith-based programing associated with Quixote House seeks to be far away from any kind of religious indoctrination. In fact, among residents of Quixote House there were those who had no religious background or connections to religions ranging from Evangelical Christianity to Buddhism and Traditional spiritualties. Borrowing from Indigenous research methods (Wilson, 2008, p. 77), I tried to embed my inquiry in the caring relationships that have developed over the last several years; ensuring respect, reciprocity and responsibility throughout the interview process.

Respect was shown in the way the interviews were conducted. The places in which the conversations were held were carefully prepared, and the information provided carefully guarded. This respect expanded to include close attention to all ethical concerns. Participants were aware of their role in the study and the ways in which information was obtained, the absence of any coercion for obtaining their participation, the confidentiality of their names (pseudonyms are used to protect their identities), and the option for them to withdraw at any stage of the research.

Reciprocity was expressed in terms of the mutual benefit that this research would provide to all of the people involved with Quixote House and, in general, those concerned about the reinsertion of released offenders into community. The voices of those who lived in the house were heard. They are a meaningful part of this research, as it seeks to provide a basis for the development of alternative approaches to tackling recidivism and better options for the rehabilitation and reintegration of released offenders.

Regarding my responsibility toward the interviewees, the idea was to develop an environment for research about the house where I currently live, in which everybody can contribute and be held accountable for their contribution. The challenge was to obtain information while preserving this environment within the house, where respect, reciprocity and responsibility would continuously be nurtured. This exercise started with myself (Wilson, 2008, p. 127) and was extended to all participants in the research so that everybody became guardians of the respect and confidence that preserved relationships within the house and among the residents. It is more than an ethical issue as this challenge is to effectively “decolonize” (Memmi, 1967; Smith L. , 2012) the approach of the researcher; not only in the way he has lived and participated in the dynamics of the house, but also during the development of this research.

In line with Gandhian approaches, this attitude and behaviour elicits respect, gives love, and appeals to the conscience of the other for liberation and empowerment (Burrowes, 1996).

5.5.5 Data analysis, validity and reliability

The impact on the ex-offender population ‘dwelling’ in transitional homes and community correctional facilities has not been sufficiently addressed due to the large number of institutional programs that play a part in the rehabilitation of offenders (Correctional Service Canada, 2005; 2013). This research tries to bridge this gap by including the experiences of ex-offenders and their parole officers with regards to Quixote House. This is a small but significant contribution, because all voices were heard; especially those of offenders, successful or not in their reintegration, the two founders of the house, and interviewees from the law-enforcement world. With the analysis of what has been said in their interviews and my own experience as a resident of this place, I tried to depict an accurate portrait of the role of Quixote House in the Winnipeg community since its founding in December 2007.

Interview transcripts were the primary source of information for the study and were the basis for the analysis of the data. Transcript files and additional data included interviewer summaries detailing background and self-reflection, and other notes from interview debriefings. These were analysed and codified. Themes emerged inductively from the data. Codes were “words or short pieces of text added to the margin of a unit to identify and mark longer sections of text” (Alaszewski, 2006, p. 98). In fact, I have on the wall of my office a chart composed of 228 sections written in 18 different colours where I summarized the information gleaned from the interviews. Codes were then “grouped into clusters or families or into more complex hierarchical structures or networks which contain[ed] nodes and links” (Alaszewski, 2006, p. 98). Then, the contradictions and coincidences were deeply analyzed in order to find categories

from PACS that helped to explain the everyday practices of Quixote House and its impact on the peaceful co-existence of stigmatized minorities prone to violence in Canadian society.

5.6 Conclusion

This research is a “case study” of Quixote House (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007, p. 59). The study is based primarily on the shared experiences of the people involved in the house in order to understand their views, experiences, and aspirations. This shared experience provides insights about how the Quixote House community perceives the researcher’s presence among them, and surfaces potential barriers to, and opportunities for, bettering their lives. This research allows a “holistic examination” of the house to avoid “the separation of components from the larger context to which these matters may be related” (Jorgensen, 1989, p. 19).

In general terms, I was content with the results that were produced from using this methodology. I was often moved by the lucidity and directness that I was able to obtain around some issues. There was no difficulty finding common needs and experiences in the people interviewed, and the narrative style helped me to dig deeper into the meaning of Quixote House which, in the end, is the goal of this study.

I especially highlighted the commonalities among parole officers and ex-residents about the impact of house, which also help to verify the accuracy of the data. I expected much gratitude from ex-residents with histories of success in their reintegration into mainstream society. Yet, I even discovered that many of those who haven’t succeeded also expressed, in well-articulated terms, how they found the house helpful in their journey out of prison and addictions. Although some of the ex-residents had difficulty pointing out the specific help they received by living at Quixote House, that was not the case with CSC officers, all of whom highly advocated the need to create more places like Quixote House. The professional input of CSC officers made it easier

for me to connect the practices of everyday life at Quixote House with the concepts of peacebuilding and peacemaking used to analyze the data.

Chapter 6 – The challenges of Quixote House residents

Oh, you've been to prison, tends to shake people up, and say 'you are a bad person', you're this or that you shut down, you are no longer trustworthy, you are no longer...you are not capable of holding down jobs and they just...they flush the toilet on you. In that sense, they just flush the toilet on you (Bear, ex-offender, 5 years successfully integrated into community, 2016, pp. 7-8).

6.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on knowing and understanding what hinders the reinsertion into the Winnipeg community of former offenders as part of their rehabilitation. Thus, following the classification given by Leverentz (2011), the barriers that offenders must overcome for reintegration are identified and explained primarily in the words of Quixote House residents. The voices of some parole officers and offenders are also heard in order to complement and guide what has been said by sociological and criminological studies in the area.

The housing situation in the city in which this study takes place is highlighted and described with reference to the people released from correctional institutions. This discussion also seeks to clarify the centrality of community in the process of offenders becoming 'law-abiding citizens' in the urban and societal milieu in which Quixote House was created and functions to this day.

6.2 Main challenges to reintegration into community for Quixote House residents

Leverentz's (2011) typology is useful for organizing the ideas and understandings identified as barriers for reintegration; gathered from conversations with parole officers, offenders and ex-offenders during the course of this research. In terms of the 'individual', the barriers are those

related to mental health and finances, as well as management of emotions, stress, loneliness, fear and stigma. From the ‘structural’ point of view, proper employment, lack of community programs, criminal records and housing are the main obstacles to reintegration into mainstream society. In the ‘relational’ sphere, family estrangement, lack of positive support, diminished citizenship and troubled relationships with peers and romantic partners can be hurdles for reintegration.

6.2.1 Most of the hardships are perceived as individual

Regarding individual hardships associated with reintegration, parole officers frequently pointed out mental health issues as a main difficulty. A parole officer from CSC, identified as ‘E’, mentioned that, in offenders, it is common to find “mental health issues that have never been adequately addressed. And so, they ended up within the justice system”. However, mental health issues are not the only problems that inmates face. Dealing with the criminal justice system comes from a “sort of accumulation of factors” (‘E’, 2016, p. 3). When offenders were interviewed for this study, mental health issues were not a common part of their stories. Some, however, such as Bear and Squirrel, mentioned “depression” or “unstableness” as mental issues to be aware of (Bear, 2016, p. 6). These individual conditions always work in conjunction with other factors leading to reoffending or breaching parole (Squirrel, 2016, pp. 3-4).

Offenders and parole officers seem to endorse Martire’s (2010) insights into the relationship between financial strain and recidivism. Offenders understand the financial “issue” as their ‘very limited access to credit and needed goods’ when they reach community. Financial strain can also be a problem before incarceration but it gets worse after the person is released from prison. This was true for Otter, who discussed his situation, after his release, in the following manner: “the biggest obstacle I personally have to get through was financial, it’s

through the financial burden, having to be a responsible adult, of having to pay bills and everything that was really difficult for me at first” (Otter, 2016, p. 4).

This was also the case for Ram. He said that the rebuilding of his finances was one of his greatest challenges and achievements. This is what he had to say on the issue:

...trying to get yourself back on track... because everything... you trying the best to hold. Like I had to rebuild my credit, right? And my ex-wife destroyed the credit so I focused on that.

I found that I owed a \$500 bill to Rogers [Cellphone provider], and that is the only thing that was holding on my credit rating... so I paid that off, done, and then, I had to secure myself a credit card for \$500 and then, after a year, I am just using \$500 on the credit card. I got my money back, well, we doubled it, at \$1000, and then at every year I get an increase, and I don't go too crazy in debt.

That is the key thing. You get to build that credit rating and it takes years to do, so I am actually successful, I have done that now (Ram, 2016, p. 4).

Parole officers interviewed, are also aware of how financial worries are common when addressing parolees' re-entry into the community, many of who “have never had a bank account” (‘C’, 2016). The financial hardship is described as “poignant” and also associated with other situations, such as unemployment or poor educational background (‘A’, 2016).

Being trapped by emotions or being seen as weak were clearly identified as a cause of recidivism, even in offenders with strong family support “on the outside”, as articulated by PO ‘E’:

What often happens is when someone is sentenced, especially when someone is doing their second, third or fourth term of incarceration, is what they try to do is shut off the outside world quickly. Because the outside world is a reminder of what exists, and the emotions that are out there, family members and such, and you'll see these guys...

They would not talk to family. They would have them not come to visit them. They would try to shut everything down. It is a survival mechanism in jail.

They don't want to be weak; to, you know, accept these emotions that may make them vulnerable, down range at the jail, so they do this as a sort

of self-preservation which is really detrimental to their eventual reintegration into society because they're that much further back.

I often talk to guys putting on these blinders and slowly sort of descending into the prison walls and not thinking outside of it ('E', 2016, p. 5).

In identifying factors of failure after release, PO 'E' also mentioned the following in his narrative:

A lot of people they just feel anxiety that kicks in. So you couple that with trying to sort of ride their ship into society and having all this anxiety and other factors that are complicated and now they had to try and...

From a parole perspective they have a number of conditions; they have to abide by special standard, so they have rules to make sure they're following in. Meetings that they have to make sure they are getting to, not only with their PO, but the Psychologist, the Social worker, programs, nights, and they know and have their ingrained fear that if they miss something, well 'I am going straight back to jail' because they have heard all sorts of horror stories that are likely inaccurate from offenders who have been sent back for probably significant breaches ('E', 2016, pp. 4-5).

This 'ingrained fear' is also noted as a main source of failure by parole officer 'B': "Their hardships start with their own sense of...their own fears, and their own biases towards themselves and how they fit into the rest of society" ('B', 2016). This fear makes them reject society and any help that may come from it. In that sense, fear makes them become 'anti-social'.

In fact, non-owned emotions seem to be the source of crime and recidivism, at least for Bear, who said:

I can look in myself, and you know what, the emotions that I had were real to me. It wasn't a bad intent behind my crime, in that it wasn't preplanned or anything but the emotions I felt, and the despair I was in, and the bad relationship I was in, I can bring it all together as a collective picture and apply it to myself and see, and say yeah, this is the story! (sob) Right? This is the story, this is what happened and I can take ownership (Bear, 2016, p. 4).

In the same way, fear (Otter, 2016, p. 8), or loneliness (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3) were mentioned by offenders when they were asked about their hardship after being released.

However, there is no question that the most important hardship for offenders interviewed after being released is the ‘parolee stigma’. In many cases, the emotions were triggered by the stigma, which, even though we can place it in the relationship typology, undoubtedly works in the individual as a source of emotional unrest and even affects their participation in reintegration programs (Edwards & Mottarella, 2015). That happened with Rabbit, an ex-offender who linked the stress he was suffering after prison with the possibility of others learning about his criminal past. This is what he had to say:

The stresses of wondering how are you going to get a place to live, how are you going to pay your bills, how are you going to get a job, you know...it’s everybody always going to ask you, do you have a criminal record. What would you do? It is a lot, lot of stresses... (Rabbit, 2016, p. 3).

Stigma is viewed as a major hardship in the process of reintegration into community.

Panther, one of the offenders interviewed by me, compared his stigma with a physical mark that can be seen by anyone and affects how offenders in community feel about themselves:

Well, it is like walking around with a little ‘P’ on my shirt that says ‘prisoner’ or something. And I kind of feel like an outcast sometimes. I don’t think I feel that way as much anymore but, back then, when you are first initially released, you have that, like you are wearing the scarlet letter, right? (Panther, 2016, p. 4).

This happened regardless of the offense, as Otter pointed it out in the following way:

I think that is just mostly to do [with] the stigma around having been incarcerated. Um, now, a lot [of] people have this idea that anyone that has been in prison is super, super dangerous...

I am having to come out for things like employment and it is very, very difficult, so a lot of people still have these prejudices about being incarcerated no matter what the charges are (Otter, 2016, p. 3).

Bear, who sees incarceration as an experience that labels the offender and shapes ideas about him in the rest of the people, also thinks that the stigma is there, regardless of the offense.

He notes that:

...coming back out of prison you're suddenly labeled, being a con, and it usually doesn't matter what your crime is, just being labeled: 'Oh, you've been to prison', tends to shake people up, and say 'you are a bad person', you're this or that you shut down, you are no longer trustworthy... you are not capable of holding down jobs and they just... they flush the toilet on you (Bear, 2016, pp. 7-8).

However, there are certain crimes for which the stigma is worse, as was pointed out by Fox, a sex-offender:

I think, well for me it was more, a lot, about the stigma attached to my kind of offense, and I think just knowing that there was a media release out there and if you google my name all that stuff will come up so it was really difficult for me to go anywhere where my name is going to be, it's going to be coming up (Fox, 2016, p. 3).

All of these individual hardships can become unbearable if there are also barriers for reintegration into the structure of the system and in society.

6.2.2 There is a structural mistrust of offenders

Reintegration for some offenders becomes a matter of "luck" as was pointed out by parole officer 'C':

First of all, just leaving the structure of prison, and getting from the structure where they really have no say about what happens day to day. They just go through the same routine to what they have to come out and begin the self-initiative, and begin to problem solve... the ones who are lucky go to a Halfway House so they can get a chance to have a slower start and get some more support ('C', 2016, p. 2).

There is also a lack of information with regards to programs available for inmates in their preparation for release. At least that was the case for Tiger who noted the following in his narrative:

I didn't know the benefits and stuff like that, until, you know, I was able to, you know, actually see in everything like that. And so, I took on the opportunity, you know, but I was surprised that I was going to get an evening outside, right, and so I joined the group.

Like at that time I was joining all these different groups, right? Because I mean...one it was for experience; and two, it was to kind of open my eyes to

these programs, like, you know, ‘Why are these people going to these programs, like is it working?’; like ‘what is going on, you know?’ Like, I, it is like, you know, yeah, and also too I have a parole coming up and, that is how I got into this. Curiosity, you know, being able to, like, being able to kind of open myself to these things (Tiger, 2016, p. 1).

Another ex-offender, Rabbit, also complained that, earlier, Rockwood Institution (the former minimum security correctional institution adjacent to Stony Mountain Institution) had programs for rehabilitation that exist no more. This is what he noted:

That’s the problem. We have too much locking everybody up but don’t rehabilitate. We are not rehabilitating people is... You know, like Rockwood. It used to be a great place to rehabilitate people: they have the farm, they have trades. Now there is nothing you can do. If you have got your Grade 12 education, there is nothing to rehabilitate people (Rabbit, 2016, p. 9).

Or, simply, the way programs are implemented fall under the guise of mistrust. For example, as Moose stated:

...that was the biggest problems I see, you know, every person is a different person every day there in the Halfway House or something. You can’t learn relationships, you don’t set. You can’t build relationships with people. There is no trust, you know, you kept the community locked up, your personal stuff, you are not supposed to trust. You just protect your property and things (Moose, 2016, pp. 7-8).

However, since one of the conditions for release is fulfilling one’s participation in programs, offenders often see themselves overburdened by the expectations placed on them by correctional officers in community. PO ‘E’ expresses this point as follows:

...from a parole perspective they have a number of conditions they have to abide by special standard, so they have rules they have to make sure they’re following.

Meetings that they have to make sure they are getting to, not only with their parole officer, but the psychologist, the social worker, programs, nights, and they know and have their ingrained fear that if they miss something, well ‘I am going straight back to jail’ because they have heard all sorts of horror stories that are likely inaccurate from offenders who have been sent back for probably significant breaches.

So there is an underlying fear of failure and ‘what would come next?’ (‘E’, 2016, p. 4).

‘Programing’ depends on the ‘case management’ of each offender; so parole officers will mandate that offenders released into community must attend meetings and interviews, go to appointments or see medical doctors, psychologists, psychiatrists and counsellors. In addition, offenders need to be employed, to avoid ‘financial strain’. The lack of proper employment is also another big obstacle to their rehabilitation and keeping up high levels of motivation and staying clear of criminal activity.

In fact, there is an opinion among correctional officers in Manitoba that offenders generally have no experience and poor work skills (Brown, 2004, p. 32)—which was confirmed by the experiences of the parole officers I interviewed. For example, parole officer ‘B’ said that offenders under his supervision have “a poor work history, and they have limited skills. They are undereducated” (‘B’, 2016, p. 2). In addition, parole officer ‘D’, said that they lack “employment skills, education skills, reading skills. There are just, so many barriers, you know, that these guys need help with support” (‘D’, 2016, p. 2). Even more significant than employment ‘per se’ and what contributes to prevent recidivism is the level of motivation associated with the employment. Officer ‘E’ who noted the following exemplified this:

You have to try to find employment with a criminal record, which isn’t easy but it is certainly doable, because I see a number of people do it.

So there is an over assumed ... level of motivation that can get them through this, and guys that are released from jail have different levels of motivation and commitment.

Are they really willing to step outside of that criminal world that they existed in prior to incarceration, and during incarceration? (‘E’, 2016, p. 4).

In fact, the problem is not about finding a job as a source of income, but to get employment that can keep up the levels of the person’s motivation and commitment. In the case of Ram, for example, the first three months after being released were the only time in his life that he had been unemployed. “Welfare once in my life during three months, never again, and I think

I collected unemployment for three months once. That is the only time that I ever got unemployed. But I always find work” (Ram, 2016, p. 4). This is due also to the characteristics of the urban Winnipeg job market, which demands all kinds of low-skilled personnel. The situation is different as employment becomes a barrier for reintegration when the offenders are not only searching for a ‘job’ but for high-quality employment (Leverentz, 2011). Access to high quality employment with a stable position, with substantial economic compensation and with a gained “sense of meaning from one’s work” is recognized as a key factor for ex-offender reintegration to society (Leverentz, 2011, p. 362). Otter identified it as “proper employment”:

I just mean we know without prejudices, without feeling like the employer or the employees are talking about you behind your back, proper employment being a place that feels safe, where you can go, do your hours, do your job without having to worry at the potential of getting fired just because you did something wrong and they use the charges against you or something (Otter, 2016, p. 3).

The need for proper employment was reiterated many times by the parolees I interviewed. Wolf, for example, after one of his releases from a provincial institution mentions the following: “every time I got out, you know, it is just, I was just like dropped out of jail, dropped out on the streets and there we go, right? So, trying to figure it out where to put my feet on the ground. So, this [Quixote House] wasn’t that way, you know” (Wolf, 2016, pp. 4-5).

Much of the ‘help’ provided to offenders in community is done through Halfway Houses. However, Halfway Houses are places that ex-offenders tend to avoid, since in their eyes they are perceived as links connecting prison to community and community to prison. It seems as if residents are “just one step away from going into or getting out of prison” (Ross & Richards, 2009, p. 39).

Parole officers and ex-offenders I interviewed reframed this perception. For example, Wolf describes living in a Halfway House, as follows:

The initial set up was that the fellows would go and get released from jail and go and live in a Halfway House under the corrections department for a time, and then move into Quixote House. So then, you know, basically the person would be living within society but under the rules of CSC, under the roof of the CSC staff (Wolf, 2016, p. 5).

This was also the experience of Squirrel, who felt ‘filed’, as though he were in a filing cabinet, or ‘classified’, while living in a Halfway House:

The Halfway House, I found like I wasn’t there in a good frame of mind anyway. I probably shouldn’t get on parole. I shouldn’t get out on parole, or being in there... I just found that you have your one interview when you first get there, you sign a PO, you have to make... you know, you have to make an appointment to see them... you are always, you know, signing in and out all the time and it is... To me it is just so impersonal. It is just like you’re... I don’t know, a file... (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3).

Moose had a similar experience when he spoke about how the impersonal relationships continued from prison to Halfway Houses, in spite of the “good intention” of some people who work there. He noted that:

...in a correctional centre you are called by your number. There is a definite disconnect.

I am sure Corrections have the right spirit, and staff, have the right spirit, but even the staff or even many time allowed to really help or do anything and its true is in the back of the staff at the corrections centres, corrections staff are even ostracized by their own members, for stepping in, helping in or doing things and teasing social workers, all kind of things so that is a difference.

That even though staff would help you in the correction centres and in the Halfway Houses they are not able to, because they...yeah. It is a completely different environment (Moose, 2016, p. 4).

Also, for Fox, Halfway Houses were associated with the low quality of relationships one can develop in the process of readjusting to society once again:

...Halfway Houses could be pretty rough, depending on where you end up going or just end up in a cheap hotel.

It has been lots of stories where you don’t have a residence...I think when you don’t have your... the place you live, if that is dysfunctional it is hard to focus on anything else, especially when you are struggling, ‘cause you don’t have a sense of safety and peace... (Fox, 2016, p. 5)

This sometimes becomes a desperate situation, and gets even worse after a prolonged period of incarceration. Lion describes it in the following manner:

I had many hardships leaving prison. I was locked-up for quite some time and had no support and nowhere to really go upon my release. Being my statutory release I asked the Parole Board to consider and re-consider putting me into a drug and alcohol program and then a Halfway House voluntarily but they said “No” and gave me a welfare appointment and the address to the nearest homeless shelter.

I knew I had issues that I needed help with and wanted to give myself the best chance of being successful upon my release. I had no friends or at least anyone who could be a positive person in my life. I wasn’t allowed to associate with anyone with a criminal record or be around anyone using drugs or alcohol but I was around all of those at the shelter!

I didn’t have much money or nowhere to just hang out. I ended up just hanging around the mall because I had nowhere else to go! There were times that I thought to myself that I was better off in prison at least I had friends and somewhere [I] belonged. I felt I should feel happy being out of prison but that just wasn’t the case. I was lonely and walking around with no destination (Lion, 2016, p. 5).

Following upon Lion’s narrative, it is clear that housing is crucial because it responds to a very basic human need. It is not restricted to the provision of a roof over the ex-offender’s head, but as a safe place to stay. Indeed, the physical location and environment impacts human relationships. These connections are even more crucial to those released from prison. It shows that more than the individual and the structural barriers for reintegration into society, there are some “relational” factors that will depend on the dynamics and the people with whom offenders are connected after incarceration. These barriers, called “informal” by Leverentz, demand from offender’s negotiation skills that normally are not used in correctional centres (Leverentz, 2011, p. 336).

6.2.3 *There are ‘no second chances’*

The sense of having “no second chances” was Bear’s experience after his release from prison. He describes the impact of this sense of hopelessness on himself, as an individual, and on his relationships, in the following way:

It is just a matter of life. So you can always say we are a forgiving society, and that ‘everybody deserves a second chance’, and blah blah blah ...the walls that society have built up are very hard to scale over.

With time, I found with time, emerging...and the thing is you are always looking over your shoulder and I guess that is another obstacle for myself. You are always looking over your shoulder. You know, you are looking, looking for the cops, you are looking for this, you are looking for that, and you are looking for someone else.

As you know you are not doing anything wrong, even though you are told coming through the system that you’re always such a bad person. That you just start looking, and so you actually come out jaded.

The system makes you jaded, towards the system. Right? So the system is supposed to help and protect you, you became a little jaded I guess. You know?

So, it’s a...two way street, I guess, the public becomes jaded against you and you, because of the system, become jaded against them. Because there is no...in a lot of cases, no second chances... (Bear, 2016, p. 8).

Another ex-offender, Rabbit, articulates the feeling as ‘stresses’. He noted that, “the stresses are that you first realized that things are going to be a lot different than when you went in. Stresses that, you know, you lived in this bubble for so long, and have this kind of what you call the safe haven; even though, you know, prison is prison” (Rabbit, 2016, p. 3) . By contrast, Wolf expresses it in terms of overtiredness and enervation. “I was absolutely exhausted. I was drained all the time. I was not sleeping right. I was not living right. I was living like, you know, doing things that people shouldn’t do. You know. And it was just why I ended up in jail” (Wolf, 2016, p. 11) .

Parole officer ‘D’ even said that offenders are not receiving basic support from existing families. “I mean lots of them would have family, but I mean a lot of them came through CFS

[Child and Family Services] so there is not really good relationships with parents and family.

You know, a lot of them, their dads were in gangs, they join the gang...” (‘D’, 2016, p. 2). This estrangement from the family occurred in the case of Otter, who had the following to say on the matter:

I mean my first experience of home was being with like abusive parents; not physically abusive, but I mean like addicts... and then, going to different foster homes.

I never really had a sense of home, most times I was just there for a temporary basis, for weekends, for a week, for a month. Even when I did find constant foster homes it wasn’t really home ... I was still looked upon as a foster child. I wasn’t viewed as being part of the family (Otter, 2016, pp. 6-7).

Consider the example of Squirrel who said that, “family and friends kind of turned their backs on me, when things were bad for me, so I’ve never been able to heal from that, I guess, it still stings, so... I haven’t spoken to my kids in 12 years” (Squirrel, 2016, pp. 3-4). Wolf also describes the difficult family situation he had to face after release, and how that experience became overwhelming as the family was not able to provide him with the support system he needed:

My family was kind of always there but they weren’t the best support for me. You know. And mostly because I have, I have some serious issues about roles. Like ‘What is my role as a dad?’ and ‘what is my role as...’, when at the time, was I the husband or the ex-husband, you know, so that’s... even though my family is always being supportive they are not always the best support. Right? (Wolf, 2016, p. 9).

Also, without a good relationship with family and with the open possibility of going back to their ‘old friends’, offenders have no chance of meeting CSC expectations for lacking “positive supports” (‘D’, 2016, p. 2). As stated by parole officer ‘B’, CSC has “unrealistic but exceptional expectations from either us, at least us”, over offenders (2016, p. 2). Program meetings and appointments also trigger offenders’ fear of failure and anxiety as was previously

stated by parole officer 'E' (2016, p. 4). In this sense, relapsing into drugs or alcohol becomes a 'coping mechanism'. This is even encouraged by the familiar "support system" they knew before prison. As Tiger notes:

Hardships, hardships out of prison, hardships, hardships, out of prison hardships...yeah, just a... kind of switching from a different kind of support system. Before was, you know, like a different kind of life. It is just like... it was just like, you know the struggle making new friends, getting, you know, their friendship, and you know, not talking too much to my old friends and, you know, switching that kind of thing....

I think that was, that was the most difficult, was like making new friends, and you know, not really relying on my old friends for support and stuff like that and try, and try, like, to be stable too (Tiger, 2016, p. 3).

Real or projected, family member's rejection of the individual offender can "increase [the] likelihood of eventual relapse into drug abuse and other criminal activity" (Mowen & Visher, 2015, p. 341). This is exactly what happened to Lion who made this point in the following way:

Patronizing places and people who have drugs and alcohol on hand. We fool ourselves into thinking its no problem. I don't need a drink or a drug and I guess many times we can get away with that but unfortunately we're not always that strong or we step over that line and then step back.

One beer won't hurt, if I have just a little of this drug nobody will know and maybe that's true but it makes it that much easier the next time. And if you happen to find a woman who drinks or does drugs you're pretty much doomed, sooner or later! (Lion, 2016, p. 4).

In addition, Squirrel articulated a similar theme in his narrative with regards to the peril of drugs:

My wife's passing, depression, I would say drugs for a while, to you. Maybe, a little bit of alcohol, a bit. I don't know. Loneliness I guess. Family and friends kind of turning their backs on me, when things were bad for me, so I've never been able to heal that (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3).

And Panther now faces "some addiction problems, on alcohol and drugs" (Panther, 2016, p. 4). In fact, relapsing into "old coping strategies" is often a sure path for the person's re-entry

to prison. Parole officer 'E' pointed out that this is "really detrimental to their eventual reintegration into society" (p.5). This creates "anti-social attitudes and ... making it difficult for them to step outside that mindset when they get outside the walls in their early state" ('E', 2016, p. 5). This point was also highlighted by Parole officer 'C' who noted the following in his narrative:

...for a lot of them, their hardship is to go back to the community and into a setting where they have family members that are gang members and are still in the drug lifestyle, using....

They may have a girlfriend, they have had two or three children from, but she has three or four children from other fellows as well, and there are ongoing issues, lack of money, stress, relationship problems, and so it is kind of throwing them into a boiling kettle and hoping they survive ('C', 2016, p. 4).

When there is a difficult relationship with family, the negative effect of peers in reoffending is clear, at least for parole officer 'B' who articulated the following in his story:

You know a lot of guys get out and they don't have homes and they have, you know, men's hostels and welfare facilities and really they are just in the poorer areas of the city and they are surrounded by other offenders and drug users and gang members and criminals and just really negative influence around them ('B', 2016, p. 4).

One of the factors, which also contributes to the person's relapse into criminal behaviour has to do with offenders' relationships with "women". Male offenders' romantic and intimate partners are often linked with their offenses. Sometimes, partners' expectations on released offenders are "too much to chew". That was the case for Lion, who blatantly contended that:

There are certain things that cause us to be side tracked and sometimes even derailed. First is women! After spending any significant time in prison all we want is the warmth of a woman, sometimes many women...

I think it's not so much about sex but being wanted and even needed but it's so important to find a woman who understands that we are working on ourselves and not being too demanding of our time and resources....

But too many times we either go back to someone we know isn't good for us but fool ourselves into thinking that they've changed or find that someone, anyone to hold close....

Many of us have our own wants and needs which lead us to lose focus on what we are doing and too many times when things go wrong lead us to self-destructive behaviour (Lion, 2016, p. 4).

Relationships with women developed sometimes in contradiction to the rules of the house in which offenders were living and was an excuse to keep “hidden agendas”. For example, Bear states that having girlfriends can be problematic for ex-offenders:

... you know, guys still have their agendas, personal agendas, and so, yes, you know...

I know in certain occasions, that the rule in the house was no women upstairs in the private rooms and I know guys that had that, you know they have got a girlfriend shortly after that; they had own girlfriends....

They were times when they were... having them, the girls upstairs, and you know doing whatever they were doing late at night, you know? (Bear, 2016, p. 4).

The absence of good role models further exasperates the situation and affects the process of reintegration. This is stated by parole officer ‘D’ who found that “they haven’t just had the positive role models. They haven’t, you know, had those connections, so...” (D’, 2016, p. 3) . These role models can be informal in the community, such as in the workplace or church, but also through designated “re-entry mentoring programs”.

Finally, second chances are hard to see when offenders are perceived as vulnerable and not worthy of the protection of their basic rights. Moose complained about how his rights were systematically violated while in prison:

There was no sense of responsibility with the front line staff. Like I said, the food was not as they promised, our food was not properly stored; all of these things... we were not being properly housed, you are not getting sleep.

There was torture being carried on by offenders on other offenders with the staff hearing what is going on, knowing it and just complete acquiescence! (Moose, 2016, p. 10).

Once outside prison, Bear perceived this vulnerability as “diminished citizenship”. This is what he had to say on the issue:

...going into prison as an outstanding citizen you might say, as far as the public was concerned. Self-employed, stable member of society ... so going into jail, losing all of that...

So you know, you put your whole time, and effort and soul into that and when it's gone, it's very deflating....

I remember the psychologist saying 'we don't know'. Then, as I've seen her in the outside when I first get here on Parole, she said: 'we don't know', 'we', meaning my management team, because there is POs, Psychologist and other support members from CSC, they said 'we don't know how you are managing out here'. Right?

This is what you're coming through. And what you lost we don't know how you function, so they expected me to just curl up in a little ball I guess, and die, you know? (Bear, 2016, p. 6).

This diminished self-esteem and difficulty to stand up as a valued citizen for one's individual and basic rights, is a tangential consequence of their institutionalization.

6.3 The effects of institutionalization

Parole officer 'A' said that, "being released from an institution, becoming familiar and reacquainted with moving into the community setting again, can be a hardship for some of these guys" ('A', 2016, p. 2). The level of institutionalization in inmates comes from how prisons, such as Stony Mountain Institution, work and are structured. As parole officer 'E' states in the following story:

They ended up within the justice system by, you know, some sort of accumulation of those factors coming up, and then their criminal activity and ended up in jail.

Now, through the jail process they may take some programming, form some relationships with community agencies or partners if they are lucky. But the most significant thing, I see, when they are released, is the level of institutionalization that exists and is inherent in being in jail.

They come out the door and the world sort of stops them in their face because things have changed. They changed. They become so used to living in the jail, the structure, the routine and the way of things, the language, and the way people walk and interact ('E', 2016, p. 3).

Sr. Carol stated that, "they are not good at navigating the social systems. So, that sort of reaching out to help, not too much, because then that could be enabling but initially when

somebody comes brand new and doesn't know what to do next" (Peloquin, 2016, p. 9). In her opinion, this sort of conflict is due to the inexperience of released offenders in navigating social systems, so that help should be offered in a way so as not to diminish their own capacity, which has been fractured by their past institutionalization.

6.3.1 Jail rules still at work

One of the common negative perceptions present when former offenders come to live together 'again' is the persistence of a code of conduct among them, which is often named 'jail rules'. Inmates "become so used to living in the jail, the structure, the routine and the way of things, the language, and the way people walk and interact." ('E', 2016, p. 3). These rules, learned during incarceration, often reproduce the attitudes and behaviours of large male groups (gangs, soldiers, sports teams, etc.) and they have both positive and negative effects. Every offender offers a different perspective about these rules after they are released. However, it seems that places like Quixote House provides a communal environment in which residents can keep those rules alive. For example, Bear notes that any community has a negative side:

In the acceptance of the community aspect we had the dark side that we accepted and one thing that usually helped within the prison mentality, I would call it, among inmates, was the, you know, us-and-them.

And so, even though everybody knows the rules we wouldn't tell the establishment of Quixote House necessarily what was really going on behind the scenes (Bear, 2016, p. 4).

Panther hid his addiction to alcohol while living at Quixote House yet he was still able to 'keep up appearances' for a while. "I was drinking a little bit there, and trying to hide it from everybody, so that was that. I know a few other guys were using drugs, but they kind of kept it under wraps, but they were still maintaining themselves, they were still, you know, gainfully employed" (Panther, 2016, p. 3).

Consequently, secrecy becomes a way in which released offenders deal with the rest of the residents, but specifically those identified as ‘the establishment’ of Quixote House. Bear noted that Quixote House, in this regard, is no different from prison for many residents because ex-inmates always keep their own personal agendas:

I found it interesting that the prison rules; some of them were kept when the guys came out and other ones weren’t. Like for example, in prison, you get all its own rules and regulations.

A lot of guys break them too when there are random searches and guys get sent back to Stony and you always have the undercurrents, right? The dark side, I don’t say the dark side, but the underside of people of trying to live their own agendas.

Quixote House is not different. Guys still have their agendas, personal agendas... (Bear, 2016, p. 3).

Bear also recalls how rules were broken by residents on the premises and no one told those ‘in the establishment’ about what happened:

I know on certain occasions, that the rule in the house where no women were upstairs in the private rooms—and I know guys that had gotten a girlfriend shortly after they were out or they had their old girlfriends.

There were times when they would have them, the girls, upstairs, and you know doing whatever they were doing late at night. I know there was drinking going on, and drugs going on, and other stuff going on in Quixote House too. We had theft in Quixote House too, so it’s not perfect by no means.

But having said that, that’s kind of the negative side of Quixote House, because people are people and obviously there is a reason why most of us went to jail (Bear, 2016, p. 3).

This confidence in respecting secret agendas and hidden behaviours is based precisely on another jail rule, which is the prohibition of ‘ratting out’ your ‘mate’. Even when a Quixote House resident tries to support another resident in difficulty, he has to respect that rule: “You are trying to get sent back, trying to give them support that way, without really quote and quote ‘ratting them out’”. (Bear, 2016, p. 4). However, sometimes the prohibition of ‘ratting out’ is based on shame, or resistance to the power structure, or the fear of going back to jail associated

with the perceived lack of understanding of their situation coming from parole officers. Bear goes on to say:

Yes, and depending upon the agenda of what's going on, because they are individuals, they may or may not tell you everything (laughs). Because there is some of the secrecy that goes on because they know that if they fall off the wagon, maybe they turned back to doing drugs or stealing something or whatever, there is always that aspect of it.

They ended up not telling you that, because, in part, they are ashamed of where they are at and also scared because, if it gets back to the parole officer, they go back to prison (Bear, 2016, p. 17).

In fact, it is important for residents to not be perceived as 'prison rats', and this is a big challenge when 'things happen' at Quixote House. Even in the midst of major breaches of rules, such as alcohol or drug use, there is always a need to balance the impact of this behaviour inside the house and with parole officers so as not to be seen as 'prison rats'. In the words of Sr. Carol:

But to outline, to meet, to talk [with parole officer] about what would be the points we are honestly going to tell the guy [Quixote House resident]—and also what are the wonderful things about him, that we are also going to say—we can't just continue on...like 'things must change!'

And that's our firmness. Which actually would be respected by every other person living in the house and, in time, by the guy himself if he doesn't instantly, he will at least see it as just, and it will no longer... it won't take the flavour of being a prison rat (Peloquin, 2016, p. 16).

Indeed, Quixote House has the ability to provide support and at the same time not to ask inmates to 'rat out' their fellow residents. The way in which residents of Quixote House deal with issues that should be reported to their parole officer is key to earning trust and not becoming a 'prison rat' in the eyes of released offenders. It is hard to deal with this 'jail rule', but it is not impossible. As Sr. Carol goes on to note:

And I think the key is that when we report [to parole] in any way, that we need to, even if it is to a parole officer, we maybe need to write down the paragraph that we are going to say on the phone or ask the guy [Quixote House resident] to be with us when he phones because in prison the worst thing, the reason why people are called 'rats' in prison is because they do things behind people's backs.

And if we first try to give one chance, and say what has to happen then the next step has to be working with Parole and to say that we really like this guy, he has potential, how can we work together. Going back to prison shouldn't be a first alternative. We are willing to walk with him but the guy has to know that this, to me, this is tough love.

And in the end, in the end what we do will be appreciated and acknowledged, even though initially there is resistance. It's hard! It's hard for Next Step and it's hard for Quixote (Peloquin, 2016, p. 13).

However, the persistence of secrecy, personal agendas and the prohibition of 'ratting out residents' (a jail rule), impacts new residents from prison and serves to solidify those rules. The constant presence of new residents coming to the house from prison also keeps alive another condition forged during incarceration in the offenders who already live in Quixote and Massie House; namely, the stigma of prison.

6.3.2 The persistence of stigma

When people are building community they tend to be together all of the time. Building community with people who have been in prison provides an additional challenge of overcoming the stigma associated with having committed a crime. It is the price these men think they have to pay for necessarily being surrounded by other offenders, instead of trying to hide or cover up their identity. Also, as much as Quixote House is well known in the broader community, those who live there, or are associated with "the Fathers" who live there, are easily recognizable as 'released offenders'. Thus, it is difficult to get rid of the 'criminal' label while living at Quixote House. At least, this is the experience of Bear who articulates how the stigma remains, even while you live in Quixote House:

...with those connections, again comes the stigma of being in jail, and that is just because of the association, right? You are back in Quixote House and they know, and once they are very accepting and open minded, but you know, it is... but you still have the stigma. You know, it is kind like too bad (Bear, 2016, p. 12).

Also, he compares this situation with a story from the time when he was a wanderer in other parts of the world:

I couldn't just... you know, I traveled when I was younger, and I spent ten months overseas, nobody knew me from anywhere, from Adam. I knock on the door because I have that reference. I just stop in this place and just tell who you are and who sent you and then they just open the door and said: Hey, How are you doing? Come on in, you know, stay well, stay a week, whatever you want, don't matter to us, the floor is over there, the bed is over there, you know, help yourself with food, see you, we're gone! (Bear, 2016, p. 12).

However, because of the lasting impacts of the stigma, ex-prisoners remember and acknowledge 'who they are' and 'what they have done' by themselves, without being reminded by others. This has a positive effect. Below is what Rabbit says about this experience:

You know, it just brings me joy when I talk about that stuff and until this day at least once or twice a week, when I drive downtown I drive by the Remand Centre on purpose because I never want to forget where I never want to be again. Like... it is so easy to forget.

Especially when it's been... you know, it has been three years since I am out now, you know, my warrant is over last year, so you know. You are free, there is no restriction. There is nothing.

You never want to forget things. It's good to put it behind you but you never want to really forget because when you start forgetting that is when bad things are going to happen (Rabbit, 2016, p. 7).

In fact, as Rabbit pointed out, Quixote House can become a reminder that things won't be exactly the same after one is incarcerated. The expectation for those changes to happen, and the actions that have to be taken by those perceived to be part of 'the establishment' by the released offenders, inevitably creates a tension in the house. This tension is a sign that things are changing, and that the relationships and the way in which the life of the offender was moulded before and after incarceration can find another way of being shaped with the support provided by Quixote House.

6.4 Key findings

The interviews and the opinions of officers and residents of Quixote House clearly support the following findings:

First, it is hard for any offender to re-integrate into community. The difficulties that were addressed complement what has already been stated in the literature on the subject. It is evident that, although the distinction between ‘individual’, ‘structural’ and ‘relational’ helps to frame the topic, these obstacles are commonly accumulated and intermingled in practice. To read about them is one thing, but it is very different to experience them in the person who lives with you. At the very beginning of my time living with released offenders, I thought that it would be easier for them to reinsert into the local community due to the anonymity that cities often give to people. This was far from the reality. All three kinds of reintegration barriers frequently interplay in a macabre game against the ex-offenders hope and willingness to restart their lives. Even simple activities such as getting a bus pass or a health card become tall orders after the experience of long-term incarceration; the process can threaten an offender’s mental stability.

Although mental illness is highly stressed in the literature as a hurdle for reintegration, my interviews show that only when mental illness is combined with other factors does it lead to reoffending or breaching parole. Also, in the interviews, residents show some sort of compassion when they talk about individuals who, even though they seemed to have everything needed to succeed, were impeded from distinguishing what helped them on that road and what did not, because of their own mental condition. When the offender is faithful to his treatment and can handle his condition, including the aid provided by others around him, mental health issues are not a concern. However, when mental health issues are accompanied by secrecy, ‘self-

medication' with street drugs, lack of support from the system, the combination becomes the perfect recipe not only for breaching parole but also for re-offending.

In contrast, the major factor identified as preventing offenders' successful reintegration into the community is the financial burden that they feel after incarceration. This financial burden often comes from their criminal activities (for example: Driver's License suspensions, delayed taxes, loans) and also the consequences of their lifestyle before incarceration, particularly their experience of crime and punishment. Many of the interviewees, as soon as they were released into community, saw themselves wanting many things that they simply could not afford. This creates in them the feeling of financial burden.

According to Goodchild (2013), 'debt money', the continual possibility for the expansion of capitalist markets and production for the sake of profit, has indeed replaced the theoretical, practical, and social functions of 'God'. Debt money becomes a way of seeing and valuing everything, which seduces us with the promise of wealth and the threat of impoverishment; worship is an obligation laid upon us in a capitalist market society, overpowering us with its serviceability as well as its fragility (Goodchild, 2013, p. 53). To overcome this, it is necessary for offenders to find by themselves the right means to get money to honour debts and to pay reasonable expenditures, while simultaneously dealing with the causes of that financial burden. What is at stake, in fact, is the offenders' relationship with 'money'. If this relationship changes, the financial burden won't happen again.

Second, the main challenge faced by the offenders is the rebuilding of their financial credibility. Debt money and credit are the foundation of the modern world, the basis for one's perceptions of objectivity, liberty, wealth, and reality (Goodchild, 2013, p. 52). It is known that access to credit is a common complaint of impoverished individuals and communities. Released

offenders are part of this community of people who are outside of the credit system, and they all know that without financial credibility there are no chances to afford what mainstream Canadian society offers to an average citizen. They are shunned not only by the community but also targeted specifically by the financial system. In addition, habits acquired during incarceration often work in favour of that exclusion.

This suggestion follows the approach of some people I interviewed in Winnipeg. A parole officer from CSC, identified as 'E', mentioned that, in offenders, it is common to find "mental health issues that have never been adequately addressed. And so, they end up within the justice system". However, mental health issues are not the only problems that inmates face. Dealing with the criminal justice system comes from a "sort of accumulation of factors" ('E', 2016, p. 3). Mental health issues were not a common theme in the offenders stories. What they complained about the most was the 'financial strain'.

For example, in their everyday lives, I have observed that once offenders come into the community, they try to identify those from whom they can get, at least, small loans. Therefore, their first relationship will depend on how faithful they become to repaying those loans or the easiness of getting them. To honour a small debt, in those frequent cases, not only guarantees another future small loan, but also, crafts the credibility of the person among the group, as someone who is able to keep his or her word. Once they have built that kind of credibility, the challenge is to go from this small community trustworthiness to situations in which credit cards and major loans, for vehicles and housing, become possible.

Third, an additional individual factor deemed important is related to emotions, which some identified as 'fear', 'depression' and 'loneliness'. In the interviews, released offenders often saw themselves as 'garbage' (Squirrel, Bear), 'lonely' (Lion), and 'anxious' (Otter,

Moose). Because of fear, offenders tend to hide this low self-esteem with violent defensive behaviour or quietness. These reactions, combined with the ‘stigma’ associated with their crime or their incarceration, become stumbling blocks to their participation in programs for reintegration.

In fact, I have seen that many residents participate in some programs just because they are mandatory. The proof is that even if they have the option to continue in some of the programs after their warrant expiry, or even if they know that they still need them, they do not stay or remain in them. However, they always want to reside at Quixote House, which offers housing and people who may understand their needs. Nonetheless, Quixote House does not offer routine and professional programs such as those offered by CSC and rehabilitation agencies in the city.

Many of those programs are also related with the management of emotions, such as anger or mood disorders. Offenders need to overcome fears of rejection and build a sense of ownership, value and self-knowledge so that they participate willingly in the programs offered for their support. So, obstacles are not only external to the individual; there are also internal struggles that must be overcome everyday—especially when fear surfaces.

Fourth, offenders criticized the suspicious and cautious way in which programs are presented and delivered to them. Released offenders perceive Halfway Houses as a connection to prison, regardless of the good intentions of some people who work in them. As released offenders transition from prison to mainstream society, they are caught in a fragile dynamic, in which conflict with individuals, organizations and institutions in society are often present.

One word that characterizes the situation of released offenders is “tension”. Tension is never related to something static. Tension always indicates movement, even if it is subtle or imperceptible. According to PACS, tension is found in power, dealing with personal challenges

and the ‘political realism’ approach. It is found in structures, between institutions and agencies; in economic realities and in the dynamic between growth and human needs; in identity, between endogenous and exogenous factors; and in culture, between memories from the past and ideas about the future. In light of this, it seems necessary to build peace by creating new narratives that will intertwine with dynamic reality and enhance its own tendency to promote peace, inclusion, and mutual understanding. When power is executed by the structures of a legitimized state towards a minority, the tension needs to be managed by other means; those focusing on the structures that power creates in seeking to perpetuate itself (Burrowes, 1996).

In this regard, power is institutionalized through establishments, doctrines and laws, while success is measured in terms of legitimacy (Cheldelin, Druckman, & Fast, 2003, p. 169). When people revere violent power and coercion, institutions and structures justify their existence and all of the sacrifices made by many for their sake (Cheldelin, Druckman, & Fast, 2003, p. 159). This is evident in the structure and functioning of correctional centres, and even leads to the institutionalization of its members (Goffman, 1961). However, a social structure relies on everyone’s expectations of fulfillment within the entire system. So, when individuals are aware of their social roles and their ability to redefine the consequences associated with their activities (Cheldelin, Druckman, & Fast, 2003, p. 156), tension between institutions and agencies becomes inevitable. This helps to explain why those men interviewed for this study avoid being associated with correctional and rehabilitation places.

This tension feeds issues such as policy inadequacies (Jeong, 2000, p. 33), the partiality of government officers, and state or institutional hegemonic interests. When groups shape their own identity in contrast with other groups, with which power over some common goods must be shared, the conflict escalates and perpetuates itself. This happens due to the way conflicted

actions increase and delineate the identities of those groups. Offenders also spoke of being overburdened by the programs and the expectations placed on them by correctional officers. This is rarely mentioned in the literature yet, when combined with lack of housing and financial strain, offenders are led into solving their problems in inappropriate ways. Even the time used for programs and scheduled visits can seriously limit job opportunities for released offenders who need to be available for work.

Fifth, the lack of motivation and commitment create problems in the workplace for offenders. An important factor that helps residents of Quixote House to stay clear of crime is employment. Some residents show poor work skills and experience as has been highlighted in the literature. However, many said that it is not a lack of experience or skills that creates problems for them in the workplace, but their own lack of motivation and commitment.

In the analysis of social conflict, John Burton (1990) bases his Human Needs Theory on the assumption that conflicts are not caused by an evil human nature or “physiological compulsory means”, but by “situational variables that influence mental requirements” (cited by Jeong, 2000, p. 70). The availability of objective resources, perceptions and expectations are intertwined in a complex system of values that provide criteria for evaluating any conflictive situation. In this evaluation, fear, hatred and despair indicate a lack of satisfaction that probably leads to violence and conflict. These emotions are not necessarily consistent with an objective account of usable resources (such as food, shelter and material means) for personal fulfillment.

In fact, the catalogue of human needs is not compounded by things but by social experiences such as recognition, a sense of fair allocation of resources, participation and freedom. The most explosive source of conflict in the modern era is connected to the desperate needs of groups who are excluded, disempowered and not heard when expressing their basic

needs (such as identity, recognition, and security) (Cheldelin, Druckman, & Fast, 2003, p. 64). Hence, the lack of appropriate employment opportunities for offenders may be related to their skills but more often than not are connected to their social experiences and other factors in the relational realm.

Sixth, institutionalization affects their ‘navigation skills’ in the social system and perpetuates ‘inmate’ behaviour. In the case of Quixote House, residents not only deal with their cultures of origin but also with a ‘bonding’ prison culture that applauds secrecy and hidden agendas. Offenders said that relationships with the wrong people almost inevitably lead to relapse into drugs or alcohol as ‘coping mechanisms’ when ‘things go downward’ or when hurtful emotions arise. I often have seen that, before relapsing or breaching parole, there is a frustration coming from an unmet need leading the person into isolation and the search for ‘old ways’ to deal with it. It is as if there is no middle ground between confrontation and irrelevance; a space where they can express their needs in dialogue and negotiation.

These hurdles are common inasmuch as institutionalization affects their ‘navigation skills’ into the social system and perpetuates ‘inmate’ behaviour. Interviewees were able to identify a certain way of being and the expectations placed on them during the time of incarceration that kept them ‘safe from a mess’ while in prison. However, this attitude does not help once they are in community, where effective communication, mutual accountability and respect for social manners are necessary in order to succeed. However, these are incompatible with the behaviour they exhibited to survive in prison.

In fact, secrecy leads to isolation and loneliness, and with it, they often miss chances to receive the support they require or to get information about programs and job opportunities that may suit them. For example, it is through informal conversations in Quixote House that residents

often engage in some job opportunities or programs, especially when visitors or other released offenders bring the information to them. If the resident is all the time in his room, playing videogames on his phone or computer, surely he will miss opportunities to establish a positive relationship with the community.

Seventh, the prohibition of ‘ratting out’ their peers is a sign of the persistence of prison culture and often works against them. Secret behaviour and noncompliance does not allow dialogue about their situation. In my years at Quixote House, I have also witnessed that when people open up about their wrongdoings it gives them the courage and foundation to fully reintegrate into society. Unfortunately, the situation becomes very different when they pretend to fulfill the simple rules of the house and hope that others do not report these infractions. Even though breaches are happening in front of them, they do not want to get involved or to involve others in the issue.

This sort of ‘loyalty’ among ‘peers’ often prevents them from receiving the support they need at the right moment. For example, I recall a time when one of the residents was visiting some relatives. All of the Quixote House residents except me knew that these relatives were involved in drug trafficking. Then, after a few weeks, the resident went back to jail. In fact, when he reoffended he was under the influence of an illegal substance. In a meeting after this resident was captured and sent back to prison, other residents told me the story of the relatives, but this information came very late for me to act in any preventive way. Only if the information comes at the right time, can residents receive or be directed to the appropriate support they need to avoid recidivism.

Eight, stigma based on shame when surrounded by others in similar situation can work as a deterrence factor. In the interviews, offenders and even parole officers have identified a

positive effect of shame. When offenders are surrounded by others in the same situation, ‘stigma’ based on shame, often understood negatively, actually becomes a deterrent factor reminding the ‘parolees’ of their valuable but fragile freedom. Groups shape their own identity in contrast with other groups, with which power over some common good, such as freedom, must be shared. Often conflict escalates and perpetuates itself due to the way conflicted actions increase and delineate the identities of groups.

Even though identity can be seen as a solid and definite condition inside the group, the elements of its identity have different meanings in time, so their significance can vary due to internal or external conditions. For example, an internal condition of the group, such as a common past in prison, could be interpreted in a different way from outside the group of inmates and force an unwarranted identity—for example, through stereotyping (Moore, Stuewig, & Tangney, 2013). Based on this assumption, a tension between endogenous and exogenous factors underlies any group’s social identity. This social identity, in the case of offenders in community can create symbols and narratives that link individual and collective culture and motivate social action (Cheldelin, Druckman, & Fast, 2003, p. 146). This social action, in the case of offenders, shows how much they value freedom. Residents share the challenge of not reoffending again and at the same time share the challenge of finding other ways to resist the system that continuously punishes them for what they have done.

6.5 Conclusion

The interviews and the opinions of officers and residents of Quixote House show how difficult it is for an offender to re-integrate into community. The difficulties that were addressed complement what has already been stated in the literature on the subject. The major factor identified as preventing offenders’ successful reintegration into the community is the financial

burden they feel after incarceration, coupled with an individual factor related to emotions. With regards to structural factors, offenders criticized the suspicious and cautious way in which programs are presented and delivered to them (hardly cited in the literature). Finally, offenders said that relationships with the wrong people almost unavoidably contribute to relapsing and reoffending. These obstacles usually overlap and meld. Hurdles are not just external to the individual, but also internal. They should be overcome everyday as they become evident to the people around them. For this to happen, safety becomes a primary concern.

Chapter 7 - A safe place to ground oneself

...Shelter! Housing! Food! Safe environment! Yeah, A place to feel safe, and once those main elements are taken care of they can do whatever they want to do: go to school, or find a job, progress, careers, who knows! The sky is the limit! (Panther, ex-offender, still dealing with addictions but more than 5 years without reoffending, 2016, p. 12)

7.1 Introduction

This chapter explores the perceptions of Quixote House residents, founders and parole officers in terms of the safety this house provides for the reintegration of released offenders into community. The voices of parolees involved with Quixote House are heard in their expressions of how the house has helped them to cope with and overcome the hurdles they face in community. Parolees and officers alike identified Quixote House as a safe place; a place where it is even possible for ex-offenders to relax and be themselves.

Safety is the first concern, in the opinion of most of the interviewees, because it is needed to build their own lives again in the community. However, they understood safety in a particular way because it doesn't require the intervention of authorities or officers to ensure it, as usually happens in prison. Also, safety is understood not only in an individual way, because it is also based on relationships. These connections provide them with the possibility of building community in which safety becomes an ongoing process and concern for the residents of the house.

7.2 Quixote House as a safe place

Quixote House is committed to providing parolees with safe and affordable housing (Peloquin, 2016, p. 13). In fact, the founders and parole officers identify Quixote House as a safe place that provides certain stability and a fixed address for parolees; very helpful in a job search, for example. In these terms, parole officer 'F' says that a safe place is "where there is somebody they can talk to about how things are going for them, a safe place to live and a prospect of, you know, continuing to live there. They are not going to be kicked out in six months or something like that" (F', 2016, p. 4). This distinguishes Quixote House from temporary shelters, which cannot provide this sort of safety. However, this 'safety' is understood in different ways by ex-residents, parole officers and the founders of the house.

7.2.1 Safety as clean environment and affordable housing

First of all, safety is linked with cleanliness, a decent neighbourhood and affordability. At least, this is the case for parole officer 'D':

I have seen Quixote House a few times. It is a nice place. It is a really decent place. I think it offers encouragement. I think guys have some place to live that is safe and suitable, you know, it is like a protective environment that way. The location is very, very decent so it is a great place for somebody to live and get some support ('D', 2016, p. 2).

Safety, in this sense, is the basic condition for the rest of the activities and experiences that take place at Quixote House. In fact, Fox states that in Quixote House, "...there is not pressure or fear that maybe tonight someone is going to run into my room and beat me up" (Fox, 2016, p. 11). It is a place where someone's mind is not "preoccupied with how horrible your living space is and so there is... just no peace" (Fox, 2016, p. 11).

In order to ensure this ‘peace’, Quixote House is alcohol and drug free, in compliance with its vision and mission (Future Hope, 2015). This makes a big difference, compared to other places that “shelter” parolees in the city, as pointed out by ‘C in the following story:

A place like Quixote House gives them a chance to get off the street and get away from those high-risk situations. Many of the fellows that we have don’t have money saved up and they don’t have any access to funds.

They may end up at [shelter name] and that is not exactly the nicest place to live, and there is a very high level of drug and alcohol use and abuse. There is also bullying and theft, and all kinds of other things happening in that area. Not because of the [shelter name], but it is inspired by everything they do to try to prevent that (‘C’, 2016, p. 2).

This was also the case for Lion. Even though he had a prohibition of alcohol use, after his incarceration he was placed by CSC in a shelter where alcohol use and abuse was prevalent:

I wasn’t allowed to associate with anyone with a criminal record or be around anyone using drugs or alcohol but I was around all of those at the shelter! I didn’t have much money or nowhere to just hang out. I ended up just hanging around them all because I had nowhere else to go! (Lion, 2016, p. 2).

Released offenders see Quixote House as a better place for the residents because it is free from alcohol and drugs. In fact, according to Squirrel, Quixote House “offers one a safe place, usually drug and alcohol free” (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3). Accordingly, Moose says that the internal safety of the house is related to the prohibition of alcohol and drug use inside the house. This is what he had to say:

I was involved in this and I helped to keep the place as it is. It is up and running and functional, and the residents are safe from external problems. There is not drinking there. There are no drugs there, and there is the expectation of all to maintain that, of course. We all have our problems and we all strive to be good, but we are not all perfect. We stayed there for a reason and, you know, issues don’t go away but regardless of that it is a safe environment (Moose, 2016, p. 5).

Therefore, it is not only the prohibition, but also the expectation that people will try to respect the quality of an environment free of alcohol and drugs, which make people feel safe at Quixote House.

7.2.2 Safety is about feeling understood

On a different note, the absence of security agents and cameras, except for a regular security system for locking the doors of the house, creates a safe environment that has been praised by offenders. This kind of safe environment sometimes is experienced for the first time by many of the residents. This is the view of Fr. Creamer, founder of the house. He said that, “for some of them this was probably the first time that they had lived in a situation where they felt safe, and kind of cared for, if you want, and the people that they lived with and were involved with cared about them” (Creamer, 2016, p. 4).

This approach is described by Tiger who considers Quixote House the safest place he had ever lived in, since childhood:

...when I was here it was like the safest place to be in my life. Like looking back, four years ago, or three years ago, it was like, the safest place I was ever in, you know, besides living with my parents, and it was the safest, most important place ever (Tiger, 2016, p. 7).

Some have even compared the safety that the house provides to “Fantasy Island”. For example, Rabbit noted that when someone comes to Quixote House, this person “can forget about everything that is going on in the outside world” (Rabbit, 2016, p. 8). It provides a “break from everyday life” (Rabbit, 2016, p. 8).

In Rabbit’s opinion, Quixote House is like a ‘safe haven’ away from the struggles of everyday life; struggles related to stigmatization, financial strain and lack of positive relationships. Then, beyond the protection that the house can provide in terms of personal safety and belongings, safety is also related to the kind of relationships they may develop by living in

community at Quixote House. The house is associated with an expectation of mutual support as is the case in the Next Step group. In the opinion of parole officer ‘A’, Quixote House is “first, then, a safe place where they can live and work together. It also offers them a group of like-minded individuals to be supports of each other, as well” (‘A’, 2016, p. 2).

This is extremely important for other parole officers, such as ‘E’, who states the following in his narrative:

These men typically have very few safe places to go in the community. And Quixote House is going to represent somewhere where regardless of their circumstances—you would be able to speak to this better than me—but I expect that you probably see some people come back occasionally, because in their heart or in their head, they know this is a safe place where somebody will talk to them, give them a coffee and talk about how to move forward (‘E’, 2016, p. 6).

Quixote House is a place where residents ‘feel safe’, so that other good things may happen to them. And good things can happen because people understand them. As Lion says, “we have breakfast, go to work if we have a job, come home, have dinner and share our days, ups and downs, knowing that we have a safe place where people understand” (Lion, 2016, p. 1).

Therefore, for ex-offenders, safety is not related to how many keys and security devices the building has, rather it is connected to the people, who are able and willing to “understand” their situation. When Panther, who lived in the streets and was living far from his family home for so long, was asked about the reason he considered Quixote House as a safe place, he definitively replied: “It was just the people! The people were great! And there was also, having Fr. Dave there, a big influence on everybody there. He is a very inspirational character” (Panther, 2016, p. 4).

7.2.3 Safety is needed to relax and move forward

The presence of ‘inspiring’ and stable people also gives the residents time for relaxation. This is also expressed in the expectations of a parole officer referring someone to Quixote House. One officer stated that this person may “find some sort of solace, safety in that place and I expect that he would be somebody that will continue to stay in contact over time” (‘E’, 2016, p. 6) . This was real for Otter, who said, “for the most part it really felt safe to be there. It was, typically, a calm relaxed environment; there wasn’t really too much commotion” (Otter, 2016, p. 4). This was, also, true for Panther, who was of the opinion that “it felt like a safe place. I didn’t have to worry about anything, as long as I paid my rent (laugh)” (Panther, 2016, p. 4). In the case of Rabbit, the time spent every day in the house, helped him to reflect at his own pace about what he really wanted and how to stay out of crime, without forgetting his past. This is what he had to say:

In everyday life, once you get out there, you realized, you know, there is the rat race again, you know. It was nice, just to step back and be able to, kind of, reflect.

The nice thing, you know, about Next Step and then Quixote House is if you get right back into an apartment, right back into the real world, you may have the tendency to forget what happened and where you came from and, then, maybe re-offend again... because you get caught up in it.

The nice thing about this is it was a slow process. It was a step-by-step process. It is funny to say, a step-by-step process of being able to integrate yourself and not forget where you came from. Right?

Because, you know, you want to put the past in the past, but won’t really want to forget it, because if you forget it, that’s when bad things can happen again (Rabbit, 2016, pp. 3-4).

Moreover, Fox noted that many residents saw the house as an invitation to relax and reflect on issues:

Also, just the place always felt so peaceful. There are the little alcoves on second and third floor where you can go and read and relax. There is a patio upstairs, just inviting you to be able to reflect. And I think for myself while healing, that the struggles I faced getting on with my life—having a place where I can come back to just take a breath, and know I was safe—that was really important (Fox, 2016, p. 4).

This time for relaxation, together with the presence of people willing to listen and to understand them gives parolees an opportunity to think freely about their own lives and the decisions they made. That was the case for Lion, who saw Quixote House as a “safe platform for me to try to put my life together after prison” (Lion, 2016, p. 4). Panther described Quixote House as a “safe, safe haven; a port in the storm” (Panther, 2016, p. 10). Fox also said he would find it very hard to work on the same growth process that characterized his stay at Quixote House if he were in a dysfunctional place. He noted the following in his story: “the place you live, if that is dysfunctional it is hard to focus on anything else, especially when you are struggling, because you don’t have a sense of safety and peace.... Quixote was excellent for providing that” (Fox, 2016, p. 5).

Panther highlights the importance of Quixote House not only for himself but also for other residents; for those who struggle with addictions, and are in need of that sort of place. He notes that Quixote House is a safe place where people “can do whatever they want to do: go to school, or find a job, progress in careers, who knows! The sky is the limit!” (Panther, 2016, p. 12).

This kind of safe individual space is needed for the success of any therapeutic activity, as is described by a Harvard professor, Leston Havens, in his book *A Safe Place* (1996):

The work of psychological healing begins in a safe place, to be compared with the best of hospital experience or, from an earlier time, church sanctuary. The psychological safe place permits the individual to make spontaneous, forceful gestures and, at the same time, represents a community that both allows the gestures and is valued for its own sake. It stands at the crossroads of society and solitude, at the intersection of those often divergent and equally necessary paths leading to ourselves and to what we need for ourselves-others. In this safe place, created by doctor and patient, we can learn our inhibitions, false alliances, community-denying demands, and why we despair of anything better; and, still more important, experience these bits of sickness within a deft association that provides tolerance and hope. Finally, this little community

serves as a preliminary, general model for those eventual, particular lives we search for outside it (p. vii).

Therefore, Quixote House is a place where healing begins. The healing process conducted outside the house by professionals in the medical, psychological and substance abuse arena, finds fertile ground in residents while living in community at Quixote House, who can see immediately the progress of their respective treatments.

7.2.4 Safety as a new way to satisfy needs

In some of the opinions displayed above, safety is related more to a ‘feeling’ from which other things can be constructed. This feeling stresses the satisfaction of current and future individual needs. This creates, as well, a safe expectation of those needs being met in the future. At the moment of describing Quixote House, parole officer ‘B’ says:

I think it offers a lot of things that guys need when they get out. They need a safe place to live. They need to eat, and they need to have faith that it’s reasonable and worth moving forward, and I think, Quixote House holds them accountable. It doesn’t sugar coat anything (‘B’, 2016, p. 2).

In the opinion of parole officer ‘B’, Quixote House makes a difference because it satisfies the residents’ individual needs in the context of safety and mutual support. This was also pointed out by parole officer ‘C’: “I think Quixote House does excellent work. I am aware of the things they provide: a safe and supporting place for parolees to live, when they get into the community” (‘C’, 2016, p. 2). And this is also the experience of Wolf, who says: “in that safe place, like for myself, I was able to let go of lots of things, you know, thinking that everybody has to do their part” (Wolf, 2016, p. 8). There is an expectation of mutual support, even though ‘we are all broken’. In the words of Squirrel:

I mean there have been instances where that didn’t happen. I think, you know, I mean not all of the guys get along personally, you know. There is conflict sometimes, but I think that overall it is a good place for guys... What is the

word that I should use?... Just a place where people can come sort of, we are all broken in some way, right? (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3).

Consequently, Quixote House is perceived to be a safe place, not only because of the way it is built and the neighbourhood in which it is established, but mainly because of the people who live there and their approach to satisfying their individual needs. Those needs are basic, such as food, housing and storage of personal belongings, but they also extend to listening, sharing and understanding. In this house, alcohol and drugs are not allowed, not only because it is a requirement from CSC, but also because relationships of mutual support are encouraged, and these relationships are more difficult to maintain in an environment where addictive behaviours surround everyone. This is made easier because the ultimate goal of sharing a house is the satisfaction of having individual needs met while building community.

Safety is associated with the feeling of having genuine relationships. Residents have found this kind of connection radically different from those which are ordinarily part of interaction with the staff at prison, correctional centres or Halfway Houses. With regards to the kind of relationship fostered in Halfway Houses, Otter states that they are seen as obligated and, therefore, not genuine:

It doesn't feel genuine when you interact with a staff member in a Halfway House. Because a Halfway House is pretty much just kind of like a super minimum security facility. I mean it is still government operated.

They still have their regulations, and still kind of have to deal with being incarcerated but still not having the liberty of being a civilian. The attitudes toward it, they feel, are more obligated. When I was released I did spend three months in a Halfway House and, a lot of time, the attitude felt more obligatory than genuine. It is kind of like their program is designed that way (Otter, 2016, p. 11).

Conversely, when addressing the importance of relationships at Quixote House, Otter recognized that in Quixote House the relationships were more personalized and, therefore, more authentic:

I feel that a lot of their concerns are more genuine, and a lot of their support and their advice seem a little bit more personalized and not so cookie cut, not like a cookie cutter response. And yeah, the kind of support they offer is a lot more personalized. It is not like, you know, it is not like 'OK you have this addiction we going to treat you like anybody else and we expect this from you'. Of course, [at Quixote House] there are those expectations but I mean they don't really, you know, put a time line on you (Otter, 2016, p. 11).

This distinction between the formation of genuine relationships at Quixote House and 'enforced' relationships elsewhere was also noted by Moose who argued that, "one is a prison environment; one is a community environment, where the persons are genuinely caring for you and assisting you. It's a 'hand up' is not a 'hand out' either" (Moose, 2016, p. 4). Genuineness comes about, then, from reciprocal relationships among members of the community, and also from a perceived fairness, stability and freedom to belong or not. This reminded Moose of the experience of home:

Everything is there and everybody is equal. And everybody is going to see and take away different things. So, as for the home environment it [Quixote House] was just everything the home environment should be like. You know. There is no in and out of the group. It is not like people are leaving and coming and going.

There are others that live like that, yes, but it is not over and over, this day, one day, changing every day. That's why there is so much screening done there. There is some 'you are in the group or out the group.' You know, that is your choice. So, if you leave the group, you leave the group. No problem. But it has to be like that for stability.

Because I've been in other programs and that was one of the biggest problems I saw. Every day, every person is a different person there in the Halfway House or something. You can't learn relationships, you don't settle. You can't build relationships with people. There is no trust (Moose, 2016, pp. 7-8).

Also, the genuineness is preserved by a constant 'give and take' that happens on an everyday basis. As was pointed out by parole officer 'B', Quixote House provides a 'holistic sort of approach' that emanates from priests and parolees living together and sharing life every day.

In the words of parole officer 'E', there is some mentoring coming from residents as well as the priests and nun associated with Quixote House:

Yourself [Interviewer who also lives at Quixote House] living at the residence provides some level of accountability to these guys, as well as, you know, companionship, counselling; those sorts of things. There is also assistance with basic needs in preparation for reintegration: whether it is support in education, reemployment, or volunteer work.

It is more of a holistic sort of approach, as the individual, sort of shows motivation. It seems certain that Sr. Carol or Kathleen, or in some cases yourself, are willing to sort of meet them where they are and help them move forward.

There are also, I guess, some life skills that they learn. There are, too, the expectations around having a day when you cook, some of the cleaning routine and some of the other aspects; learning to respect one another in each other's space.

Also, because now there are transition apartments that have been built—this is more recent—people can transition from Quixote House to next door and live more independently and those people are still available to sort of mentor in some capacity, I guess, the people who are living at Quixote House ('E', 2016, pp. 2-3).

Those 'transition apartments' referred to by parole officer 'E' are the Massie House Apartments. The mere existence of this building contributes to maintaining the 'give and take' relationship between residents, even after they leave Quixote House. It keeps them around in the role of mentors and provides genuine proof that it is possible to have a decent life after being imprisoned. As Bear notes in his story:

Quixote House is designed to have multiple bedrooms in the common living area, to become a community, and there was one separated apartment [on the main floor]. So when I came to Quixote House, the house was virtually full. I think we had about 6 guys roughly at that particular time. Then within the house there is that one stand-alone apartment that has its own kitchen, and bathroom, and bedroom and stuff. And it has its separate doors to come and go and it's basically an outside apartment. I was living there.

Then, I was given the option to move from Quixote into Massie House, which is now built but then was in the process of being built. So, I decided to move into that apartment [Massie House Apartments] for two reasons: one for continued support for myself and I guess this is the underlying reason since I have no family, nothing, no support here in Winnipeg...

And the next one was that I could see already that I can give back to the community. And for me, on a personal level, it was important. Because I have received so much already from Sr. Carol and Fr. Dave and Fr. Eduardo and the guys in the house (Bear, 2016, p. 3).

This also is highlighted by Fr. Creamer. He mentions the maintenance of long lasting relationships of mutual support around Quixote House as the key reason the Jesuit Community purchased the home next door when it came on the market and converted it into the “Massie House Apartments”. This is what he said about Massie residents:

They are there and help, including the former residents of Quixote House, you know... I think it makes for a better setup now, to have Quixote House and Massie House, because when somebody gets out of prison and comes to Quixote House, they know that their chances of staying out of prison aren't very good. And yet they can see people next door who got out and have stayed out. I think that must mean something.

It would to me. If I was in prison, and knew that just half of those released stayed out... my chances wouldn't be very good. And yet, there are people that came to Quixote House when they got out of jail and haven't gone back, and they won't go back to jail. Bear is not going back to jail, Squirrel is not going back to jail, stuff like that. I think that must mean something. You can see another future besides going back to jail. And it is right next door (Creamer, 2016, p. 16).

Shifting the focus back to the relationships forged at Quixote House, visitors often comment on the trust that the residents have in the priests, nuns and workers associated with the house. This faith and confidence has been pointed out by parole officers as the ‘fitness’ of Quixote House. For example, parole officer ‘B’ noted that:

... Quixote House found the balance between working with us and also respecting the privacy of the offender. So, I felt they would tell us stuff that we needed to know but they also respected the boundaries, and gained trust with the offender. So, I thought that was a very good fit.

There are organizations or individuals in the community that are going to cover for the guy and not tell us what is going on. They are really of no use to us. Quixote House, somehow, seems to find the balance in that... I don't know how you guys do it, but you've found the balance in my opinion ('B', 2016, p. 4).

Therefore, Quixote House creates an environment of trust, confidence and safety that extends beyond the boundaries of the house and its residents. The environment of trust is also validated by parole officers, who see this as the main characteristic of this transitional home for released offenders; a home in which parole officers find balance between private life and the information they require in order to ensure the safety of mainstream society.

7.3 Fears and risks

The process for an individual to get into Quixote House can take many months, even years. Sr. Carol and Kathleen spend long hours with offenders before their release to assess their suitability for the Next Step program and the possibility of them living at Quixote House. Residents of Quixote House have been exposed to many “negative influences” (B', 2016, p. 5). Risk is always present at Quixote House, even though “that definitely is not the focus” (Moose, 2016, p. 8). Addictions, alcohol and drug abuse, fear and the wrong management of relationships can trigger unexpected situations that entail some risk to those who live at Quixote House.

In fact, addictions are associated with unpredictable or erratic behaviour, even when someone hasn't already relapsed and is still struggling; as indicated below by Fox:

They still slipped but the idea is sometimes when you struggle with addictions, it is your eighth time that you finally learn. You know, because you are going through your inner stuff and the fact is that you have disconnection ... I think that is important (Fox, 2016, p. 12).

The erratic behaviour and the necessary barrier that others place on those behaving in this way was also noted by Wolf:

There are a few guys that have come through there that I have intentionally kept up a little bit of a barrier. I never turned my back and disassociated, I guess like I would never push someone away but I certainly put a barrier between a couple of guys because it is just dangerous. You know that they are using drugs, and when they are using drugs, they are completely erratic and if they were to come into my apartment, for example, now I am worried that they are going to break into my apartment (Wolf, 2016, p. 17).

This erratic behaviour is described as a pendulum, and it is present even in released offenders who use the Bible to keep up their strength against their inner calls to use drugs. The way to deal with this in prison is by avoidance. However, avoidance becomes difficult when someone lives with the same person at Quixote House and because drugs can be bought a few blocks away. For example, Fox notes how difficult it is to avoid temptations when you live with someone who has the same issues:

I have some problems when certain guys come in, the residents of the house who were imprisoned in jail and what happens often times you go to the chapel and you build this fortress from Bible study and Bible verses. I've been there myself, so when I moved away from that, that was difficult for me, because it is always easy to fall back into that instinct. And actually I didn't really gravitate away from my attachment to religion until I was out of the house. So when I was still here I was like a pendulum back and forth (Fox, 2016, p. 7).

The risk becomes greater when addictions are combined with mental illness, especially when residents are close to reaching their warrant expiry and are still living at Quixote House. Bear describes this as follows:

A couple of fellows actually hit their warrant expiry and, prior to warrant expiry, one fellow was already planning on going off his medication, and he was going to start using that marijuana street stuff in here. It was planned, you know? ... All I said is 'what are you doing?' Well, I said 'what are you doing?' [He said:] 'you know what? I miss this, I miss... you know'. His imaginary friends, he is schizophrenic and he wanted to kind of be back with them. He also liked the high of the marijuana and liked that aspect of life (Bear, 2016, p. 15).

What is at risk can be the physical well-being, or the personal belonging of residents.

Careless attitudes of residents put Quixote House at risk for home invasion. This is clear in the story involving Fox and Fr. Eduardo when he just moved into the House in 2011:

Of course, we both remember the person, the burglar who came into the house (laughs). You just moved in here and, of course, I was getting ready to go back to University, so I was practicing Math. I think because Tiger had moved out, he came back to do laundry. So he forgot to lock the third storey door and I guess somebody crept in and they were sleeping in Fr.

Dave's room and they were hiding in there, waiting all day and I didn't notice it.

You just moved here and I thought you were sleepwalking, because I can hear somebody opening and closing doors, and thumping around. Finally, I finished up my math homework and I went upstairs and there was this guy standing in my room, with my watch. I knew right away, I recognized it, so I didn't know from all the sound if there was a whole gang. I didn't know what was happening so I freaked out, went downstairs and I called the police.

And, of course, as I did that I didn't know if that guy and everyone else was going to rush down or get me, but the police came within minutes. Eight of them stomped in and went through everywhere and finally they caught him (laugh). That was quite an experience! And I think it was just the two of us in the house... Sometimes the house is very full and sometimes it is pretty empty (Fox, 2016, p. 9).

Bear had also been the victim of theft. Theft, he points out is often associated with substance use: "I had some stuff stolen from Quixote House and so you build this kind of little mistrust. At times, you feel being used by the guys and, you know, they borrow money and don't pay it back, and stuff like that, you know. I don't mind giving the guys rides or stuff like that" (Bear, 2016, p. 11). Others, like Ram, prefer to distance themselves indefinitely: "They had to deal with their own consequences for things, and it didn't affect mine; you learn to distance yourself" (Ram, 2016, p. 6).

With regards to risking life and physical well-being associated with substance use, Sr. Carol tells the story of a member of the Next Step group who committed suicide after a drug overdose. Lamentably, this case is not an exception. According to Daigle and Naud (2012), "offenders [in Canada] could be suicidal throughout their life and even more so when outside prison" (p. 521).

This man apparently made that decision because of poor management of his relationships:

But to be absolutely transparent and after an initial, maybe only one warning, and a sincere commitment to change on the part of the resident, then I think in that minute the parole [officer] has to be engaged. It's 'we are

not reporting on them, we are reporting with them'. So, any letter, any phone call is told to them ahead of time.

I personally have written a note to a parole officer and psychologist for a guy who was in really big trouble. I called them to my home and showed them the letter. I said: 'everything he said in his parole hearing, he isn't doing and he asked for support, because he knew that would be his downfall and I think those who are seeing him, like he is working all night at his job, he is having trouble with his relationship, you know, all the red flags are there and he is not attending Next Step faithfully, and you need to know this. And he has great potential'.

I made a point to put in all the favorable things; he has wonderful potential, he is brilliant, he is a hard worker, but right now he is doing what he committed himself not to do if he were to succeed and... he needs help! Now, he has left Next Step because he isn't coming to meetings to do these other things. But you need to know this. I called him, handed in a copy, a personal copy, and he agreed that it was correct. And a month later he killed himself. Because they did nothing. Neither the Parole officer, nor the psychologist. And there is no... maybe they did something but whatever happened he wasn't called in for real help. He remained in the community and he overdosed. And I was... unfortunately the next time there was anything about him, I attended his funeral and read at it (Peloquin, 2016, p. 13).

Absence and silence are often indicators of risk in residents or participants in the Next Step program. In his journal, Fr. Eduardo describes how some unexplained absences created a climate of tension in the house. This is what he had to say:

My fears are increasing about the stability of the house with the absence of the other guys, the one in Massie House, who barely showed up this week. I also have been attending to my brother, who is leaving on Saturday. Z is worrying me too. Every time I am not at home he is here at the computer. Every time I am in my room and go out to the washroom he is on the computer, and as soon as he notices that I am there, he finishes in the computer. What is he doing? I don't know (Soto Parra, 2016, p. 14).

Fears can also trigger taking unnecessary risks. As Tiger says, fears are hard to handle when one lives with other offenders:

I was like 'scared' [and Fr. Creamer asked:] 'What do you mean?' We are just normal people like everybody else'. I never knew why he said that. Where I am from, I can manage it, right? But some people will have a difficult time being able to live here. Being able to live with ex-cons and stuff like that (Tiger, 2016, p. 5).

Those fears are also pointed out by parole officer 'E', when he was addressing the main causes of recidivism:

[They] have their ingrained fear that if they miss something, well 'I am going straight back to jail' because they have heard all sorts of horror stories that are likely inaccurate from offenders who have been sent back for probably significant breaches. So there is an underlying fear of failure and 'what would come next?' ('E', 2016, p. 3).

Those absences, fears and unexpected risks are the inevitable consequences and challenges of the 'particular security structure' of Quixote House.

7.4 Safety and inevitable tension

At Quixote House, safety is not congruent with cameras, locks or guns but depends on forging supportive relationships and trust. The absence of 'strict control' at Quixote House provides a space for exercising freedom that has the potential risk of serving personal agendas. This creates an inevitable tension. The relationship of trust among residents of Quixote House is deeply compromised by these agendas. As soon as they are known by residents, they need to be disclosed to the correctional officer. In fact, parole officer 'E' finds it very challenging for people involved with Quixote House to keep safe the relationship of care they have with offenders:

I think some difficulty that Quixote may have is in its relationship with the parole officer and getting to know what the proper response would be, because there is a level of trust built between the people—just as you or Kathleen, or Sr. Carol—with these offenders that are in the community.

They have to figure out, or you have to figure out, what level of information you are going to share with us. At what level are you compelled to share? And I wonder if this is going to hurt the relationship... ('E', 2016, p. 4).

Sr. Carol points out just how difficult it is to maintain this balance, which involves working together, meeting, talking, supporting, and encouraging honesty among the residents, priests, nuns and parole officers:

It is always several working on something together, which is better than it just falling to one and each person. If each person is responding to a guy who is having some difficulty, one might be sort of enabling him, without meaning to; being nice to him, another trying to be strict... We are all trying different things and we have to get on the same page. And probably, one of those things may be a meeting without them.

But if we have meetings with them, whether it be myself and the two Jesuits, or if it involves Next Step, that is a question that could be decided, sometimes yes, sometimes no. If it is only how Quixote House is, then to meet and talk about it to see how we can support each other and have a common effort of support for the guys and also a common tough love that we all do. So that, we are not doing different things.

And what do we have to tell the parole officer, what does parole really need to know, and what does parole not need to know, because we are going to work on it ourselves. And if parole needs to know, who would take that approach. Does it involve Next Step? Does it involve Quixote as well? If so, it's probably [Sister] Carol or Kathleen but how can we make sure that the resident knows that he's had a bit of a warning about his struggle in an area and he was given a chance to pull up his socks and make things different. It hasn't happened and, in Next Step, how can we be gentle and firm and honest.

And that he knows exactly the points. That whether, maybe it is in Next Step or Kathleen, sometimes it is just Quixote, sometimes it's everywhere but how can we, at least one person or two people, not too many, when it comes time to tell parole something, I don't think it should be all four of us sitting with the guy. But it could be two. You know? Depending on the situation but... depending on who's going to speak to parole.

But to outline, to meet, to talk [with parole officer] about what would be the points we are honestly going to tell the guy [Quixote House resident]—and also what are the wonderful things about him, that we are also going to say—we can't just continue on...like 'things must change!' And that's our firmness. Which actually would be respected by every other person living in the house and, in time, by the guy himself. If he doesn't instantly, he will at least see it as just, and it will no longer... it won't take the flavour of being a prison rat. And that is something that we haven't really done (Peloquin, 2016, pp. 15-16).

Trust, then, is difficult to maintain. The challenge for the people of Quixote House and Next Step is not to reproduce the old familiar behaviours highly criticized in prison, such as being a 'prison rat'. Sr. Carol explains the challenge and the way to deal with it, especially when residents of Quixote House are at risk of breaching parole. She explains it as follows:

The key is that when we report in any way, that we need to, even if is to a parole officer, we maybe need to write down the paragraph that we are going to say on the phone or ask the guy to be with us when he phones because in

prison, the worst thing, the reason why people are called ‘rats’ in prison, is because they do things behind people’s backs. And if we first try to give someone a chance, and say what has to happen then Next Step has to be working with parole and to say that we really like this guy, he has potential; how can we work together. Going back to prison shouldn’t be a first alternative.

We are willing to walk with him but the guy has to know that this, to me, this is tough love. And, in the end, what we do would be appreciated and acknowledged, even though initially there is resistance. It’s hard! It’s hard for Next Step and it’s hard for Quixote.

This is actually essential, also, so there won’t be resentment by other people who live in the house. It’s like a home that way. Siblings don’t like it either when a person is allowed to do stuff that, you know, is absolutely forbidden in a house or it would destroy the home. And, it is a whole community, the good of the whole community that is important for the individual to see in this case. And it has to be or the house would close (Peloquin, 2016, p. 13).

This attitude has impacted parole officer ‘D’, who mentions the way people at Quixote House care ‘genuinely’ for the released offenders. She articulates this perspective as follows:

Well I think they are people that care, people that genuinely care, people that are willing to help, people that are there to support them. And, you know, not only when they do something good or right, but also even when they are struggling. You know, giving them a second chance. I know guys that have been there before, and then go back to jail and are allowed to come back [to Quixote House] (‘D’, 2016, pp. 4-5).

This genuine care was also felt by Lion who, inside his cell after living at Quixote House, remembers the experience of receiving support he had never had before:

We eat together, do chores to keep the house clean. It’s really a community of guys who have had issues that led them to prison. It’s a place where you’re responsible. If you’re having struggles there are people who genuinely care about you and are willing to help. It’s really like a family! [It is the] sharing and caring that a lot of the guys never had. We have breakfast, go to work if we have a job, come home, have dinner and share our days, ups and downs knowing that we have a safe place where people understand (Lion, 2016, p. 1).

Residents at Quixote House, also described this mutual support as friendship, which develops and even remains among the ex-residents after living together. In the words of Bear, “I actually became friends with them and continue to get support from them and give support to

them, even though they are no longer, including myself, no longer in Quixote House” (Bear, 2016, p. 2). He also made a distinction between a relationship in which someone ‘uses’ the other out of selfishness, and the relationships in Quixote House where people feel ‘like family’ and you ‘start to like them’:

I try to continue to build, you know, a support system around me, and I genuinely like the people so it is not just a selfishness from my point trying to use them. I like those people, and they continue to be my friends today. That’s becoming...you build your own family as you come through life. And, you know, it’s been very good, that aspect of it (Bear, 2016, p. 10).

Once released offenders, such as Bear, Otter or Wolf, have overcome their major fears they are better able to build and develop by themselves a support system, making it easier to maintain their place in the greater community. This kind of safety and outcome is precisely the ultimate goal of Next Step and Quixote House.

7.5 Key findings

The following eight salient findings emerged from the interviews:

First, safety is an important concern for offenders living in community. People may think that parolees are tough enough to deal with the safety concerns of living in Winnipeg, and that safety is not a preoccupation. However, that is not what the interviews have shown. Personal safety and the safety of one’s belonging occupy a very important place in their lives. In their experience of incarceration they were placed and moved without consultation, and often were surrounded by people they did not know personally. This situation created in them a sense of being unsafe, vulnerable, and afraid for their own physical wellbeing and their possessions. More than having a job, or reconnecting with family, they need to be sure that when they come back to their residence, they will be in a place where they can stay, leave, and return without becoming defensive. This concern is rarely cited in the literature.

In my experience, the worst moments in Quixote House are when this kind of safety is threatened. If one of the residents of Quixote House or Massie House is visibly using drugs, the probabilities of risking safety escalate. If someone is under the influence, he becomes violent towards people in the house, but also when the craving comes, he is prone to steal artefacts and exchange them for drugs or to pay drug debts. A community is healthy when its members feel safe enough to tell the group how they feel threatened by the attitude of someone living or visiting the house, instead of asking for an additional and exclusive key to lock their room.

This concern about being safe may possibly have a connection to their fear of becoming homeless. This is not an unrealistic fear. Many of the interviewees were homeless and living on the streets at some period of their life (Squirrel, Panther, Moose, Tiger). They know what it is like to sleep in a shelter. They share the fear of being assaulted during the night or being infested by bed bugs. Safety, therefore, also includes the cleanliness of the place, the people who are present in the house, and the perception that one's belongings will only be moved by the owner or with the consent of the owner.

In order that this jealousy for protecting one's belongings does not become another sign of secrecy and hidden agendas, the rules in the contract, which the residents sign at the beginning of their residency in Quixote House, are very clear. It is important that they know what may happen with their belongings at the end of their stay. Also, by these clear rules, the basements of Quixote and Massie Houses are not intended to be warehouses for the goods of offenders in community or those sent back to prison.

Second, Quixote House is perceived as a stable place. Parolees and ex-residents agreed that although Quixote House is a temporary place, it does provide them stability. In the interviews, this stability is related to the fulfillment of expectations, the absence of sudden

‘drama’, and the regularity of people, places and routines. For the interviewees, institutions—the religious communities that support the house—may play a role in the stability of the house, but the reason the place is perceived as stable is because of the people involved with Next Step and Quixote House. They find the people trustworthy and reliable, and this is true, not only of the Jesuits living with them, but also the other residents.

Also, thanks to the contract signed at the beginning of their residency, residents are given the expectation of staying there as long as they follow the conditions. Their permanence in the house does not depend on activities such as going to certain places, doing specific activities or belonging to a certain ethnicity or religion. No resident considers that stability means being there forever. They are the ones who decide how long to stay there. Secure in Quixote House, as long as they take care of each other and the house, they have time to build up their new life in mainstream society, without being worried about where they will sleep or where they will get their next meal.

This stability also provides them with a known address and a landline phone number, which is very helpful as they start over. In fact, all of the employment agencies, financial institutions, and even government agencies ask for an address and a phone number to provide their services and to ensure a follow up. Quixote House provides this to them as soon as they arrive. I have often seen how residents wait for the mail to come with news about their financial or tax situation, future studies, a driver’s license or good news about friends from their past during Christmas time. Stability is reinforced every time someone receives mail in a place and reads his own name above the address given. This distinguishes Quixote House from temporary shelters, in which that kind of stability is not possible.

Third, parolees require a place where they can relax and deal with the struggles of everyday life. Safety and stability are conditions for true relaxation. No one can rest and wonder about her or his future when the fear of being kicked-out at any time is present. It is true that in prison men have a lot of ‘free’ time, so they may sleep a lot and watch endless hours of TV, but this happens under different conditions from those found at Quixote House. Inside the institution, they do not have to deal with the struggles of everyday citizens. The free time outside prison is not framed by institutionalization. Once released, offenders at Quixote House decide how, with whom and where they will spend their leisure time.

It seems that the only concern is to be productive and to be fully employed. However, I have seen more than one resident of Quixote House burn out from too many hours of work, risking not only his health but also his chances of staying out of prison. In fact, parolees are frequently tempted to deal with stress and tiredness by drinking liquor or taking drugs just as many of their co-workers deal with the same concerns.

The place of leisure in the life of parolees is an area not sufficiently addressed in the literature. Leisure is important because it provides an opportunity for people to personally reflect on their lives. Also, people exercise their creativity, do what they like and share their personality during leisure time. I have felt this ‘inhabited silence’ at many moments in the house; often at night, or early in the morning, when everybody is preparing to go to his workday or when everybody is going to bed. Great conversations and insights happen when I surprise someone watching a certain kind of TV program or listening to some particular kind of music. Early in the morning or after supper, the aroma of coffee permeates the whole house. It becomes a subtle invitation to share a moment together. When a person is relaxed in her/his own home, she/he is prone to share her/his dreams and concerns; making bonding possible.

This kind of personal activity is crucial in parolees because after incarceration they need to get rid of the tension that permanent surveillance supposes. They need time and space to find their own stride, to reflect on what they really want, and especially to reflect on how to stay away from crime. They can see by themselves that they do not have to be busy all the time to avoid bad behaviours. They can see the goodness in themselves whether at work or while resting, when they are among others or alone. Quixote House provides this reflective space, and at the same time gives them the chance to deal with their past and work to build a brighter future.

Fourth, stability is not only about the place but also about the people. Personal safety is achieved in Quixote House not through the presence of guards, locks and weapons, compared to what happens in the Correctional Community Centres or Halfway Houses, but because of the kind of people who live in and visit the house. This is a major difference between the prison and the community environment. In prison, safety and stability are assured by the possibility of using weapons and coercion in a professional way. In contrast, at Quixote House, stability is based on trust. It is respect for the people who live there that contributes to the sense of stability among community members. All of them know that they have been carefully selected and they have agreed to behave properly. Safety is perceived as a feeling that brings comfort to the house residents and is nurtured by relationships among the people who share their everyday lives at the house. Offenders know that they are no longer under surveillance but they also realize that they are not alone or ‘on their own’. The people of Quixote House are journeying with them.

Using PACS insights, a place like Quixote House can be described as a peace system in which conflictual relationships between former offenders and the rest of society can be transformed. Quixote House provides more than just ‘housing’. It is a ‘home’ initiated by the third sector—members of two religious communities—, which is an external third party in the

intervention process. In this context, the design enjoys the advantages of ‘triangulation’ in mediating conflict (Augsburger, 1992). This new presence transforms the patterns that characterize the way the liberal state addresses the re-entry of offenders.

According to Jeong (2000), to design a peace system is to be against the dominant militarist and neoliberal paradigm in the world today. To be successful, this design should consider the global context, of which everyone is a part, the behavioural patterns that legitimize violence, the creativity of grassroots communities in protecting their own values and cultures, a reinterpretation and incorporation of marginalized communities values, and the new experiences in politics for building a better world through a holistic concept of peace. In the neoliberal paradigm, war, fear, economic and political power, are the means used by elites to impose control over the masses, whose lives lack dignity and freedom (Mac Ginty, 2006). A stable place for people who are struggling to live in peace and dignity within the community after offending, creates a space for possible dialogue, the avoidance of violence, and an arena where perceived differences can be transformed and resolved.

In the global arena, peacebuilding processes sponsored by the United Nations (UN) hardly ever address social justice issues directly because of the influence of security studies and the neoliberal approach taken in international conflict resolution and peacebuilding (Mac Ginty & Williams, 2009). In many cases, the first preoccupation of the global elites is about the establishment of a secure environment so that other organizations may safely take on social justice issues (Haus, 2010). In this endeavour, the influence of the security studies approach in conflict resolution demands a restriction of that activity, due to the fragile situation that emerges after a cease fire, where attention is concerned with demobilization, confidence building measures for political transition, and immediate relief for victims through humanitarian

assistance (Hauss, 2010). These measures, called a “formal package”, belong to a minimalist approach to peacebuilding, which searches only for political and military stabilization, in a negative peace (e.g., conflict management) (Jeong, 2000).

A similar process may happen when a Risk-Need-Responsivity model (RNR) is applied to former offenders going back to community. In its application, a RNR model can deny the dignity of former offenders, even with the acquiescence of the community. In fact, this model focuses only on lowering the risk and increasing community safety instead of paying attention to the reality that offenders want to have a better life (Wadd & Maruna, 2007). If a stable place is not available for them, released offenders must face this uphill battle alone, without any place that can serve as a ‘site’ of resistance (hooks, 1990). Such a site becomes a platform, a place, and a small community, which mediates between the “lowering risk” narrative from the state and the ex-offenders’ response to the institutionalized approach from the state.

Fifth, the ‘drug and alcohol free’ rule, a requirement for residency, is not always followed. In the interviews with correctional officers and founders of the house, the prohibition of alcohol and drugs in the house contributes to the safe environment of the house. Imbibing alcohol or the use of drugs is a frequent breach of parole and recidivism. This is due to its availability and also because it is easy for the authorities to detect through mandatory urine analysis. Therefore, for the benefit of offender residents, Quixote House was established as a dry house, although this rule does not necessarily exist in other male residences.

However, most of the residents interviewed saw the prohibition of alcohol and drugs in the house simply as a necessary imposition from correctional officers, instead of a safety concern. They noted that this rule is a sort of extension of the power of authorities in the Quixote

House milieu. My sense is that the ‘caregivers’ in the house all feel safer living with released offenders in a place where drugs and alcohol are not available to residents.

At the end of the day, released offender residents accept the rule because of the fear of being caught by a surprise mandatory urine analysis. In fact, these analyses are ordered at the discretion of their parole officers. It is very sad to see that fear becomes the major factor for deterrence, so that they often try to ingratiate themselves with their parole officers to avoid frequent analysis so that they can have a ‘drink’ or a ‘joint’ without risk of being caught. I even heard how they plan to be clean for the said analysis. Lamentably, these men having those conversations are the first ones caught and sent back to prison.

Residents also pointed out the difficulty of hiding the use of drugs and alcohol by avoiding housemates. This use can happen inside or outside the house especially when visiting friends, acquaintances, or after work hours. However, although this avoidance technique might work in other larger locations, it is harder to maintain at Quixote House, since everybody shares common spaces and lives together with the same people over a prolonged period of time.

This attitude of respect for the other residents of the house, who are struggling with addictions and bad habits, becomes a minor but a significant new deterrence factor in breaching parole. I have seen the change, even in myself, when I am visiting someone in the community and a glass of wine or hard liquor is offered, I immediately think of one particular person at the house whom I don’t want to smell the odour of liquor on me if I have to talk to him when I reach home. For me, it is to lose a precious chance to talk or address some issue, if he is searching for me that evening. Residents slowly develop an ‘awareness’ that alcohol and drugs are banned, not only because it is a prerequisite from CSC but, also and more importantly, because the

interaction of mutual support, which is encouraged at Quixote House, is harder to preserve and cultivate in an atmosphere where addictive conduct frames everybody.

Sixth, mental illness combined with addictions is the greater threat of safety at Quixote House. The residents' opinion about the use of drugs and alcohol significantly changes when this kind of addictive behaviour is combined with mental illness. When they identify one of the residents with mental illness, the rule prohibiting alcohol and drugs gets new meaning, because of the unknown consequences of combining mental illness, or its treatment, with illicit drugs and alcohol. Because of the indiscriminate use of alcohol or street drugs, they reject the possibility of being around people who care about them; to the point of risking their mental stability or life.

Residents recognized this 'combination' as being a significant threat to the stability and safety of the house. I have seen prolonged absences of residents from the house when one of the residents was in that sort of condition. The worst moments at Quixote House during my seven years of residence there have to do with residents who were medicated and stable for a period of time and, then, went back to self-medication and drugs. The consequences of that vary from a simple breach of parole, which can be addressed by the supporting group of people around the offender, to the commission of a new crime, inside the house—such as stealing, damage to property or even violence towards other residents or visitors.

Also, this becomes critical when residents are close to reaching their warrant expiry. Maybe this is caused by the stress of not being under CSC surveillance anymore, by the end of their residency at Quixote House, or just by the identification of real 'freedom' with going back to a certain lifestyle in which the use of alcohol and drugs is widespread. This is the lifestyle, romanticized during and after imprisonment, that they have sacrificed over a long period of time.

The image that comes to mind is of horses before the race. They are excited and nervous before the barrier is lifted and they can release all of their fury and energy on the first sprint. The appropriation of the mental health issue at the end of their parole needs to be addressed as a permanent condition, even though it can be forever associated with the experience of incarceration. Further studies might focus on this particular time of the offender in community and how the places and people around the person can provide better accompaniment and support.

Seventh, safety is related to the residents' needs and expectations. Safety is not only about the immediate satisfaction of parolees' needs, it is also connected to a reasonable expectation that those needs will be met in the future. As John Burton (1990) outlines in his Human Needs Theory, conflicts are caused by situational variables that influence mental requirements (cited by Jeong, 2000, p. 70). Quixote House provides objective available resources, such as a house, rhythm of chores, and meals everyday in a clean and comfortable place that is appreciated among the offenders, from the first time they make a visit. These perceptions help them to realize what they really need, and to create and maintain the expectations that have to be met in a place like Quixote House.

Some needs are basic, such as food, housing and storage of personal belongings, but others are more complex, including listening, sharing and understanding. Needs can vary from just having 'something to drink', to finding the kind of soft drink they like to drink in the right part of the fridge. They vary, for example, from having a TV for entertainment, to being able to watch a favourite show with someone so that they can exchange impressions later. They learn during their time in the house how to express those needs and how to satisfy them by their participation with others. Listening to one another's expectations and their fulfillment, even the

simplest ones, gives room for a deeper conversation and exchange as well as the sharing of really big needs that are often unaddressed because of their past criminal behaviour.

The 'give and take' liaison between residents keeps some ex-offenders around even after they leave Quixote House. They realize that this kind of exchange is not offered everywhere. It is something that has to be built and maintained through time and everyday mutual activities. Also, when they become aware of their own vulnerability, they work for the satisfaction of the need to create and maintain their own support system. This 'for life' support system often involves places, peoples and activities from Quixote House. Additionally, in this frequent reconnection to the house, ex-residents can assume a role as mentors. When this happens, former residents of Quixote House become providers of support to recent released offenders. They are genuine proof that it is possible to have a decent life after being imprisoned. They also can provide chances and expertise for listening and understanding others, which is difficult to offer to recent, released offenders.

Eight, tensions and risks are always present, even though they are not the main concern. The safety that Quixote House provides to parolees is based on trust that they will not harm anyone again. This trust is something that is built by everyone, everyday. It starts during the first meeting with Kathleen inside prison. It continues in the Next Step meetings, and then it is lived in the everyday activities of Quixote House. The overall experience of those who have resided at Quixote House is of a joyful, quiet, cozy place to live. This often surprises visitors. Safety becomes a concern when someone exhibits behaviour that may hinder this conviction, such as the use of alcohol, seclusion, or absences from common spaces and meals. This situation creates tension, because at Quixote House coercion cannot be exercised while caring for the individual and collective needs of its residents. Coercion is the prerogative of professionally

trained parole officers and law enforcement staff, but both are absent from the everyday life at Quixote House.

This resembles what happens with the distribution of power in the international arena. In fact, when PACS describes how power is distributed, it might seem disheartening that the state's military and political elites do not care about elementary individual needs (Jeong, 2000, p. 367). Coercion in all of its violent dynamics is continuously exercised by a relatively small number of people who victimize many. However, this power is not executed without resistance. Some of this resistance can be violent and follow the same patterns as political realism; e.g., replacing these elites. Yet, in today's world, many people have responded to this dominance through resilient people and nonviolent movements. These movements search to replace oppressive hierarchical structures by starting with personal transformation itself (Jeong, 2000, p. 328).

Gandhi's nonviolent movement in India is an example of how personal challenges spread throughout a massive population was able to defeat the political realist policies of one of the most powerful empires in history (Jeong, 2000, p. 326). When offenders in community behave in a proper manner based on the trust placed in them, without the need of officer surveillance, they are exercising resistance to a system that stereotypes them as dangerous and not worthy of reliance. It is precisely this willingness to engage in everyday activities, such as eating meals, cooking, doing laundry and watching TV, which builds trust and makes a new identity possible and credible. According to Pink (2012), everyday life "has been posited as a domain of normative behaviours or conversely a site of resistance" (p. 143). In the case of Quixote House, the norm is to live with dignity and resistance against what the institutionalization and stigma did to the resident released offender.

This demonstration of resistance is not always successful. I have seen many events in which some residents (Squirrel, Panther, Lion) have slipped back into their old behaviours, making it more difficult to trust them. However, the risk that the trust brings in those circumstances is necessary to maintain the authenticity and efficacy of a home like Quixote House. Even though some studies focus on the family in the offender's reintegration (Mowen & Visser, 2015), there is not much literature on the risk to people from the non-profit sector involved in that activity and, so, this study can provide some ideas for further research in that realm.

7.6 Conclusion

The data demonstrates how Quixote House provides released offenders with a safe haven, stability, relaxation, and mutual relationships. In the literature on offender's rehabilitation, it is employment and not safety, which is the main concern. Surprisingly most of the interviewees were of the opinion that their primary concern, the rebuilding of their personal lives in the community, was only possible within a safe and secure environment like the one provided by Quixote House.

Nevertheless, not every safe place works in the same way. Residents experience the safety at Quixote House as 'unusual' because it does not entail the presence of officers or their intervention. Instead, people with whom offenders in community share their home are most likely to 'understand' their situation and meet their expectations. The liaison with these people is necessary to maintain safety and to make sure that their basic needs are met. To keep this liaison becomes an option for residents, and opens the door to the possibility of building the kind of community in which life concerns can be continually and more personally addressed.

Chapter 8 – Community and belonging at Quixote House

The main thing is that we sat down that one time a day, and we were with each other. That was really good too, that was something that I never really had in my life (Wolf, more than 5 years without reoffending and sober, 2016, pp. 7-8).

8.1 Introduction

In the research for this book, most of the participants, in one way or another, identified Quixote House as a community. The comments of ex-residents match the vision of the house as designed by its founders, who also envisioned Quixote House as a ‘community’ (Peloquin, 2010).

However, ex-residents articulate the concept of community in diverse ways and link it with different experiences. They perceive these experiences as helpful for their reintegration into society. This chapter explains how parolees and correctional officers experience Quixote House as a community and their understanding of its main characteristics.

8.2 Community as life lived in ‘common’

The community experience of Quixote House is mainly associated with common activities of everyday life; such as cleaning shared spaces, preparing suppers, receiving support from one another when ‘things get tough’, and attending Next Step meetings together. In fact, ex-residents noticed a contrast between their own pace and some sort of ‘push’ that people around Quixote House gave them to move forward. As Otter noted, this ‘push’ was given by those living in community: “It is just to take the things at your own pace, but there is still that support to take initiative to move forward. And, yeah, kind of really creating a community with all the members, trying to get everybody involved in there” (2016, p. 2).

They identify this dynamic, this external energy to get everyone involved with the functioning of the house, so that they are in sync with each other. Fr. Creamer (founder and also

a Quixote House resident during the first 5 years) reported that residents are interested in building a sense of community:

Everybody was invested in ways in that house, you know? How it operated, and... it just had that sense. Even the idea of the pictures there on the walls of the groups from year to year, and stuff like that.

I thought it's all kind of building the sense of a community that has staying power. I guess you can say that if you give people a sense of security; Quixote House wasn't a fly by night kind of operation (Creamer, 2016, p. 10).

Community is related to a sense of mutual collaboration that happens every day.

According to Moose, Quixote House “is a community living situation. Everybody pitches in for groceries, for keeping the place clean, for cooking—at least supper anyway is cooked by the residents—and you put your name upon the calendar” (Moose, 2016, p. 2). Here, Moose is describing how everybody wrote their names on their cooking day on the bulletin board calendar every week. “To get involved with dinners every day” was a good experience for Otter (2016, p.2), who even jokes about it:

Meals were great, depending on who was cooking (laughs). No, it was always good. It means ending the day sitting around with a bunch of guys in a similar situation. It was kind of reflecting what they, what we, all did with our day; kind of listening to other people's progress (Otter, 2016, p. 2).

Residents agreed about the goodness and convenience of having to take turns cooking dinner. This creates a sense of collaboration and fairness, which invites the group to become more involved in the activity. The level of involvement rapidly showed itself in creative meals and the enjoyment of all in their preparation and sharing.

8.3 Community as shared joy that lingers

Community is linked not only with doing chores in common, but also with enjoying the outcome of the chores together. This is manifested during suppers, which are an opportunity to informally

check each other out, and listen to and confront each other's ideas. This played a key role in creating community; at least, in the words of Fox, who noted the significance of togetherness:

Quixote House is about a community to me. I always felt home. Even after I left, every time I came back, I always felt like I love the way the model works; especially, I think, the big thing for me is the dinner.

The idea of sharing dinner is a big piece, because what that does is everybody picks a day, and so, you are encouraged to cook something and then everyone else cooks, and I enjoy that because I know I will have one day a week, and so that day you can put out your passion to do it, and then you can relax because you won't be the cook on the other days. It is a really good philosophy (Fox, 2016, p. 4).

In fact, the description of suppertime brought back memories of home, family and mutual support. As Bear relates, the common table plays a big role at Quixote House:

The good thing is the community suppers. I would say they are good. They are sitting at the table, like a... community aspect of it, the family aspect of it, even though most of us, or a lot of us, find it hard to cook and a few things like that, because we took turns cooking.

Like for me, I was working and it was always more difficult. For those of us who do have jobs, to attend meetings and stuff like that, it was difficult to be a participant. But, you know, the sitting down after supper, the hanging around watching TV and communication and talking.

And then with the presence of Fr. Dave, who was in charge when I first arrived. You know, by a certain time in the night he was always sitting downstairs, watching TV, and if you want to talk, you get to talk and the community aspect was there and if you want advice, he would give you advice, and talk about issues. So, there is a lot of support from that aspect of it (Bear, 2016, p. 4).

In addition, parole officer 'D' avowed the importance of having a meal together, because at meal, conversation happens and this becomes "a good way to sort of touch base with people and interact and if you want to go and spend the time with them" ('D', 2016, p. 3).

The presence of residents each day at supper creates an opportunity to linger after eating, to do dishes, and to clean up the kitchen. Moose notes that this generates a caring environment, which never existed in prison or even in Halfway Houses for these men:

One is a prison environment, one is a community environment, where the persons are genuinely caring for you and assisting you. It's a 'hand up' and not a 'hand out' either.

You come to do your part at Quixote House and the demands or whatever it is, the prerequisites, and expectations, are not outside of reality, which is another thing about some of the 'correction centres'. Their expectations are not realistic.

And there is a definite lack of individual needs, you know, when it comes to the 'correction centres' and Halfway Houses; with respect to comparing them to something like Quixote House where there is help for you individually, you know.

Everybody has mental health issues or level of intelligence, and qualifications and all these things. So that is another difference between Quixote House and the 'correction centre' environment and Halfway Houses (Moose, 2016, p. 4).

This environment of care, coming from meeting each other every night, sharing a meal, listening and respecting each other, helped Wolf in his reinsertion into society. As he notes, sitting at table together every day, like a family, is something he never had before in his life:

When we sat down at the table, you know, we had the opportunity to just engage each other, and it was just like a little family. You know, and just like, just like a family, like with your cousins and your uncles that would come around but aren't there daily.

[At Quixote House], even after the guys have moved on, they come and join us for suppers. It was just like a family get together. You know, a bunch of people with that same thing in common; we all came out of jail and parole, and were trying to stay out of the jail (laughs). Yeah. So, it was really nice to sit and have suppers.

I usually take more than an hour to prepare the meal, and we would sit down and supper would last, you know, maybe half hour, 45 minutes and a little bit of a hanging out afterwards.

Some people would hang on a little bit longer to spend time with each other. Others would eat, and after a couple of words, be off to do whatever they were going to do. And no matter what the person's take kind of was, if they wanted to stay and talk or if they wanted to just eat and go, you know, it was always OK.

The main thing is that we sat down that one time a day, and we were with each other. That was really good too, that was something that I never really had in my life (Wolf, 2016, pp. 7-8).

Wolf identifies the sense of community at Quixote House with family, highlighting the fact that Quixote House was more than just a place to live and that the sharing of meals at the

table was more than just satisfying one's hunger. For example, Otter articulated that this mutual support was complemented and reinforced by House Meetings, which also helped to resolve the inevitable conflicts that arise from living in community:

It is not just like a place to go. There are community activities, such as the house meetings. It is something you don't really get staying in a shelter. And a place like Quixote House offers a little bit more of a sense of security, sense of safety, where being in a shelter wouldn't. It also offers a little bit more support for those people who suffer from addictions (Otter, 2016, p. 10).

The sense of community and support was also extended to celebrations, such as birthdays, or holidays, in which the presence of members of the wider community was appreciated. Panther experienced the goodness of having other members of the community as visitors at Quixote House:

Visitors often came over for dinner. They were members of the larger religious community, like lay people, lay Catholics, and maybe they come over for dinner. Everybody would pitch in, chopping up vegetables, and making a meal, and there are even times when there was a drug addicted neighbour who came over. Someone just brought him over for supper and he came often. Just little things like that, you know, being neighbourly (Panther, 2016, p. 7).

These acts of neighbourliness were also crucial and highly praised by ex-residents. For example, Tiger noted that:

It was like gold, the community support that I had. You know, we always have... we never miss a holiday.

There are always special occasions, and that was a tremendous support that they give, like that you give [the interviewer/researcher]... unlike anywhere else. And, you know, it was a special kind of... highlight these people giving up their special day and time to come and hang out with us and stuff like that.

It was like, you know, wow, you know. And, you know, being with people, because I mean, a lot of the times it would be spend by yourself, right? And being able to spend time with people and see them better, you know. Yeah, so...

I think that was, I think that was... that was something that was special, able to be with people that is special (Tiger, 2016, p. 6).

Also Lion noted the importance of these little moments of celebration together when in his letter he shared the following memory:

I remember I was upstairs and I heard all this noise downstairs, it was just before Christmas I think, I came downstairs and Fr. Eduardo and Fr. Kahn (not sure of spelling) were the only ones there and they were having a fabulous time cooking brunch for us all. And no matter what they don't forget a birthday ever, even if you'd prefer that they didn't (Lion, 2016, p. 3).

In addition, Rabbit recognized the significance of holidays as he shared his memories during Christmas and Thanksgiving day:

I remember, I'll never forget... I wasn't living here but I stayed overnight because I had a weekend passes, the first Christmas I was out. And it was Christmas morning and just everybody came around in their pajamas and we were having coffee and then you pulled out your guitar.

I think I still have the video. You just started singing and you were playing your guitar and Awe! It was so great! You know, stuff like that. At a normal lunch, the jokes and the funny things that have happened. You know, lots of fun, bugging each other.

And also, you know, there were special times of the year, like Christmas dinner or Thanksgiving. You know, when everybody gets together and we all made different foods... (Rabbit, 2016, pp. 6-7).

In the opinion of parole officer 'E', "I sort of see, what I have seen over time is that attempt to build a community of support; note, that is partly through the attendance at the Next Step program, as well as the continuation of that while living at the residence" ('E', 2016, p. 2). Then, community living based on suppers together, shared chores, taking turns cooking and organizing celebrations became an opportunity for the residents to put into action throughout the week what is learned during the Thursday evening Next Step meetings. As parole officer 'F' says: "It's kind of a 24 hours connection that people can have and I guess, in more practical terms, housing, safe housing, and a 24 hours sense of community and connection" ('F', 2016, p. 2).

It needs to be pointed out that Quixote House also resembles the male student religious communities formed by the Jesuits in houses in downtown Toronto. Fr. Creamer also noted the importance of what Sr. Carol does in the Next Step meetings on Thursday evenings. They both played a role in the creation of Quixote House. Fr. Creamer suggests that Quixote House:

... was an extension of what she [Sr. Carol] was doing on Thursday night. It became a model for Quixote House for the whole week, if you want, and the only other model was the Jesuit Community, you know, the kind of communities that existed in Toronto in those days in Theology when we lived in separate houses, and cooked for ourselves and so on.... This is just like we do at Quixote House, taking turns cooking and cleaning, and all that stuff (Creamer, 2016, p. 2).

The origin of the community owes much to the Next Step program, which reinforces the efforts of individuals to become part of a living community. Moose articulated that:

... the Program Next Step, which is the stepping-stone for the house, and played a role in rehabilitation long before the house became a reality. It is still ongoing and there is a meeting I believe probably still today, once a week at least. Maybe the meetings are at the house, I am not sure where they are conducted.

Anyways, the Next Step meeting is to keep the members of the house and other members connected with the group and focused, and spending the night [at the Next Step meeting is considered] as part of the house. It is the underpinning of it, really. They keep separated, but they are together, related (Moose, 2016, p. 2).

The other model for the community of support in Quixote House, as Fr. Creamer stated, is the Jesuit community. In his view, Quixote House:

... a lot of the way it operated was basically just the model of the Jesuit community, you know? Where people got their own breakfast and lunch, and somebody would cook dinner and the other people who didn't cook the dinner washed the dishes. And people have jobs to clean the house and so on. That is what we did in small Jesuit communities (Creamer, 2016, p. 5).

Quixote House was even a surprise for Fr. Creamer at the beginning of the project. The depths achieved by the men participating at Next Step and living together in Quixote House

provided a meaningful and healing environment, one that was far different from the superficial relationships among men in university dorms or rooming houses:

I thought it would be like when I lived in the University dorm. You see roommates and friends there, but it was rather superficial in some ways. You know what I mean?

Quixote House wasn't like that. I guess because every Thursday night we went to the convent for those Next Step sharing meetings. And so, you got to know people at a very kind of deep level. There were some extraordinary evenings there. Not so much in Quixote House itself but in that Thursday night meeting that we attended.

That was because if people were open and honest at those meetings, we worked with them. So, if they had something going on and tried to talk about it in that meeting that made quite a difference. So there were some pretty intense meetings, at which people kind of rallied around, and cared about people and tried to do something to help them (Creamer, 2016, p. 5).

In the opinion of Fr. Creamer, it is very important for the success of Quixote House that its residents know themselves with a certain depth. This depth is nurtured by their incarceration experience in common, and also because of their sharing in the weekly meeting at Next Step. In those meetings, everyone is invited to show who they really are, and this creates mutual respect and accountability.

8.4 A community in which everyone is accountable

The tasks in common, the shared spaces and the depth of knowing each other, thanks to Next Step, create a safe space at Quixote House that makes it possible to hold residents accountable to each other. As parole officer 'B' recognizes, accountability is seen as a major characteristic of Quixote House residents:

Quixote House has demonstrated accountability and they have a reputation of legitimacy, and they really, I think, really offer a lot of things that guys need when they get out. They need a safe place to live.

They need to eat, and they need to have faith that it's reasonable and worth moving forward. I think Quixote House holds them accountable. It doesn't sugar coat anything. It addresses their offence cycles and their needs, and their risks and that...yeah, I think that it absolutely offers something ('B', 2016, pp. 2-3).

Parole officer 'B' also appreciates how the Quixote House community provides support yet also teaches residents how to be accountable; crucial in their journey from prison to community. This is what he had to say:

There is the sense of community, and support. It is as close to unconditional as you probably get, with some level of accountability. I think that is the big one. I think that they are going to be building some level of skills as well. Some of that I think I mentioned earlier: the expectations related to chores and cooking and, you know, group outings and all that sort of thing ('E', 2016, p. 7).

The same parole officer also referred to the sharing circles at Next Step as an outstanding experience for all of the participants:

I also remember there was like, I guess, a form of a sharing circle or accountability circle or something. If one guy was going sideways, the other guys were going to sit and—I can't remember how exactly it worked—and they were going to support the guys who were working through decisions. I thought it was awesome ('B', 2016, p. 5).

However, it is not those in authority in the home, but the community itself, which keeps residents accountable and willing to share and receive support from each other. For example, Rabbit articulated that everybody reminds each other “that things are going really well but [someone] has to keep your mind on still trying to watch your step because if you get ahead of yourself, you are going to end back where you were before” (Rabbit, 2016, p. 4). Rabbit also gives an example of this in his narrative:

If you were committed to make dinner on a Thursday night, you needed to make sure to get back here. If you couldn't, you needed to communicate to somebody ahead of time. Not just have everybody waiting for dinner and again, you just don't show up.

There is responsibility actually and there is another one: Quixote House brought you back to the world but you have to be responsible, because being in a place like Rockwood, where you are locked up for a while, there was no responsibility. Right? I mean you had to do your job, or you had to go check in at a certain time but there was no responsibility to be part of the group (Rabbit, 2016, p. 4).

Accountability in community becomes the main difference between the experience of the inmates in correctional institutions and in a place like Quixote House. Quixote House is not only a place that provides housing, it also provides community support intertwined with spaces to be responsible and accountable. This is very clear to Fox, when he argues that even though the issue of housing is big, even more important is “having not just housing but housing where there is accountability and a dependent supportive environment. That is what I think Quixote is; this sets it apart for me, from other houses that try to do the same or give housing to guys who get out of jail” (Fox, 2016, p. 12). Also, Fox mentions the importance of togetherness at the moment of healing, “if you want to heal, if you want to go through your own process of getting strong by overcoming the inner demons—we all face them, and it feels like we are all trying to do that together” (Fox, 2016, pp. 12-13).

This process of healing is accomplished at the pace of each resident of Quixote House. Each person prioritizes what to work on a given time, how to face his own struggles, knowing that he is accountable and responsible for what he decides. This made a difference for Moose, as he noted “the difference between Quixote House and the Correctional Centre environment and Halfway Houses” (Moose, 2016, p. 8). This was also Tiger’s experience, who had time at Quixote House to open himself up and improve his social skills. He said, “you know, you can relax, knowing where everybody is at, you know, kind of get a feel for who they are, and yeah, I am all for that. They helped me to open up to more people” (Tiger, 2016, p. 7).

One of the stories that illustrate this environment of community and mutual support is linked with Fr. Creamer’s jigsaw puzzle. Moose narrates extensively about that puzzle:

Oh yeah, there was always a jigsaw puzzle going. There is a puzzle, the community puzzle. Fr. Creamer, I believe, he is the sponsor of that (laughs). Maybe he has an addiction issue and that was his.

I always helped with that. There was always a puzzle, you know and the puzzle was there for everybody to work on. So we sit around and we put a piece in—it was always out and the others were watching TV, watching news, commercials. You always have someone to talk to, visit and share with.

Many shared what happened during the day or something like that. That was a great thing to help people to communicate, you know. The puzzle was on the coffee table in the living room. He moved it out there ... It was on a big board, and it was there for anybody.

If during the night you can't sleep you can work on the puzzle... Fr. Creamer will be there working on the puzzle, or anybody else. That was one of the things that I can remember. It stands out to me anyway.

I think that it was out because it was for everybody, it was a communal thing, you know. I didn't do puzzles, but, I stuck in a piece every now and then... (Moose, 2016, p. 8).

Sr. Carol also noted the impact of Fr. Creamer and his puzzle in the common living room area of the house:

For the several years, Fr. Dave was here and I didn't think of it in the beginning but it turned out this was really bigger than it looked. He liked to do jigsaw puzzles. So he would sit in the living room, close to the door where the guys would come in. He would do big jigsaw puzzles. And then, sort of have CNN in the background.

But just quietly in the background again, and again, and again. For sure he heard all the news, but guys would come down from upstairs for a glass of juice or they came in from somewhere and, because he wasn't doing anything that took his total attention, he usually asked how are you... and they often stopped. They come for a glass of juice but they sit and talk about their day. Or they come in and talk about what happened when they were out.

And the fact that he was not in his bedroom but was sitting there, seemingly with nothing special to do but listen to them, was pretty positive and many of them remember that.... It felt good to them to have a presence, just sitting there. It probably did more than he ever guessed, by sitting there doing his jigsaw puzzle (Peloquin, 2016, pp. 5-6).

This puzzle, done every day, was an opportunity to forge community around something in which everybody could share and participate. The completion of every jigsaw puzzle became a 'superordinate goal' for the diverse members of the community, with the "cumulative effect in the direction of reducing existing conflict between groups" (Sherif, 1958, p. 355). There was the

enigma of a shared puzzle, but also each one of the residents found it an opportunity to get together and talk and bond with each other:

And then you come home and usually Dave was here (giggles) doing a puzzle or something, right? And he is always asking ‘how are you doing?’, you know. If things are going OK or if we can do anything for you....

You have supper at 6 o’clock when everybody will sit down and, kind of like a family, things happen. People just start talking about what is going on and you always have fun and joke around. It is not, it is not serious, and it is guy’s talk anyway.

And then, you know, maybe sit around and watch TV or go to your room and do whatever you do, and then go out for a while. I mean there is no pressure where you know, ‘you have to be back!’ I was certainly more responsible for myself here, you know what I mean, liking independence. Basically that is how I looked at the day (Squirrel, 2016, p. 4).

Even though some of my interviewees suggested that Fr. Creamer intended the jigsaw puzzle to be a community building activity, he only spoke about the jigsaw puzzle as his form of recreation, with little recognition of its capacity for community bonding by becoming a ‘superordinate goal’. In fact, he just mentioned this possibility in passing, when narrating a story about how Tiger felt free to invite his classmates to Quixote House. This was what he had to say on the issue:

So these two guys were from mainland China and came to the University of Manitoba. He met them in class—in a math class or something—and he brought them to our house. They didn’t know who the hell or what we were.

They saw the jigsaw puzzle and they went crazy. They knew about puzzles but they hadn’t seen one before and they started trying to put the pieces in. Tiger began saying “hey we gotta go or we are not going to get to our movie” (Creamer, 2016, p. 14).

Quixote House is a community of support built by different members in different ways; in the same way that a jigsaw puzzle fits together. Everybody was playing their part in a very informal yet structured way. This informal yet regular coming together allowed residents to develop a sense of belonging and authenticity that was different from what they had experienced in prison, and in other correctional facilities and Halfway Houses.

8.5 Community and a sense of belonging

One of the positive feelings of connection that ex-residents and parole officers have highlighted in their conversations about Quixote House is the sense of belonging. This feeling and the emotions associated with it are often connected to their memories about the house and the experiences they had there. Parolees often talk about the need of being “grounded” or “anchored” (Fox, 2016, p. 3). In fact, “rootedness and rootlessness evoke conditions of existence, which tend to stress the emotional gravity of place” (Lovell, 1998, p. 1).

Quixote House became a place where parolees could find rootedness, a space to grow and to be fruitful. However, they found different ways to articulate this sense of belonging and how important it had become for their ‘desistance from crime’. In the case of Otter, to have a sense of belonging was something new and the Friday night suppers played a major role in it:

The Friday nights when we would have the community dinner, it wasn’t only just the guys, but their family, their partners and volunteers, as well. Everyone just kind of came together as a community, and it kind of gave me, how can I say, gave me a sense of belonging.

It is not really something that I had growing up, and it gave me just a little bit of more self-worth for myself. I think that is what a lot of the social aspect did. I was coming out because I wasn’t so, I didn’t feel afraid, or ashamed of what I did, or what happened in the past.

There was kind of more, just moving forward and I think that really helped me a lot (Otter, 2016, p. 3).

Otter’s sense of belonging during his time at Quixote House is narrated as something ‘processual’. It is an experience that takes time and ‘grows within’. The experience of belonging to a group with such a variety of people as he mentioned—“the guys, their family, their partners, volunteers” (Otter, 2016, p. 3)—created in him the possibility of believing that other people can see him with different eyes, and not just as someone labeled by the crime he committed in the past. This also seems to be very important for him as he has moved forward in life:

Giving me a sense of community, a sense of belonging, I think that is what Quixote House did for me... kind of showed me that not everyone in the world will hold my past against me, that there are those that would give me the opportunity and chance to redeem myself and that it wasn't a place... where I was treated like a criminal or an ex-offender (Otter, 2016, pp. 4-5).

Sometimes, the sense of belonging is articulated with the word 'family', as was the case for Rabbit as he noted that "it was just like being with a family" (Rabbit, 2016, p. 2). That is also the experience of Squirrel who articulated that "it is almost family for me. I shouldn't say almost; it is family for me now. You know, I don't have anybody, so it's you guys who are the closest thing I have to an actual family, so... that is important" (Squirrel, 2016, p. 7). Sometimes, Quixote House was viewed as an 'extended family', which was the case for Wolf who remembers the experience fondly: "It was like a little family, you know, and just like, just like a family, like with your cousins and your uncles that would come around but aren't there daily" (Wolf, 2016, p. 7).

In others, the sense of belonging is connected to the 'safety of having a home'. This was highlighted as an 'incredibly rewarding' experience by parole officer 'A':

From what I heard, from the few that I had the opportunity to speak with about their experiences at Quixote House, the experience itself has been incredibly rewarding. It has provided them with that sense of belonging, that safety of having a home. And of having the additional supports there, with staff and with the others... the individuals who live in that home with them...and then, given responsibilities like you would have in a home ('A', 2016, p. 3).

Moose also describes this sense of safety and belonging at Quixote House as something he never experienced in prison or in other programs. He associated it with the word 'home' in the following way:

I've been in other programs and that was the biggest problem I see. Every person is a different person every day there in the Halfway House. You can't learn relationships, you don't settle. You can't build relationships with people. There is no trust, you know, you keep the community locked up,

your personal stuff, you are not supposed to trust. You just protect your property and things in another place. Whereas this place, Quixote House, is like your home and you know that protecting property is something that you don't have to worry about; not completely. There is always some risk but that definitely is not the focus. Yeah, it was a home. It was a home in the true sense of the word (Moose, 2016, pp. 7-8).

The aforementioned comments illustrate the complexity of the idea of home and the difficulty of defining home from just one perspective; although certain adjectives become common in the Quixote House residents' description of the home.

Quixote House intends to provide to its residents a sense of belonging that makes people stay around freely and move forward in life. This contrasts sharply with what offenders have experienced in prison, Halfway Houses or other related programs. Sr. Carol noted that Quixote House allows for a sense of freedom and belonging that make it possible for residents to engage in free commitments:

That's why Halfway Houses aren't felt that way and there can't be the trust of employees, because employees won't get paid unless they do proper reports. So, it is not their fault really but the Halfway House is in that position. And if others have to be there, there can be people, other guys that aren't committed as we hope they have or they say they are...committed to live out a community life like at Quixote.

There is no such thing in a Halfway House as you must be there for meals or whatever. But again it goes back to... it goes back to the desire to truly keep one's commitment to Quixote House. There is a free commitment. It's not that you go there and you are obliged.

You are free to live at Quixote House or leave, or not come in the first place, whereas in the Halfway House there isn't that freedom and that's big. It's like prison in that way; it feels like prison. In reality, it is a roof over their head and food but feels like prison because prison is a roof over their head and food as well (Peloquin, 2016, p. 11).

The sense of belonging and solidarity among the people living at Quixote House pervades residents' decisions even after they reach their warrant expiry or finish their parole. For example, as parole officer 'C' noted, Quixote House becomes a place where released offenders "can touch base" and "even after they left Quixote House, they still can come back and have

contact with staff there and touch base.... You know, come back for a meal or just a visit and that provides something for them that they didn't often have before" ('C', 2016, p. 4).

Parole officer 'C', articulated that this is extremely important because, in ex-offenders, the word 'home' is often associated with chaos and insecurity:

Sadly, with most of the people I work with their 'sense of home' was a place of violence, distrust, insecurity, and chaos.

Some offenders that come through... had come through a nice stable background with good supports and that, but somewhere along the line that has typically gone off the rails.

Even if their childhood was very decent, they got into adult relationships that have gone upside down and they have got caught because of that. So, again, they've found [at Quixote House] a place of support, stability there, guidance ('C', 2016, p. 3).

Whether they had or did not have a positive experience of home during their childhood, the ex-residents of Quixote House tend to visit or stay around after their time is over at the house. Even during their worst times, Quixote House has a positive impression on its residents. "If the guy in his worst moments comes back to Quixote House, and is not even overtly asking for help, but is there because he is down and out and has nowhere else to go... I don't know, I think that's pretty successful" ('E', 2016, p. 7). In fact, this shows the sense of belonging and care that the house provides for current and ex-residents.

Ex-residents also highlighted this positive experience. .Bear, who is still very close to the house, says that, "overall, you know I'll give it probably a 90 percent as far as providing support and comfort and security and a sense of belonging. I would say that aspect was really good" (Bear, 2016, p. 10).

Even, if they do not stay around physically, the feelings linger and arise when they see each other around the city. This is the case for Wolf, who describes the feeling as similar to what someone feels when he sees a good old relative who brings him joy:

There are a lot of fellows that I don't spend hardly any time with, especially now that I am not living there. But, even though I am not living at Quixote House and there are some guys that have come through there that I only just know, not to actually have any interaction with them, I still feel like they're family.

Like still it is just a different kind of connection now that would live in me forever. You know, if I ever, ever come in contact again with guys from Quixote House, it'd be like seeing a long lost cousin, or something, you know, in the middle of nowhere, and just be joyous (laughs) (Wolf, 2016, p. 17).

The effects of this sense of belonging in the individual are associated with self-acceptance and are attached to the development of social skills, the sense of purpose or direction and, as stated above, with the feeling of being anchored, or having self-knowledge, for what is coming next in life. In fact, Tiger noticed that this was one of the key changes that brought him to live at Quixote House in the first place:

After Quixote I was more open to meeting people that otherwise I would never have met. Yeah, and, you know, to just be more open to people. I find that, sometimes hard and dangerous to do, but not after Quixote House.

After that I was like 'people need a chance' and stuff like that. But I think they only can do it in a controlled environment or something, and, you know, with Quixote House it was like I knew the people from the group, so it was kind of build that bond or relationship with them and ... everything is good and, you can relax, knowing where everybody is at.

You kind of get a feel for who they are, and yeah, and I am all for that. They helped me open up to more people (Tiger, 2016, p. 7).

After living at Quixote House, Otter "found community, a sense of belonging, I found myself, I found, you know, the freedom that offers... I found myself, who I was, where I belong, kind of like a new sense of purpose" (Otter, 2016, p. 9).

Those stories have even impacted the parole officers who worked with residents of Quixote House. For example, parole officer 'D' avowed that the stories shared by released offenders living in Quixote House were really 'touching':

I remember in an initial conference of housing that we had two years ago, we had a couple of the residents [of Quixote House] come and talk and share their

stories, right? How they made it and how the help and support that was provided helped them to make it through. You know, and the longer you are out and the longer you don't re-offend, I mean, it is just ... yes! (expression of satisfaction). Just the personal stories that they shared at that conference for us were really touching. That was awesome. That was really encouraging ('D', 2016, p. 5).

When men find a positive place where they belong as opposed to 'just having a roof over their heads', they are unlikely to reoffend. Stories about the community built at Quixote House have touched the hearts of those who have the mandate to reintegrate them into society. On the other hand, freedom and commitment make the house depend on resident's efforts and agency, and so, the support that the house provides is always as variable and fragile as are the residents themselves.

8.6 The fragility of a community built in this way

This is an entry from my journal for September 04, 2016:

A day of ins and outs. Sunday. In the morning X was frantic, around me like a bee, fighting for the crepes he had for himself. I told him I had to leave and celebrate Mass. It's quite hard to keep track of his mood. I even felt relief when I had to leave home. I came back around 12 for a nap before leaving for Rockwood. The house looked clean and nobody was around. Then I came back from Rockwood and I saw Y barbecuing, instead of X. He said that his daughter called him and he had a long time without talking to her, and that justified his skipping cooking supper.

My discontent with X grew at the table, while eating food that was supposed to be prepared by him. He does not want to cook. He was talking loud and sometimes seems very aggressive. Their language at the table was also terrible. Y and X were talking and using the "F" word many times. I just looked at Z who was at the head of the table.

Regarding the head of the table, X wanted me to be seated there. I asked him to do so, and he rejected it. He wants to do what pleases him, and his language goes from cursing to talk about God and the devil. That simply drives me crazy. So, my patience is tested here now. After supper Z mainly cleaned all the dishes. We had time still for coffee, when Bear finally appeared! I have gone the whole week without seeing him. He even missed meeting my brother. We had a nice conversation, Z, Y, even X, sometimes, while waiting for Sr. Carol, and the house meeting.

Finally, Sr. Carol came with donuts, she sat for a while with us at the table, and X was in his room. Bear left [for his apartment], and we started

the meeting. X even complained about the absence of an apple fritter. Actually, she bought two, but they were eaten before X arrived. I discussed house cleaning with the guys before the meeting started. So we thought that the meeting would be short. We were wrong.

Sr. Carol read from the Bible. She asked about blessings and struggles... everybody was clear and respectful in their answers, until X took his turn. He ranted nonsense, complaining about everything, and he again left the group...but he came back. Then, we gave him good feedback, acknowledging what is right and asking about what we think may be wrong, or has an explanation. I think he understood the point. He stayed, signed his contract and went back to his room after talking a little more with Sr. Carol.

After the meeting, the climate of the house changed. I promised to cook breakfast for all tomorrow around 9:30 am. I watched "Spectre" with Y, and he shared the weird behaviour of his Mom with regards to the payments on his phone. This house is so fragile! (Soto Parra, 2016, p. 16).

The above entries describe just one day of activities at Quixote House, including one of the most structured activities, a house meeting. However, it is clear that without the willingness of residents to participate, no activities at Quixote House would ever be possible. The perceived difficulty that the released offenders seem to have to fulfill explicit and implicit expectations of the other residents of Quixote House shows their fragility. This is pointed out by Lion as follows:

Unfortunately I also found a lot of pressure to do well, like everyone else in the house seemed to be and when things in my life seemed to take a downturn, instead of going to the people in the house for help and support, I was embarrassed to be needing help and not performing as well as the other guys seemed to be doing (Lion, 2016, p. 2).

Furthermore, the short amount of time (from 6 to 18 months) that people typically reside at Quixote House brings to mind the temporary nature of the experience. For example, Ram lived there for only 11 months. Even though Quixote House was important in his development, he described it as "something transitory, making transition to the community better", and he "would call it a Transition House" (Ram, 2016, p. 7). Ram knew Quixote House "was a step...that it's not going to be full time so it is that stepping stone in order to get into the next place" (Ram, 2016, p. 7).

This fragility is also evident by the “brokenness” of Quixote House residents, as was pointed out by Squirrel (2016, p. 3) and Bear (2016, p. 2; 14). This brokenness does not negate the capacity of people to support each other, but it can often exemplify their brokenness even more. Bear articulates that:

I won't say incapacity to, they do have the capacity to do it, but in their own stuff they haven't reached the point where they can embrace that capacity. Whereas here, the guys know they are broken, they've been told they've been broken, let's break some more (laughs) (Bear, 2016, p. 14).

This fragility sometimes affects the admission of new residents to the house. Sometimes, new residents are welcomed with warmth and enthusiasm; sometimes, with suspicion or judgment even though these “new comers” have been meticulously screened by Sr. Carol and Kathleen. To be sure, some offenders are disallowed entry into the program. This rejection was perceived by parole officer ‘C’, as a sign of the weakness of Quixote House to fulfill its mission:

I just noted recently that Quixote House is rejecting some people that I thought they used to take. So I hadn't had a chance to speak with anybody about whether our admissions standard changed. And the reason this stands out for me is because you folks do such a wonderful job that if somebody is not allowed in it is like I am disappointed because, you know, you have your reasons for being selective about who goes there, because you can't just open the door to anybody unless you have a functional place ('C', 2016, p. 6).

Fragility is not found only in residents who have been offenders. Sometimes it comes from students or Jesuits who have been part of Quixote House. Fox spoke of being judged harshly for his sexual orientation by one of those residents who in turn even threatened Sr. Carol. This is what Fox had to say:

He didn't stay very long. But he was... one of the examples... I mentioned of some residents who were very religious. It's the fundamentalist Christian religiousness. He had a lot of that... and, you know, he would preach at me nonstop.

And he was doing a lot, he would say things but he would do the opposite. He had a problem with drugs, and women, and he got... there is one time that he really challenged Sr. Carol in a way that I thought he was

going to attack her. And he stormed out of the house. Not a very good situation.

Finally the police came and I think eight police officers came to take him away, and that was the last we saw of him here (Fox, 2016, p. 9).

Bear also mentioned that the fragility even comes from the Jesuits living in the house who sometimes don't provide the strength and stability they are supposed to:

For the most part it is good, I would say; but there are times when, you know, it is like walking... a little bit like walking on glass, thin ice—you know, in there. What really helps is the stable presence, though, I would say of the Jesuits and the lay people that are there. Even though they have their ups and downs (Bear, 2016, p. 9).

Although Fox praises the work and presence of the Jesuits at Quixote House, he also shares a story of one Jesuit who seemed to be very unstable while living there:

In terms of the Jesuit members of the house, like Fr. [other Jesuit's name]... and all the other people that have been here, from the Jesuit body. It's been pretty consistent. I think there is one who was here, his name was.... He was a little bit strange. He seemed crampy and miserable, but he wasn't here when I was living here.

I think he was after I came back to visit and... he is the only one I can think of who really didn't seem to be very warm and welcoming. My thinking is because we disturbed him to make him do chores, he wasn't happy about it...(laughs) I think that was the problem (Fox, 2016, p. 7).

Ram also told a story of 'the potato peeler'. In this story, Ram narrates how one Jesuit who lived in the House reacted to his ways of dealing with some controversy over supper:

I can't remember the guy's name; he got out of jail, right? And I told him like he was going to the Next Step group, right? And I said, well I will cook so stay for dinner, so he shows up at the house, OK, I am going to cook steaks and potatoes and everything for the guys for supper, right?

So I started making everything for the whole house for supper. And Fr. comes in and just went ballistic, 'Oh you are making this fancy supper tonight, and all this!' Oh, well, I didn't know about this. I said 'It is an easy thing I am cooking supper for everybody here so, what's the deal?'

So he got on the phone to Fr. Creamer and told him this other story, so Fr. Creamer comes back and flips out on me and I said, what is the problem? I cook supper for everybody not just myself and... I can't remember the guy's name but... I said for everybody. So, it is all good, you can do your supper tomorrow night or whatever, right? It is not going to be the end of the world. He just kept arguing about what Fr. had said and

stuff like that... and I ended up getting kicked out of the house, down the road man. It is not big deal with me.

I did laugh about the potato peeler incident. Because, in [Next Step] group, Squirrel told me that Fr.... said I came about with the potato peeler like this (threatening position) and I said, no, this is what I had, the potato peeler in my hand and because Fr., is younger than me I said (changing the position of the hand like grabbing a pointer) 'look junior, you don't tell me what to do'. It is all that I said. So he got mad, right?. (laugh)

He thought I'd go and attack him with a potato peeler! And Squirrel said, why would Ram do that? Because there is a drawer full of knives beside him... So really? The potato peeler? I am Irish, but, c'mon! (Ram, 2016, p. 3).

In the opinion of Sr. Carol, the Jesuits who live in the house bring their own particularities to the house, though they seem to need more support from their congregation. This is what she had to say on the issue:

In time, we may hope there might be one of our former members who could help as well, but at the moment, and for the last 8 years [the Jesuit residents] have been critical, a critical presence and each Jesuit has brought his own personality and added something. You know they've been good people.

And it is good for guys to have met them. And it is fine that they are human. I mean, because their humanity makes them more, I don't know, more real and approachable. It is sort of good that they have strengths and weaknesses but they are still committed to the house. Then, another whole area that I suggest is to have more support for the Jesuits who are in charge here.

I think, and even the guys in a way, but not to put so much pressure on the Jesuits themselves, as they try to run the house (Peloquin, 2016, pp. 14-15).

This institutional support is also fragile, as Fr. Creamer declared, when he was asked why he founded the house:

You know, the idea of living in a house with people like that was to me like going down to my Dad's home. My grandmother's house was pretty much of a zoo.

But the other thing is that, you know, we talk all the time as Jesuits of being with the poor, and we have much great language around all that kind of stuff, but we really don't do very much. And so, that bothers me now... (Creamer, 2016, pp. 3-4).

Therefore, the fragility of Quixote House emanates not only from the offenders, but also from the founders of the house, Jesuits and others who have lived there. Everybody who resides at Quixote House and is around released offenders has to deal with ‘jail rules’, secrecy and personal agendas. They live with the angst of not being perceived a ‘rat’, while avoiding the ‘stigma’ associated with being surrounded by ex-prisoners and those who help them. In addition, there is always the risk of falling back into substance use and abuse, and unforeseen situations and relationships are often overwrought by fear. All of this occurs without a tight definable structure in the house, a house managed by ‘non-professionals’ and a ‘messy’ kind of intervention.

Everybody, including the Jesuits, have been challenged and pushed to their limits in providing ongoing support every day. As I wrote in my journal on September 05, 2016: “What a day, a day like a roller coaster. A day to believe, stop believing and believe again” (Soto Parra, 2016, p. 17). The support provided and the community built at Quixote House have both positive and negative outcomes. The next chapter will examine what is going on at Quixote House, what kind of practices of everyday life are conducive to nonjudgmental approaches and service for others, including all that it means to share a home in this very unique context.

8.7 Key findings and conclusion

The following eight relevant findings about Quixote House arose from the interviews:

First, personal pace and accountability in community become the main differences between the experience of the inmates in correctional institutions and those living in a place like Quixote House. Offenders, as every human being does, eat, do laundry, go to the washroom, and communicate with people around them. These activities and relationships are the same everywhere they go, but they have to be executed in a different way depending on where they

are. Those activities are rigid and institutionalized in prison and Halfway Houses. In contrast, Quixote House provides a sense of freedom and belonging that makes free commitments possible.

As soon as they enter into Quixote House, residents realize they are no longer in prison or in a Halfway House. The kitchen, dining room and living room are together. The cosiness and cleanliness of the kitchen and carpets are simple indicators that activities happen in different ways. All of them know they have one year to resettle their lives, but there is no institutional expectation in terms of achievement. Therefore, they can set their own rhythm and order of priorities through a free conversation with Kathleen, Sister Carol and the other residents of Quixote House.

The freedom to set their own rhythm and pace for achieving a successful reintegration into the mainstream society is forged within the everyday community interactions at Quixote House. It is true that everybody has to perform their daily, weekly or monthly duties, and cook a weekly meal, but everybody freely decides how and when he will do it. In this small community, concrete personal challenges are taken into account, so as to associate this respect and concern with the word 'home'. For example, when I arrived at Quixote House, seven years ago, my English was not as fluent as it is today. I have seen how the other residents made an effort to understand me and to talk to me in a way that I could understand what they are saying. In the same way, some of the residents never had the chance to work on their communication skills and, so, we all worked together, each at their own pace, to meet that particular challenge. I never felt the pressure 'to do it right' immediately, nor did the other residents.

The same thing happens with the common 'chores'. In Quixote House, residents can always ask for help, or negotiate about their chores that need to be done. In decisions that affect

everyone, a person's personal pace is respected to ensure a comfortable participation in building community. This gives room for free commitment and accountability. It is not their parole officer who will call attention to failures in this regard, but the other residents who had to use a dirty washroom, or found no supper prepared. They may complain directly to the resident who did not honor his own word. This mutual support and accountability allows for more authenticity.

Interviewees identified informal and regular gatherings as authentic and, in this sense, very different from what they had experienced in prison, in Halfway Houses, and in other correctional facilities.

Second, community provides for residents the necessary 'stimuli' that subtly or not so subtly 'pushes' them to move forward by allowing the opportunity to see personal rhythm over against the rhythms of those around them. Community not only means sharing spaces, or doing activities together and being under the same roof, it also means being motivated by others who challenge individualism. In the interviews, residents were able to identify concrete people and moments that helped them. Besides that, the interviews showed how residents referred to Quixote House as a whole 'entity' that helps them be less worried about their individual needs and concerns. People and the place prepared the individuals to move forward in their life.

For example, often a visitor coming from abroad, or good news shared after supper, or just the way the chores were performed by one of the resident's, became this necessary 'stimulus' to get out of one's comfort zone. Sometimes, that particular moment or person cannot be identified within the memories of the residents interviewed, but they assert that the impulse to move forward really came 'from living in Quixote House'. This is the recognition of Quixote House as a community capable of becoming an agent of change. This idea is very important and often underestimated.

According to the information given by the interviewees, Quixote House is a community that offers a ‘way of solving needs’ that is different from prison, or even before incarceration. Community is evident when the individuals who build it distinguish their own ways from the ways of other members. Community becomes real and intentional when, with that knowledge in mind, they give their personal assent to keeping part of it. This personal commitment cannot be forced or taken for granted.

Once this personal decision is taken and maintained through the period released offenders are challenging themselves by living at Quixote House, the community is also able to change them. As soon as it is identified, community can ‘energize’ people’s participation and motivate commitment. This commitment may start with small chores, but sooner or later will take form in broader pursuits.

Third, having meals together amidst table conversations was a major source of community bonding. Most of the residents interviewed stressed the importance of having a meal together. In Quixote House, supper is served every day at 6 pm. This supper is prepared by one of the residents and it becomes a chance to develop culinary skills but, more importantly, to share personal preferences and culture. It is not only the meal; it is how the table is prepared, where and how the residents are seated, and the time taken to eat our food. Some residents never had the chance to eat in that way, seated around a table, talking about their day, acknowledging who is around before starting to eat. In the interviews, suppers are spoken of as the most important event at Quixote House.

Residents and visitors recognize the impact of a regular meal together in building community. Around this meal, community is built because it provides an opportunity to serve, to listen, and to care for each other. Everyone can bring questions about the lives of those seated

around the table or share the news on TV and in the Newspaper. Service is not linked to inferiority or oppression, but it is seen as an opportunity to show gratitude. The service is also done as a team, made very clear when all residents help in the dishwashing and cleaning up after the meal. Supper is rarely served in silence. Finally, to routinely see each other once a day, becomes an opportunity to ask questions and offer support; especially, if ‘things are going wrong’ or if someone has a ‘bad day’.

Meals are indicators of how the individuals and the community as a whole are functioning. Participation and creativity encourage others to keep the community active and strong, and to provide chances for receiving support and feedback about individual needs and concerns. Conversely, when people do not show up for supper, when residents are absent without crossing out their names on the kitchen board, when someone rushes the preparation of the dish, or when the food is not tasty or the dishes are left to be done by the cook, these signs point to a community that is not healthy enough and so actions must be taken.

Fourth, community is about enjoying the outcome of common chores together. Similar to what typically happens at meals, common chores allow everyone to delight in what they have done together. More significant than a task is respect for the way and time for the activity to be performed. Everybody has the chance to add their personal touch. This becomes a chance to the use integrative power to prevent and avoid conflicts within the community, inside and outside of Quixote House.

Integrative power is an important tool in PACS because it is related to the capacity to deal with uncertainty and randomness, common in peacebuilding interventions (Boulding K. , 1990, p. 123). Also, integrative power “may have something of an insurance-like quality about it that enables people to carry themselves through bad times into better ones without collapse”

(Boulding K., 1990, p. 123). So, if Quixote House is able to provide a collective identity and soften the effects of institutionalization among the offenders, it is because of the use of integrative power in a 'homelike everyday' situation. In Quixote House, power is deployed in the practices of everyday life such as the chores or the preparation of a meal for others, creating a space for "hybridization", which has become one of the critical issues in PACS in recent years.

These 'homelike everyday' practices are also an opportunity for residents to exercise cultural fluidity, since they normally come from different cultural backgrounds. When culture is addressed in conflict resolution processes, cultural fluency and awareness are emphasized as necessary for avoidance and reappearance of conflict. According to LeBaron (2003, pp. 53-136), cultural fluency is a familiarity with the dynamics and workings of culture so as to avoid the different cultural traps, such as ethnocentricity and complexity that hinder dialogue and real communication. Cultural fluency invites the exploration of the concrete humanness of the people in each culture related to the conflict. This can be present in norms and formal declarations, and even in poetry, music, literature and other cultural representations.

Cultural fluency leads to dialogue and mutual understanding among parties and interveners. In the case of Quixote House, residents not only deal with their cultures of origin but also with a 'bonding' prison culture that applauds secrecy and hidden agendas. So, for conflict resolution or transformation to happen it is necessary to develop listening skills and 'mindful awareness' (LeBaron, 2003, p. 85). Everyone is taught and encouraged to listen carefully to the cultural particularities of perceived adversaries in Next Step and Quixote House, and to discover in every person a 'common' humanity. As Squirrel said: "There is more to it than what you just see. There are other colours there or whatever ... there is more to it than just two. That is sort of how I would see you guys [Quixote House]. You see where you want to go and other people

don't see that. I don't know if that makes sense but it takes vision" (2016, pp. 7-8). When all parties grasp this, a satisfactory solution for everyone is possible. Thus, people are willing to restrain their own cultural vision to be enriched by the vision of the other. This diagnosis and the discovery of 'common humanity' become a source of joy for residents and visitors to Quixote House, no matter what their cultural background is.

This enjoyment results in personal gratification and also community achievement. Community is a source of joy, relaxation, and gladness that invites the men to persist in making the experience work. This is especially evident when residents of Quixote House organize 'special suppers', which in the words of the interviewees are clear examples of the result of this invitation. Interviewers were deeply touched by celebrations in which suppers become special, including their preparation and presentation. I also remember that those suppers allowed people room and gave courage for huge revelations and provided venues for reconciliation. One event that particularly struck me was when a resident asked to be forgiven by another (who had punched him) after Christmas Mass, and before Christmas supper. He realized by himself that he could not sit together at the same table if he still had this grudge in him.

Fifth, community resembles 'family'. The 24-hour connection and participation of the residents during celebrations such as birthdays, graduations, Christmas, and Thanksgiving build a sense of belonging that resembles 'family'. Some ex-residents have indicated that the people in Quixote House are 'like' their family, like 'old relatives'. The lines that usually differentiate staff and clientele do not exist in Quixote House because there is no staff at Quixote House. Residents with different roles and backgrounds develop a deep quality friendship. This relationship is nurtured by the quality and the depth of the sharing at Next Step and the permanent contact in the place where they live.

Also, most of the individuals at Quixote House share the common stigma of being convicted offenders. The stigma is still present but is now accepted in a positive way. People cannot come telling ‘fairy tales’ about prison when everyone has been there. Often at table conversations or while watching the local news, places and surnames linked with Stony Mountain are taken for granted. At the beginning of my experience in the house it was difficult to understand places such as the ‘fish tank’, or ‘SALAL’ that they talked about but were new to me. As in a new family, I now know that the ‘fish tank’ is the common room where inmates are housed when entering Stony Mountain Institution, and ‘SALAL’ means the rooms of the ‘Salvation Army’ in downtown Winnipeg, with the additional meaning of not being wanted by anyone.

Each of these common experiences are ties that bind them together, just as happens in ‘traditional families’. The experience of incarceration becomes the origin of this new extended family for everyone in Quixote House. Some memories are sorrowful, but the ‘family’ that resulted from that experience is, often, the only one that they know. This sense of belonging also includes the volunteers in prisons and non-offenders residents at Quixote House, as was illustrated in the story of Fr. Creamer and how Ram was willing to give his last fight for defending Fr. Creamer’s life.

Sixth, people find rootedness in community; space to grow and be fruitful. Quixote House becomes a home for offenders and other residents (Jesuits) as well because it is “the place where domestic ‘communitarian practices’ are realized” (Mallet, 2004, p. 66). These domestic practices require the participants’ humility and self-recognition in order to perform them. For example, dishes are not dirty if no one eats. No one eats if no one cooks and no one cooks unless someone goes shopping. In a home like Quixote House, the “centrality of relationships” for the

need's satisfaction of all those involved is evident (Douglas, 1993, p. 280). The sense of belonging among the individuals is associated with self-acceptance; it calls for the development of social skills, a sense of purpose or direction and a growing feeling of finally being 'grounded' or 'anchored' in life.

Quixote House is a place where people identified as 'ex-con' can discover other identities as well, such as 'the cook' (Moose, 2016, p. 4) and 'breakfast sunshine' (Rabbit, 2016, p. 3), among others. This kind of interaction can only happen within a home. At home, people have multiple identities and work with them freely. In addition, home provides a place and time in which those multiple identities can be addressed through attentiveness and continuous inquiry about things and their meaning (Lederach, 2005, p. 36). The gift of paradox provides an intriguing capacity because it holds together seemingly contradictory truths in order to locate a greater truth. It seeks to find the home of meaning in the experience of people.

This rootedness in community is authentic. Authentic connectedness that occurs at home is encouraged. The first step toward authenticity is to understand and publicly recognize that the engagement of deep issues and of people—in sustained dialogue, living together and understanding each other—is hard work and does not end with signing a lease or a contract for a room and agreeing to minimal rules for sharing a housing facility together. As Lederach (2005) states, "authentic engagement recognizes that conflict remains" (p. 49). However, it is at home and around a table that feelings of transcendence emerge. Gathering and eating, throughout human history, are often seen to signify the place where enmity dissolves. It is as though, when such a space is created, it sparks the broader use of sensuous faculties and people become more human (Lederach, 2005, p. 110). This dissolution of enmities often happens at home. As Mac Ginty (2013) states, individuals, families and communities are the ones who have to do "the

‘heavy lifting’ of peacebuilding by learning to live with their neighbour from another religious group or learning to work alongside someone who shares very different values. This everyday tolerance and diplomacy is hugely overlooked in the peacebuilding literature” (p. 6).

Quixote House conceived of as a platform more than an institution provides a base for responding to “dehumanizing or diminishing approaches” (hooks, 1990). A platform has permanency of purpose and flexibility to generate new responses to emerging challenges. It is in this sense ‘smart’ and ‘flexible’. Institutions are notorious for creating structures but are not typically known for their capacity to shift and change according to environmental demands. They are permanent in purpose but are not flexible in how they pursue that purpose (Lederach, 2005, p. 127). Consequently, Next Step’s peer support work in conjunction with a supportive home like Quixote House work as a platform for social change that can be flexible in order to generate responses to emerging challenges. When a deep narrative is broken, there is a risk of losing the capacity to find a place in this world, and from there to find our way back to humanity (Lederach, 2005, p. 147).

This grounding and sense of purpose remain even after leaving Quixote House, which is evident in the return of ex-residents to visit, sometimes during their worst moments. Constantly, the house phone and personal cellphones of ex-residents receive calls from ex-residents who are back in prison. I have seen poems around the house written by ex-residents where they poured out their deepest sorrows. The porches at Quixote House and Massie House, especially during the summer time, receive visits from ex-residents, even those who did not finish their experience in the best way. They often come by just to say ‘hello’, ask for old mail or, on Fridays, for a slice of pizza, and a can of soda, as well as the chance to have conversation with someone who will truly listen to them.

Seventh, the support that the house provides is always as variable and fragile as the residents themselves. In contrast to the perceived stability of the house because of the people and religious institutions that support it, the aid received and given at Quixote House varies according to the reliability of residents at any given moment. As Sr. Carol has pointed out, even though candidates are thoroughly screened and selected, once in community it is evident that not everybody can live and build community at Quixote House. This statement is applicable not just to offenders, but also to other residents, such as students and Jesuits.

Community living has its own particularities and challenges. Some minimum measure of personal agency and strength is required to resist enticements and to become violent. It is one thing to preach about community, but to practice a communitarian style of life requires effort. In our individualistic society, every limit to our personal range of possibilities becomes an excuse to become aggressive and even violent. In offenders—and Jesuits—, who often are very territorial, this behaviour can only be lessened through a conscious and persistent effort. Emulating previous residents of the house often encourages this. Also, the result of this common determination is always at hand because the house relies absolutely on residents' efforts and care.

Likewise, rebellion against the simple rules of the house and violence is also at hand. These unforeseen situations, often associated with substance use and abuse, can push the limits of everyone in the house, including the Jesuits. In this regard, people with a disposition for building community at Quixote House have to assume risks. There is always risk in welcoming someone you barely know into a home. Also, those dwelling in a home do not have an 'occasional' relationship but rather, a 'continuous' relationship. Over time, Quixote House has become the transformative platform, in which other institutional approaches can be addressed

and relationships can be sustained in a constructive change beyond the episodic expression of the conflict between offenders and mainstream society, or the effects of stigmatization. Indeed, according to Lederach (2005), “the creation of such a platform is one of the fundamental building blocks for supporting constructive social change over time” (p. 47). These platforms generate processes that produce solutions and potentially transform the epicentre of relationships in context. Even if a person dwells at Quixote House only for a short period of time, that experience seems to have a permanent impact on individuals and groups involved with this initiative. However, the platform is not provided by the business sector, or the state. It is just a small community of released offenders and people around them, with their own weaknesses who believe that second chances are always possible. For this reason, the support is always fragile.

According to Augsburger (1992), a mediation position is always vulnerable and delicate, and can only happen when a basis of common commitment—common connections between parties and a continuity of the outcome—is assured (p. 197). In urban societies, the identity of parties is framed by individualism, an ego-centred and autonomous context. However, Quixote House provides a collective identity, softening individualism and the chosen rational and formal attitude coming from state structures, in which achieving individual measured performances are crucial. In contrast, the need to create a place that works as a home—as in traditional societies where the process is affective, informal, and relational—is decisive for achieving an outcome that favours, not only individuals, but the community as a whole. Mediation follows in order to preserve these relationships and mutual respect, as was said repeatedly in the interviews with Quixote House ex-residents. This respect and preservation benefits not only the concrete offender dwelling at home but, especially in the case of a home built by members of religious organizations and former offenders, it also impacts the whole community. The fragile presence

of a place like Quixote House invites further reflection about the treatment applied to former offenders and how social justice impacts everyone in the community.

Eighth, the support provided is messy. Authentic, familiar, and ‘24/7’ support given by a community like Quixote House is non-professional and often disorganized. Quixote House is not designed to become another program that many residents may access. Instead, it is a community of men who strive together to maintain their success by putting into practice what they say and learn in the Next Step meetings and other programs available. It is the place of people who accept the responsibilities and expectations attached to community living. It is an experience to which everybody is welcome.

The platform, mediation, and meaning that Quixote House provides, works along with other organizations in the transformation of the conflict between society and former offenders. Quixote House and Next Step cannot have much of an impact on released offenders if other agencies and their varied approaches are absent. In the international peace system, Diamond and MacDonald (1996b) distinguish nine tracks in their systemic view of peacemaking and conflict resolution: *Government, Nongovernment/Professional, Business, Private Citizen, Research/Training/Education, Activism, Religion, Funding, Communications and Media* (1996b, p. vii). According to Diamond and McDonald’s multi-track diplomacy (1996b; 2012), institutions, communities, individuals and activities, with a different level of involvement, “work together whether awkwardly or gracefully, for a common goal: a world at peace” (Diamond & McDonald, 1996b, p. 1). In fact, the tracks in international peacebuilding outlined by Diamond (2012) can be replicated in the journey towards full reintegration and resettlement of released offenders into community.

Quixote House is not located in the governmental (CSC), professional (medical and addiction centres), business (workplaces), religious (churches, places of worship), funding (social assistance), research (universities, research brands), or communications or media sectors. In the case of former offenders, a supportive home will be part of the system but with its own perspective, languages, cultures, attitudes and memberships, impacting the other tracks of the system, including other religious communities, non-profits and the state. Quixote House operates more in relationship to private citizens, and activists in everyday life. At Quixote House, residents can reflect, share and put into practice what comes from the other 'tracks' with which they are involved. A supportive home such as Quixote House is the space in which its residents can express their emotions and find new meanings in them. The Next Step peer support program and Quixote House together seek to ensure that the emotions of ex-offenders are not suppressed but are used to connect participants at home and members in the whole peace system toward a more fair and respectful treatment of those journeying out of prison.

So, Quixote House is not designed to provide professional support during 'office hours', but to create and recreate an environment in which professional support received by the offender takes root. In my years at Quixote House, residents have asked me questions not only because I am a priest, but also because I am knowledgeable about cooking, driving, how to find places in the city and also because of my knowledge about different cultures, languages and peoples. I have listened to complaints early in the morning and very late at night. Interesting conversations and even personal revelations happened during commercials while we were watching a movie or hockey game on TV. The length and depth of the 'informal support' given varies with our own mood and time just as happens with parents and their children.

However, I am not the only one giving support in the house. Volunteers, visitors and residents participate with different points of view, according to their own programming, schedule and speed. For example, one of the residents gave Math classes to another resident very late at night to help him pass a test on carpentry. Also, when visitors (ex-residents or not) come on Friday night or to special suppers, they often enter into long conversations, which offer support and venues for the residents to share their dreams, fears and future projects. As the support relies on those who constitute the community, the support can at times be chaotic, as well. Nonetheless, the interviews showed that even if it is sometimes messy, living at Quixote House is an experience that residents deeply appreciated.

8.8 Conclusion

According to the data collected, the sense of belonging to small communities (family, small groups, friends, churches, home-like houses) counteracts the negative impact of incarceration that often hinders the successful reintegration of offenders into the greater community and society. Reinsertion cannot be limited to developing economic means of support but also to practicing appropriate social skills needed to deal with common concerns and problems. To make the decision to stay in a community of support is a big step for the offender.

Belonging to a community limits individual freedom for sure, but its value shows itself quickly by satisfying each person's basic needs, accompanied with a deeper sense of gratification. This experience resembles what normally happens in families because it is realized without professional expertise. Although the support provided is frequently disorganized and often lacks control, it becomes authentic and timely because the support comes from the community itself. Indeed, those who benefit from this help likewise become providers of help

along the way and this process resemble and contribute to their understanding of what constitutes a real 'home'.

Chapter 9 - Everyday at Quixote House: the experience of Home

Quixote House is like your home and, you know, that protecting property is something that you don't have to worry about not completely. There is always some risk but that definitely is not the focus. Yeah, it was a home. It was a home in the true sense of the word (Moose, more than 5 years without reoffending, 2016, pp. 7-8).

9.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on how everyday life is experienced at Quixote House. According to the residents, the daily routine forges a space in which transformation is possible and encouraged. These perceptions about the house come from their lived experience of this place, a place where they can start over—set up by a nun and a priest willing to address a common need by providing a safe milieu for released offenders. Quixote House has shown itself to be more than just a place to live. It has become a vital factor in the process of ex-offenders finding a new identity and improving their chances to successfully reinsert themselves into society.

By applying the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 4, it will become evident that Quixote House is best understood as a 'home' for convicts after their incarceration. In contrast to incarceration and the 'us-them' dichotomy through institutionalization in correctional centres, the practices of everyday life among residents in this place provide the experience of 'home', which has a particular function going far beyond the satisfaction of people's basic needs. A home, unlike any other place, allows for nonjudgmental attitudes and open spaces conducive for facilitating a 'new understanding' of oneself, which is often described as 'spiritual'. Hence, the third sector, including faith-based initiatives, finds in Quixote House a powerful way to contribute to the reinsertion of offenders into society by preventing potential conflict with those

considered ‘outside home’, and ‘smoothing’ the road for individual reintegration into the rest of the community.

9.2 Everyday life at Quixote House

In chapter 8, residents at Quixote House expressed how important it is for them to be involved in daily chores in the house. The word ‘community’ is used several times to describe their feeling about the ways their needs are met in this place. However, to restrict Quixote House to the word ‘community’ is not enough for many of the residents interviewed. The significant change in how they lived their everyday life before and after being ‘housed’ in this place demands another category to frame the experience. This experience does not just happen. It is something that requires the effort and commitment of those who have become part of the ‘community’.

In forging the experience, this book argues that everyday life activities at Quixote House are in permanent contrast with their experience during incarceration. In fact, when Wolf was asked about a day at Quixote House, he answered with satisfaction:

OK there are days that were better and nice.

I was working at Habitat [for Humanity]. We started at 8 o’clock in the morning so, because Quixote is downtown, I would leave the house at 7 o’clock. I took the bus to get to work. And often I get up, you know, about 6:30ish. I never was able to get up early so 6:30 was quite early to me, and I would have a coffee or I would just prepare my lunch, and then head out the door, you know.

This happened many mornings but there was also, several mornings when Bear would also be awake. And he was, in the morning usually gone long before anybody else... but I guess he was just kind of on a later schedule at that time. Then I would get up a little bit earlier and go downstairs and we were just sitting there having this coffee before I was going to work, just kind of relaxing. He and I would talk in the morning briefly and I found that very relaxing. You know. And it was also good for Bear too, to really get to know each other, as well.

More so, than, you know, the encounters in the afternoons and evenings or whenever. Yes, so that was nice. And I get up to work, I had my lunch, I had my chat with Bear, so wide-awake. After work I’d come back home, about five o’clock and if it was my turn to cook I come at 5 o’clock and I would take out and sort through the food from the day before, or I just

took it from what I intended to make that night. That was something I could do... just sort to prepare the food. I then jumped in the shower, came back downstairs and finished up with the cooking and by that time everybody would start coming in the doors one at the time and as 6 o'clock came around, everybody would be there and we would sit down and we would eat together.

Yes, so we would have supper. We would talk about our days. We would talk about each other's personal situations. Whether somebody wanted to bring something on their own, they just kind of bring it up in the conversation. There was another person living in the house that was struggling on the streets. We would talk about that too, you know what is that, where is that person, you know, where is the things that are falling apart for them like why they just can't be there taking about and happy at this moment. Why did they have to be wandering around? Why are they, you know, living on the streets?

You know, it is not talking behind people's back or about them, but these things were very important too because, once again, in the other guys and the things that they shared, and in the other guys and the things that we witnessed I learned so much more about myself. You know, and just... better ways, better ways of getting by and, you know, how... you learn more about how certain things lead (chuckles) you know, like girl-friends right away, or rushing into work right away, or wanting to move out right away.

Like, there is lot of things that are very, very sticky situations, not that they don't work, but you gotta be very careful, and you learn where those are. So, supper, after supper, most guys would just kind of head out in their own directions, sometimes, you know, depending like some nights everybody would be like we will have supper and everybody'd be gone, you know. Everybody got their own stuff that they are doing. Other nights half the guys would still be in the house, because they have nothing else to do but stay and stick around in the house that night, OK?

So, they are watching TV. Myself I'd go often on my computer, and ... what else could I do at that time? I wasn't doing any school or nothing. Yes, I guess we spend a lot of time, evenings in the house then, eh? Yeah, watching TV or whatever... maybe I went early to bed (laughs) (Wolf, 2016, pp. 13-14).

It is clear in Wolf's narrative that the prison structure, which grounds inmates in institutionalization, is over for him. Now, his everyday activities, such as working, eating, resting and playing have found different spaces in which they are exercised. And not only the place changes, but the relationship with the people in which those activities happen also mutates. As

one of the residents says: “[we] have dinner and share our days, ups and downs, knowing that we have a safe place where people understand” (Lion, 2016, p. 1).

Fox describes everyday life in Quixote House as contributing to and receiving from others, as opposed to living only as a consumer:

Everyone is encouraged to do all things to contribute, but then you get a treat like... sort of a nice treat you didn't ask for. That made it feel sort of like a family. So... that, I think is a big thing.

You certainly go from just being a resident to being a community in a family sense. You know. That's what family does (laugh)... Let's go to dinner. I'm trying to think beyond that. But in terms of the home, laundry, there is no difference than if you have your own, rented room in a house, yet...there is that sense of community... (Fox, 2016, p. 8).

This becomes a routine, where chores and activities are posted on a bulletin board in the common area. As he narrates, “everyone is encouraged to do the chores, take turns cooking; like we had a little piece of paper where you write your meals and chores. I think I made that computer file. I started it and it is still there!” (Fox, 2016, p. 8). Moose also experienced the positive effects of sharing chores routinely:

Maybe someone didn't like the idea of putting his or her name up to cook, once a week, but I enjoyed that. And I never heard anybody complaining about that; ... we helped each other. It was that you weren't alone there. The other offenders, the other residents, usually they ... would help. You know, if someone doesn't know how to cook, when it is your turn to cook, you can ask for help (Moose, 2016, p. 4).

The cooking is combined with all of the activities attached to it: finding a recipe, cleaning the dishes and leaving the place clean: “They maintain the house, they cook, they do dishes, they clean up, they make sure everything is, like a ship, running properly” (Panther, 2016, p. 5). This creates common memories, such as the “wonder chicken”, as narrated by Panther below:

We were cooking “wonder chicken”. And we had some visitors. I can't remember how many. But even the visitors came and helped out, and it was the special recipe that Fr. Dave got from a ... I think it was ... some kind of fancy Chinese restaurant, and he managed to get the recipe for something he called

“wonder chicken”. So, we made the “wonder chicken”, crushed the peanuts, and you know ... we did all the preparation. Just having a meal together like that was ... just little simple things like that. That’s what makes the place what it is (Panther, 2016, p. 8).

Another source of common memories has to do with the preparation of and sharing of coffee and tea. In this sense, Fox highlights the significance of those coffee times even after leaving the house:

A weekend or something that works and I mean every time that I come in there I sit for coffee, upstairs when we come around somewhere. So there is ... it is an encouragement to come back and in a lot of Halfway Houses you are just happy to get out of there so I really like that about Quixote. You feel like you ... have some touchstone connections ... not everyone, some people would move on and won’t come back but what I found is also that those people never really invested in the opportunity to build relationships (Fox, 2016, p. 13).

Also, Rabbit noted the bonding ritual of having a cup of coffee in the morning:

But you know, I got up in the morning and there is always somebody here that woke up that early, having coffee before, just nice to be able to have fellowship, you know, in the morning, and you Fr. Eduardo ... you are always a breakfast sunshine in the morning! (Laughs) (2016, p. 3).

Residents in Quixote House are able to appreciate the times in which ‘nothing is done’, because those moments, offered in everyday life, are an opportunity to separate them from the ‘rat race’ outside. This is what Rabbit had to say on the issue:

Especially, the times when you can relax only ... if I stay here and I am not going to work yet, or before you went to the university, or... just the time, they are priceless. In everyday life, once you get out there, you realized, you know, there is no ... it is the rat race again, you know.

It was nice, just to step back and be able to, kind of reflect. The nice thing, about Next Step and then Quixote House is if you get right back into an apartment, right back into the real world, you may have the tendency to forget what happened and where you came from, and then, maybe, re-offend again ... because you get caught up in it.

The nice thing about this is that it was a slow process. It was a step-by-step process. It is funny to say, a step-by-step process of being able to integrate yourself and not forget where you came from (Rabbit, 2016, pp. 3-4).

Those coffee times, sharing times, preparing lunch times, are seen as relaxing and as a chance for the residents to get to know each other. The chores are also part of everyday life at Quixote House. These chores demonstrate the resident's care for the entire house and not just for the 'individual' space (bathroom or room) they use. Recalling this activity brings back memories and invites gratitude. In the words of Tiger:

When I came home, I was able to watch TV, go on to my computer, be able to, you know, talk to the people and just ... and the chores! I mean it just taught me to appreciate all that my Mom and Dad did for me around the house, because [at Quixote House] we split up the chores and stuff like that and, just are able to take care of myself, right (Tiger, 2016, p. 3).

'Taking care of myself' includes the laundry, which is done at Quixote House and requires dialogue and negotiation among the residents for sharing the washer and dryer machines. Being responsible for his own laundry created a sense of independence in Tiger: "being able to, you know, cook and clean for myself, take care of myself, do my laundry and stuff like that" (Tiger, 2016, p. 5). In contrast, Bear recalled that it created a sense of time organization for himself: "lots of time I would do laundry and prepare any meals or whatever I needed to take" (Bear, 2016, p. 10). These everyday simple activities empower Quixote House's residents to appreciate the convenience of 'living together'. As Lion pointed out in his story:

We eat together, do chores to keep the house clean. It's really a community of guys who have had issues that led them to prison. It's a place where you're responsible. If you're having struggles there are people who genuinely care about you and are willing to help. It's really like a family! Sharing and caring that a lot of the guys never had (2016, p. 5).

Moose highlighted the benefits of living in the house, even with regards to the sleeping arrangements:

The togetherness ... whatever is paid ... everybody's cost of living goes down. And so, you are able to eat properly. You know. You are able to sleep properly. You know, because your rent is not as exorbitant as living on your own. So these are the things why, the 'many' environment, even a couple is better than

a single person. So that was one of the big benefits of Quixote House and that stepping stone being there (Moose, 2016, p. 3).

So, Quixote House is a place in which the sharing of everyday life activities forges ‘togetherness’, just as with ‘a family’. These testimonies from the residents of Quixote House, evoke the idea of ‘home’; a term they often use when referring to the house and those who dwell within. Therefore, it is important to address the notion of “home”, and to take into consideration the increasing importance of this notion in a globalizing world (Perkins & Thorns, 2012).

The activities at Quixote House can be seen, following De Certeau (1998), as a shift from the rest of the actions that they must do publicly, under the scope of surveillance officers and devices. In Quixote House, residents have the chance to display their own creativity, and oppose the fragmentation of analytical, statistical and professional approaches to offenders by their behaviour in simple and daily activities. Within the walls of this house, they can find healing or restore their deteriorated relationships with the rest of the community, as soon as they show accountability, respect and care in their everyday practices.

When residents start living in community at Quixote House, they not only open new spaces ‘within an imposed order’ (De Certeau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 254), they also challenge the power relation structure in society, and resist what has been imposed on them, by showing what they really are to those who share their everyday activities. There is no place to hide and there is no need to. This experience is an open invitation to all residents, including myself.

In my own experience, every time I cook a meal, I am recreating my own culture and I place it in front of them as a dish for their delight. I never stop being ‘the priest’ or ‘the Jesuit’ but my identity is resituated from the power structure of society to vulnerability, which comes through sharing a washroom or cleaning the kitchen floor. As has been stated by Scicluna

(2017), kitchen plays an important pedagogical role in the formation of an individual because it can “serve as a place where cultural categories, practices and moral values are internalised” (p. 118).

This re-situation and internalisation does not occur overnight, but it is achieved by a tenacious, stable and permanent practice. In this way, I found myself able to establish distance from the model (‘priest’, ‘Jesuit’, ‘Venezuelan’, ‘middle class’, ‘PhD student’) and ‘defend the autonomy that comes from my own personality’ (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 255). The mediation of everyday life between models imposed from outside and the discovery and defense of one’s own personality, as happened to me, can also happen to other residents at the house. This mediation and dwelling in common allows for a nonjudgmental approach with regards to house management, which differs from what society and culture often imposes on men transitioning from prison to community.

9.3 A nonjudgmental approach

Quixote House satisfies the residents’ basic needs such as housing and food, when the resident becomes a ‘member of the community’. Once people engage the community, they develop a sense of belonging which, when lived out in everyday life, nurtures a nonjudgmental approach to house management. This becomes a major distinction between the environment of correctional centres and what they find at Quixote House. In the opinion of parole officer ‘A’, this kind of setting works against the institutionalization upon which correctional services is based. She affirmed that, “Quixote House provides them with a place where they can continue to address those areas [of growth] in a safe manner, free of judgment. And I just, I just think it is an excellent community resource for released offenders and for guys who are currently institutionalized” (‘A’, 2016, p. 4).

Another parole officer recognizes the approach of Quixote House, as ‘harm reduction’.

He noted the following in his story:

I would call it a harm reduction sort of approach; sort of meet people where they are at, in their stage of change, work with them and try to transition them back into society while supporting them in moving through different levels of accountability. Now that you have that apartment complex [Massie House], and then, beyond that.

So I wish there were more places like that and I wish more guys could connect and live there. I think that would be very helpful from a parole perspective but also from my perspective as a community member and somebody living in Winnipeg (‘E’, 2016, p. 7).

A third parole officer categorizes the approach as nonjudgmental and non-professionalized. He uses the term ‘non-professionalized’ with reference to Quixote House because there are other ‘specific’ professional resources that can be distinguished from the support provided by the community of Quixote House. This does not conflict with the residents’ accountability. This is what he had to say:

I think a lot of it is, in the sense of personal resources. You have Sr. Carol, yourself, and others there. They are people that truly care, and there is no judgement. Fellows that go there don’t feel threatened or judged or criticized.

It is not unconditional support; there are consequences for behaviour, and there are expectations and rules to follow, but most of them will not ever encounter a place where there is a support structure, instead of a punitive structure—where it is basically safe to be and there is no retaliation, even if they encounter problems.

I know Sr. Carol has often gone out of her way helping financially to extend credit to them, to get them a lot of different breaks, helping them find work. There are all kind of resources. I haven’t identified professionals there, but you have a group of people who are very good at doing that (‘C’, 2016, p. 3).

Parole officer ‘F’, also identifies Quixote House as “a nonjudgmental support that offers a home and a community” (‘F’, 2016, p. 4). In addition, parole officer ‘F’ “think[s] that nonjudgmental community stands out for me from what I hear from people, and the steadfastness, because I have had a couple of people that have gone in and out [of prison] and

then you read that Sr. Carol is still connected, so I think that means a lot to people” (‘F’, 2016, p. 4). However, when asked for clarification, parole officer ‘F’ responded that the support is not only from Sr. Carol but from “that community, that home, that place to go back to when, if they are struggling, familiar people are not going to judge them” (‘F’, 2016, p. 3).

Following the same idea, the nonjudgmental attitude that Quixote House provides, in the opinion of parole officer ‘C’, is different from how professionals and the rest of society may see the individuals who reside at Quixote House:

They feel that walking on the street everybody is looking at them as, you know, ‘you are just out of prison’, ‘you are an offender, and you are a bad guy’. It is like they have the ‘scarlet A’ tattooed on their forehead.

It takes a lot, quite a while to get rid of that fear of being judged, ridiculed or rejected. Quixote House offers a safe place where they can come and begin to feel like ‘I am not so bad after all.

There is hope for me to not just be the person who went to prison, but begin to change my behaviour and become somebody else’ (‘C’, 2016, p. 6).

Also, parole officer ‘B’ argues that the nonjudgmental approach provided at Quixote House is different from pity or sorrow because the parolees must be ‘accountable’, which in turn leads to their becoming law-abiding citizens:

I don’t think it does anybody any good just to feel sorry for an inmate—you poor thing you had this and this happen to you. I think there still has to be a ‘bad’ there, and you are an adult and you are accountable for your behaviours. I think those two things are what move offenders towards becoming law-abiding citizens (‘B’, 2016, p. 6).

And, he goes on to say that this is precisely what happens at Quixote House, where a new type of judgement is possible:

These guys need the support, they need people to believe in them, they need hope, they need faith, and they need reality too. I always found Quixote House to be very all of the above.

Like it holds guys accountable; I don’t think you let them off the hook. I don’t think you pity them. I don’t think you sympathize with them, but I think you understand some of the challenges that they have, because of their history and how they grew up and their life experiences, but also their experiences in

jail and the new type of judgement that's being placed on them, as an offender or ex-offender ('B', 2016, p. 6).

Ex-residents at Quixote House articulate this nonjudgmental approach in different ways based on their own experiences of having lived there. Some, like Squirrel, describe this approach as not just about looking at what the person has done, which he deeply appreciates, rather it “means for me, always the big thing that I am looked at as just a person not, you know, because of what I have done—that’s always the big thing for me, I am just a guy” (Squirrel, 2016, p. 7). He also links this expression with the possibility of seeing beyond what is apparent. Squirrel explains this point with a story he remembers from his father:

My Dad said to me one time, ‘what colours do you see in the sky?’ and I looked and said ‘blue and white or whatever’, and he said ‘no, son, look beyond that’. There is more than the two that you just see. There are other colors there or whatever...there is more to it than just two....

That is sort of how I would see you guys [Quixote House]. You see, you saw where you want to go and other people don’t see that. I don’t know if that makes sense but it takes vision (Squirrel, 2016, pp. 7-8).

This attitude he described is related to familial attitudes, honesty, and respect for one’s sexual orientation. For example, Bear contends that the nonjudgmental approach is perceived as the ‘functional’ family attitude towards all of its members, which is one of acceptance and support:

You know, there is an acceptance in that family. It’s not even like a regular family, where you may or may not have acceptance but I find there [Quixote House] an overall acceptance.

I think this is because we are all broken and came through the same scenario, the same funnel, and the system. And, in the end, they may or may not judge you for what a person has done but they still accept you at the end of the day. And with that comes the support (Bear, 2016, p. 2).

Squirrel avows that the realization of personal brokenness is crucial for having this kind of acceptance:

[Quixote House is] just a place where people can come sort of, we are all broken in some way, right? Well, I think we all sort of understand that. Whether we get along or don't get along or whatever it may be, I think we all understand that struggle. Guys come here when they have a problem to support one another the best they can (Squirrel, 2016, p. 3).

Then, the brokenness and the common experience of prison combined with 'home life' make possible the nurturance of the nonjudgmental behaviour at Quixote House. Bear avers that this is different to the approach parolees may find even in their own families:

[At Quixote House, there are] aspects of a home life as I've accepted, but with the commonality of prison and the realization of everybody's brokenness. The family back home, they don't realize this, when I look at them.

Now, analyzing this situation, not judging just analyzing, [I see] they don't recognize they are broken. And so they are living in their own turmoil, in their own 'stuff' we'll say, for lack of a better word that comes to mind. They are so caught up in their own, 'what's happening to me'. They are still living in their raw emotions. They may intellectualize certain aspects of it, but they don't give realization to it.

And so, as a result, they're not willing to change. As a result, of not having a common experience of prison, in behind, as far as the cons go, there's no change. There is no acceptance. They may accept you because of blood, but as far as the emotional aspect and the understanding aspect of it, they have no... I won't say incapacity to, they do have the capacity to it, but in their own stuff they haven't reached the point where they can embrace that capacity.

Whereas the guys here know they are broken. They've been told they've been broken, let's break some more (laughs) right, and... we look out for each other (Bear, 2016, p. 14).

The community at Quixote House, then, becomes the source of acceptance and care that parolees are unable to find in the rest of society, or even within their own families. Bear believes that this care and acceptance are hard to articulate:

That is what I am looking for about life in general. Acceptance comes with caring. What is the word? Caring is a love, is a community. It is hard to explain in context, when the context in general means the same across the board, but if you don't have that context in the life that you had before, it is hard to explain it when you do have it.

So, acceptance, love and caring. It is very simplistic, but it also is very deep. Yeah, it is just an acceptance (Bear, 2016, p. 20).

He goes on to say how the acceptance and nonjudgmental attitudes and behaviour at Quixote House are a sign of an ‘honest’ relationship:

We all have issues and problems, and [in prison] we’ve been told we have issues and problems again, and just by being told that and maybe having a little sense of self-realization of that, even a large realization of that, it’ll allow you to accept. And I found that in people who are living on the street.

One fellow I know, drove hookers and stuff around a lot of the time and, for lack of a better word, he liked them, he said because they are honest. He said there is no lying; they just told it the way it is. Right, they are just told the way it is and I found that too, that the further you get, it seems like the further you get out of the echelons of society, and the further you get immersed into the pulls of it, people become more honest, because they have nothing to lose (Bear, 2016, p. 15).

The honest relationship works both ways. Honesty is linked with the capacity of the members of the community, not only to be aware of their own brokenness, but also to expose and work to heal from it. Lion argues that, when residents show their own vulnerability, this is, in fact, a sign of true acceptance and care:

One time I was having a meeting with a person involved with Quixote House, a check-in to make sure things are good. Well, anyway, we ended up talking about their issues and this person actually cried in front of me! I couldn’t believe it! We were getting together to talk about me and that happened! That showed me just how authentic and honest these people are. I’ll remember that moment always! (Lion, 2016, p. 3).

When everyone is able to show their own failings and struggles, this makes room for one’s self-exploration too. The Quixote House community, then, provides room for a deeper understanding of each person as an individual, and as a member of the community ‘no matter what’. In Otter’s experience, this was very important in order to heal, to build self-confidence and move on with his life as a law-abiding citizen:

Going through Quixote House kind of provided that opportunity for me to explore, to explore without too much pressure, or without too much fear of any negative consequences, without any negative feedback or prejudice, without any type of other consequences to me or anything that kind of demeaned or minimized my emotional or physical state.

Since being at Quixote House I've actually been a lot more social. Coming to Toronto as well, being in a bigger city, in a place where I know very, very few people, I don't think without what I found at Quixote House, I probably wouldn't take the initiative of getting involved with the social programs that I've done, with the volunteer work that I do, with some of the local places here in the Aboriginal community.

I don't think I was taking really any initiative to do anything progressive, to do anything different. There is something else that I learned at Quixote House: it is kind of taking initiative for something I want. I want something better. Like right now, I am going to finish my pre-college courses, going to go to College into a new career. That's probably something I wouldn't have done if I didn't have Quixote House. That little bit of uncertainty, a little bit of change, that something that I would bring, as well as the, again, the boost of confidence in myself, my self-esteem.

I don't think a lot of this would have been possible if not for Quixote House. Because after incarceration I wouldn't like [to be in] a Halfway House and then... probably going back to the same cycle I was in before, being socially reclusive, which eventually, probably would lead to reoffending. I think that what Quixote House really brought to me was the confidence to take initiatives; the pride, the self-pride, and being less fearful of the world (Otter, 2016, p. 8).

The kind of freedom and acceptance felt by residents at Quixote House, allowed Otter to go deeper into his self-acceptance, which also involved his exploration of his sexual orientation, as he describes below:

They allowed me that little bit of freedom. I was encouraged to join the group and... everybody kind of understood, you know, who I was. After a while it was kind of they know I kind of, I have to take little bit of a break and so they didn't pressure me too much.

Again, in regards to being myself, for me it is openly, being able to openly talk. I am going to take this next step anyway, talking about relationship issues that I was going through. Now being, umm, bisexual [Quixote House] offered that safe environment to talk about.... I just don't really have to worry about being myself (Otter, 2016, pp. 7-8).

This openness and nonjudgmental behaviour in regard to the resident's sexual orientation was also a surprise for Fox. It challenged some of the prejudices he had held against the Catholic Church in general:

I mean, my assumption about the Catholic Church before coming here was that they are very strict and all that stuff, and I didn't experience that at all

here.... Even just in terms of being gay, finding my partner, I met my partner while I was still living here. I never sensed condemnation or any kind of judgement and I also never felt.... Actually when I came here originally I was the one who was more religious (laugh) (Fox, 2016, p. 6).

The experience and nonjudgmental conversations that take place at Quixote House encouraged Fox to decide to go deep in his own journey and inspired him to take courses at the University of Manitoba that would help him to better understand and embrace his own life:

It kind of helped me a lot of ways to be a bit more objective because I didn't have somebody building that up and reinforcing a lot of obstacles. Fr. Dave really kept encouraging me to take the Bernard Lonergan course and that actually was a huge thing for me. That course is what led me to becoming who I am today (Fox, 2016, p. 6).

Once at the university, Fox had to confront the stigma and the prejudices from which he had been shielded and protected at Quixote House. He states that, "I think even to this day that still comes back to haunt me. I was, recently, kicked out of the University of Manitoba, because they found out about my past [serious crime]. And I am filing a Human Rights Complaint against them right now..." (Fox, 2016, p. 3). Even, when he tried to publish his work, he found "somebody who is anonymous who sent letters to my prospective publishers, and then I have publishing contracts cancelled" (Fox, 2016, pp. 3-4).

Nevertheless, he found a sort of 'unconditional support' at Quixote House, which he compares also to characters in the books he had read:

I think of the man in '*Les Miserables*' and the priest who took him in, right? I can't remember the name... Jean Val Jean. That is the idea of unconditional support and very much, I think, that spirit is always felt [at Quixote House] (Fox, 2016, p. 7).

Quixote House provided this support not only while Fox was a resident, but also even now when he has his own home with his own husband—about whom he says:

I told him about my past quite early on, so he was able to go and see Quixote. Actually, he had a friend he knew who had a similar problem,

being up north and faced some prison time. So, in terms of when I told him, he told me right away: if it is about you going to jail, it's OK. I know someone else who has gone through this, so that made it easier.

Then, he was able to come here knowing what Quixote is, and even to this day we still come back, the two of us sometimes, and visit. He thinks it's great... he thinks it's great what we do here.

We come back for *Scrabble* matches, and I mean, even in terms of good memories of this place they go beyond living here, because I've come back many times to just play *Scrabble*. I've done that many, many nights. Or, you know, like usually it is on a Friday, when there is, that sort of community night when people are encouraged to all be present for dinner or just gathering and that's been, that's nice (Fox, 2016, p. 10).

Wolf also articulates the support given to residents and ex-residents of Quixote House as true acceptance. This kind of acceptance made people think differently about themselves and work out their struggles and addictions. In the words of Wolf:

[Quixote House] was true acceptance, I think, of where I am in life. There were things that were more important than me being able to earn a lot of money fast or have all the things that I think I need.

Other things are much more important to do. So that was tough, yeah. Coming out and trying to sort out with the kids [his children] when I got released from the Federal [prison] this time around, because of my connections to Next Step and Quixote House it was a lot easier. And I never had to fall back into that same kind of pattern. Because of that I am still sober today; I am sober over six years now (Wolf, 2016, p. 12).

The nonjudgmental approach among the residents of Quixote House provided all of them with a kind of freedom that they did not find during incarceration, and this included the freedom to stumble and fall. It is one thing to stumble, it is another to fall. In prison, neither is allowed. At Quixote House, residents can stumble and still receive the support of the community to which they feel they belong. This creates a new style of managing or relating with others, even in the workplace, as is pointed out by Wolf in the following way:

I never thought of it. I guess I always had that because I have that freedom there [Quixote House] to stumble...you know, but at the same time I had the support there to help me through it. I think I am very aware of what I learned.

If I didn't learn that kind of behaviour or attitude of mine, if I didn't learn back then, it was certainly enforced there, or allowed to grow there. We talked about this often now and then, with the other guys: to learn to love unconditionally. You know, and to learn to love as a service, as well. Right? To serve others as well as to unconditionally accept them (Wolf, 2016, pp. 22-23).

There are so many stories that support this kind of freedom; a freedom that gave space for residents to stumble, to make mistakes. This freedom has always been an important component of the support offered at Quixote House. One such story stands out for Fr. Creamer and illustrates how this unconditional support emerges precisely from the brokenness everyone shares at Quixote House. It empowers them to challenge themselves and to break free from the bonds that bind them:

Fox wasn't in general prison population, and so when he arrived at our house, nobody in our house had ever met him. They heard of him, being at the prison, but they never met this person at all. And because that was such a different situation, I remember that we even had a meeting in advance, because I told Sr. Carol this is pretty different (laugh), so we probably should meet and you need to talk to the guys and say something about this guy.

Well, first, everyone knew about him. He was very well known in the prison. So the question was what they felt about him coming to live in our house, you know. And I remember it was Squirrel, who said: 'I know about this guy. I don't understand what that is like, really'. But he said: 'how can I say that if you commit such and such a crime you can come to Quixote House, and if you commit different kinds of crime you can't... we even have somebody there that killed somebody.. so how can you kill somebody and be at Quixote House, but if you sexually abuse boys, you can't... Who is going to make that decision?'.

That's basically what Squirrel said. And... I mean, I am sitting there. I know the bible, and it is sort of like he was saying 'let the one without sin cast the first stone!'. And I thought it was beautiful. So, people agreed that they will try to live with this guy, if he came to the house. And he came. The evening he arrived, I think it was a Friday evening, you know, other people would be there. I can't remember...but anyway, he arrived. He was pretty frightened. They were equally frightened.

He did unbelievably well. So much so that, later he could bring in his boyfriend. This guy was not comfortable at first, but then became comfortable and could sit and played *Scrabble* with the guys in the evenings, and so on. And we were invited to their wedding and we went! It

is unbelievable! Really! That scenario itself could be a movie, almost, you know. I would never, ever, in my life have dreamed of living in a situation like that (Creamer, 2016, pp. 6-7).

In this environment of care and mutual understanding, it is not surprising that relationships become more personal. The small setting of the place and the house culture that evolved allowed that to happen due to the leadership of Fr. Creamer. The mutual support given and received among the residents of Quixote House allows residents to create and maintain lasting friendships. These friends and other people become attached in a web of mutual support, which is open to all of those who dare to belong to it. The support at Quixote House, as a positive element for the reintegration of former offenders into society, comes from different sources. One is the Quixote House community and the other is the web of people in the broader community who are associated with it. This group of people, in informal ways, provides something that has proven to be very valuable for the residents and ex-residents of Quixote House; namely, friendship and networking.

Wolf shares a story of when Lion relapsed into criminal behaviour, which illustrates the kind of bond that exists between residents and ex-residents of Quixote House. This story is significant because friendship and bonding is tested, especially when someone is relapsing or in risk of relapsing into criminal behaviour:

He stole from the house and he is not a small boy either and he has done it a lot of times. He was out on the street and he was in a bad way and at any time he could come back into the house and cause harm. Whether it is to physically harm people, or to the property by taking stuff or breaking stuff, you just don't know. You don't know. So, it is kind of scary, right?

But at the same time, he lives there, he has all these things and advantages for him. He throws that all away and takes from everybody there and, then, because of his behaviours, I am in fear of what may happen next to the house and to myself. But I would still, like the first moment when I see him, I am going to give him a hug. You know what I mean?

Like, no matter, I don't know... with Lion there is something different where I connected with him. I just care for him. You know? And I just want the

best for him and I can't, I can't, provide that for him (tears) and that is frustrating. But... somebody can (laughs). Right? And I just want him to be able to find that. And I just want the best for him (Wolf, 2016, pp. 18-19).

This kind of understanding and care among residents and ex-residents, especially when they are relapsing, is also found in the narrative of Bear, who articulates the experience in the following way:

I don't condemn them for where they are at or what they are doing. You know, I tell them, you know, especially the one fellow who has been three months in addiction and he says, well, talking to him, nobody loves me, nobody cares. And I am like, what? we're here!

Because we love you we are here. Right? we are here to help you. We can't force you to go to rehab, we can't force you to stop but we care enough that we are here. Right? And if you want help we would come and help you, and take you to the hospital, or whatever. We'd buy some food if you are starving.

It's... that they know they would receive that from me. I wouldn't have been so generous prior to going to jail (laughs). Oh, that is funny! (laughs) So, that is a big influence for me! Right? Now I always help people. I draw the line but, yeah, that is still a big thing (Bear, 2016, p. 19).

The relationship extended to a 'network' of 'volunteers' who offered mutual support to offenders, as Bear mentioned above. They are there not only to listen, but also to take them to the hospital or to rehab. This even includes small things like buying a resident a pair of boots, as Fr. Creamer points out:

People cared about them. People cared for them. And I mean, when you think of it, there were people who would go out and buy somebody winter boots. We had so many people that were connected to Quixote House, kind of a network. They would take an individual guy and help him do things like that (Creamer, 2016, p. 8).

Based on these experiences, the network extends beyond the residents and ex-residents, and includes their friends and acquaintances. For instance, Wolf did help Lion to find employment: "He ended up with a job, actually through a friend of mine. He ended up with a pretty good job, maybe not a great job, but it was pretty good" (Wolf, 2016, p. 18). Similarly, in

his search for new housing, Ram sought the help of people related to Quixote House, especially when his prospective landlord mistreated him, apparently because of his criminal record. This is what he had to say:

...so I went down to get my damage deposit back. I come back here and I got a phone call saying 'we decided to rent to you anyhow because...' I said, why? 'Well, we just decided to rent to you' and they sounded mad about it. So I said to [name of a person] and I talked to [name of a person]. I said "I got this strange phone call that I have to go back to the place where they actually are going to rent to get my damage deposit back. She said that is what happens when they take me on and seek a political lawyer.

So it is [name of the political lawyer] here in the Church, who actually gave them a call and told him 'I am lawyer and I am going to turn this into a Human Rights issue if you don't rent to this man'. Nuts when seeing me. Because I had no rental history or anything. So what I did over the past few years is to build myself up with a nice rental history. So I don't have issues like that anymore. It is hard to do it, to get that one-foot in the door (Ram, 2016, p. 4).

Therefore, residents of Quixote House have the possibility to connect with people and build a network of support in which they are invited not only to receive but also to give. Also, due to the fact that Quixote House is deeply connected to two important Roman Catholic religious organizations in Winnipeg, the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, and the Society of Jesus (the Jesuits), many of the connections happen to be related to these groups of people, although not exclusively. These kinds of connections, combined with a nonjudgmental approach, seem to give room for the spiritual journey of all Quixote House residents.

9. 4 Church and spirituality at Quixote House

To share everyday life with priests and other people who were in prison opens up opportunities for conversation. In these conversations, the topic of spirituality and religion is often present. Religion becomes a theme that can create conflict but also spark curiosity and forge bonding. Even though the intention of having a house for former offenders had not focused on helping people 'spiritually', residents and parole officers are positive in their opinion that Quixote House

gives residents room for deepening their spiritual journey. When they speak to the topic, they put forward different approaches and nuances about this journey. They talk about how they understand spirituality, where they find room for spiritual growth in the house and how it might be lived or realized. Some stories illustrate this point.

Bear defines spirituality as a ‘plus’ that the person has when exercising compassion. The spiritual side of the people is present when they are not just working for the money, no matter what religion they profess. He distinguishes those people from the ‘secular person’ doing social work as follows:

A secular person would do it out of compassion but maybe they aren’t spiritual as far as Christianity goes, or Islam or whatever maybe they are, even an atheist. But they have a strong belief in doing what is right. If they have that strong belief within themselves, which is still spiritual, whether they want to name that or not, then it may not have the same level, but it potentially could have similar effects.

But most secular people that I’ve being associated with through my life—I mean social workers and stuff—some can care very, very deeply but a lot of them don’t. They are just there for the wage and at 9 o’clock, at 5 o’clock, at 4 o’clock, whatever quit time is, the door is locked and away they go (Bear, 2016, p. 13).

This idea fits with what Sister Carol thinks about spirituality, which is linked with volunteer or non-for-profit care for others. This is what she had to say:

I think the spirituality in people helps if the persons—and most volunteers actually are spiritual—are searching even if they haven’t quite figured it out. You know, where it is taking them. But, they are, in a way, spiritual people, for these guys, and represent God.

Like God, what is that saying? ‘God has no hands or feet but ours, and so on’. If we are kind, if we are affirming and encouraging and also challenging, in the sense of tough love, I think that, depending on how we do that, with kindness but firmness that we actually may have the amazing opportunity to represent God.

And, therefore, maybe if we can forgive and be kind and... guys can get in touch with their own goodness and potential, and believe in it, then that is a step in their way back to God, however that might take place (Peloquin, 2016, p. 8).

Sister Carol continues, by saying that spirituality—a question for everyone—places people on a journey, in which a higher morality and the idea of God is present and crucial. In her experience this is very common for offenders who are in the process of soul searching:

If they see people on a spiritual journey who are really searching, that's important. Because often those people do have the sense of God, they have a high morality, and so that means a lot too. But certainly, I think, deep down lots of guys have a sense from their past of God.

Sometimes, they have a sense of having failed God, and failed themselves and failed other people. So, I think they wonder, on some level, if God... if there is a path back to God for them. And I think that they need, not just the example but also the assurance of people who do have a relationship with God.

The assurance that I know God, and yes I know that He is just waiting, He or She, is just waiting for you to return, carries a lot of weight. And the other thing is the example, and this could be volunteer's too (Peloquin, 2016, p. 7).

However, not everybody is prepared for embarking on that journey, as Rabbit indicates in his story below:

I can understand, how some people may have it tough... There are other people that haven't been able to adjust to it, but I think the people that have adjusted to it, that I've seen, not everybody but a good part of the people that have adjusted to it, have succeeded; in a way, because of the spiritual connection to Quixote House. I think that the spiritual part is a big part of it. I know people are welcome even if they are not Christians (Rabbit, 2016, p. 5).

There are some conditions or requirements that make it possible for someone to grow in this area. For example, parole officer 'A' pointed out that "for those who are in search, looking for spiritual help and guidance, the [Quixote House] staff can help them to understand and answer questions. It is absolutely helpful" ('A', 2016, p. 3). In this search, dialogue among the different and diverse members of the community is encouraged in a very informal way. Nothing is forced down anyone's throat, and the chance to talk about spirituality and religion is always safe and open. This gives room for very interesting conversations and narratives.

Therefore, Quixote House is not about belonging to a particular religion, but it is about searching for a better way to be fully human. Bear, when addressing his success at Quixote House, which contributed to his own spiritual growth as follows, articulates this:

I would say if you are on a spiritual journey, the spiritual people involved in Quixote House help out tremendously. If you are not on a spiritual journey then they are really not a help at all, as far as a spiritual journey goes.

They are obviously there as a day to day community and support, and yeah, I can run you here, I can run you there, and then, you know, if you need somebody to take you to the hospital, I can do that. But... there is mission work; right?

Because that's why they are here, right. It's the essence of the mission work, why they are here. So they are coming out from their spiritual journey, themselves and, being spiritual people, they are fulfilling what their mission is, and what their calling is, and let us be there (Bear, 2016, pp. 12-13)

So, spirituality is acknowledged not just as a personal inner process but also as an attitude to be more involved in community and care for others. That comes about, as Bear says, in places or among peoples who are related with religion. Quixote House and the people who live there are like that, as Otter highlights in his story:

Kind of, it did teach me a little bit more about community and involvement. So, right now, where I am now, is just a little bit like a social butterfly, three years later.

It really helped me just to get out of my shell. And also, Sunday night just kind of a spiritual discovery as well going to St Ignatius [Church] with one of the priests and some of the guys of the house (Otter, 2016, p. 3).

Rabbit describes it as a deep connection, "it is a connection that we will have the rest of our lives. You know, and I believe God brought me to that, it started with me going to see one of your [interviewer/researcher] services" (Rabbit, 2016, p. 6). Sometimes this is described as a religious experience, as Panther explains:

For me, personally, it is the religious experience. Maybe having, you know, some services within the home, getting people involved in the church. I think that is important. But it is also important to give them the choice not to be involved in any religious activities whatsoever. But offer them and have them available (Panther, 2016, p. 10).

This experience is not compulsory or obligatory. It is perceived as an option for the Quixote House residents. Panther notes that, “take it or not, that’s it. It is offered but don’t force it down anybody’s throat” (Panther, 2016, p. 10). Actually, it is perceived as something incidental, even for members of the same religious group. As Wolf, who is Catholic, put it: “even though I may have picked the priest’s brain a bit about certain religious ideas and stuff at times, that’s not, that’s not the focus of the house at all. In no way is it ever really a hot topic of conversation, religion of any kind, you know” (Wolf, 2016, p. 15). Wolf points out that spirituality, understood as voluntary service, permeates everyday life at Quixote House. He explains it in the following manner:

It is more just in daily relations, you know, and some of the choices that we make, some of the decisions we have in front of us and some of the helpful advice on what the right choice would be. But it’s never been about specific religious ideas. And even the guests that have come, even though most of them have come from different churches and...yeah, certainly some of them have come from churches other than Catholic churches; even they wouldn’t come just to talk about religious things either.

They come to talk about the fact that here are a bunch of guys getting out of jail and let’s talk about that. So this was about our integration, you know, through and through. And that is the thing, too, just like in a sober living house where it should be focused on addictions and recovery.

At Quixote House, it’s all guys coming out of jail integrating into society again, and through and through each day that is definitely topic number one. You know, at least it seemed that way to me. It was, certainly, you know, number one on my mind, the majority of the time.

So that was the main thing. It wasn’t so much about the religion, it was always about the idea, the service... what is the word I am looking for... it was just about what we’re doing there: we are reintegrating (Wolf, 2016, pp. 15-16).

It doesn’t mean that some religious symbols are not present or some religious feasts are not celebrated, but ‘life’ becomes more important in Wolf’s sight. He shares his thoughts about Next Step meetings:

We share some Masses there, share some religious practices, right? Like the prayers and stuff, like the all saints' prayer. When is that? Four times a year? You know, maybe then, we do something that is so religious and so Catholic—that is four times in a year, maybe five. Half of our day there, half of our meeting and all the rest of it, is about life. Like just life in general, like all the different areas where we need assistance (Wolf, 2016, p. 16)

According to Sister Carol, the creation of an honest atmosphere where people can ask deep questions about their relationship with the 'Higher Power' or 'God' is within the 'mission' of Quixote House. She articulates this perspective:

To me, that sort of a mission of priests, and sisters, and community, lay people, is to have the chance to sort of let God speaks through them. I think even AA [Alcoholics Anonymous] speaks about a 'higher power'. Now it is hard to think of that, to think that higher power will somehow hold them when they're too weak to be held. If they can actually name that, and have a sense of this personal relationship, that is going to help them hugely. But I think we are a stepping-stone in that direction, hopefully.

And all persons that are honest, sincerely honest about their journey and are willing to have that as a motivating factor in their lives—and something that drives in that really helps them. Guys automatically would look and say 'I think, you know, that looks like something I'd like to have', that connection. 'If it helps you, it'd help me'.

So, it is more like... I think the relationship with God is more 'caught than taught', because you don't teach them and tell them that you live it. And then, when they start to ask questions or they see a person of faith, living the faith, they sort of catch it. It intrigues them. They say 'maybe that can be true for me too' (Peloquin, 2016, p. 8).

This is complemented with some sort of 'mentorship', coming not only from the priests who live at Quixote House, but also from volunteers and members of Next Step. As Sister Carol noted, the caring relationship is extended when those volunteers are willing to participate in the celebrations and successes of Quixote House's residents:

They might have thought of it and so, some sort of mentorship or example, has obviously touched them. And they may even choose their own church, but they are sort of reminded of our church.

I think too that both volunteers from Next Step and people living in the house have attended baptisms, confirmations—moments—graduations, graduations from treatment centres like Tamarack. This is often a new

experience, to have people who care enough to be there to affirm each step you take that is positive (Peloquin, 2016, p. 7).

Therefore, it seems positive that ex-offenders have a place and are surrounded by people with whom they can grow spiritually whether they are religious or not. Parole officer 'C', who outlines his ideas as follows, recognizes this point:

On the one hand, a number of the people that have gone [to Quixote House] had not been religious in any way, and despite that they felt supported and again not judged on that or criticized on that. There are others there who are religious but not necessarily with Catholicism, but they have found support in their quest for learning about the beliefs, learning about spirituality, trying to understand it. It's been very non-denominational and I think that is a wonderful thing.

I think the spirituality of the people that work at Quixote House, make Quixote House carry on the daily life, and the daily atmosphere there, and I think they are kind of the founding principles or fine guidelines of the spirituality that helps the guys; helps Quixote House function and, again, helps to provide a nurturing environment for these folks ('C', 2016, p. 3).

Parole officer 'B' sees the benefits of a 'spiritual component': "I believe there is a spiritual component that they are expected to abide by or follow. I think that the facility works with at least our organization and, you know, supports the efforts that we are trying to move forward, and yeah, some like that" ('B', 2016, p. 2). However, this 'spiritual component' in the house, can be understood in different ways. In the case of parole officer 'B', it is understood as 'something to follow'. Spirituality, then, is linked with the image of a 'path', which is different from the image of spirituality as a 'belief system'. This is what parole officer 'B' had to say on the topic:

I guess in my experience with corrections we get all the time, we get Christians, and non-Christians and people from different cultures, and different ethnicities, and belief systems, and included in that there are some guys that do use Christianity as a path to their reintegration and, so, for the guy that believes it, it absolutely is a support. And there are people that don't believe in it yet, or are curious, but they never had the opportunity to experience it.

So it offers sort of a window for guys to look into it if they choose to do so. It is not for everyone, but there are offenders that rely on Christianity and it is absolutely important if that is their belief system ('B', 2016, p. 3).

Also Rabbit understands spirituality as a path to walk, a journey, and he explains it as follows:

It was very helpful, especially in my spiritual journey. You know, being a new Christian at that time, when I first came out and everything. I was just [in Quixote House since] July. I was baptized in September, you know, my Christian walk being so young and it was very... I think it was very important to my religious walk and also with just trying to be at peace with what is going on in your life. I think it was very important in my journey. You know this whole process from being part of Next Step, to Quixote House, to everything, I think was very, very important to the whole journey. It is all about a journey (Rabbit, 2016, p. 4).

However, Rabbit also finds the spiritual component in the house as something important in everyone's journey, a comfort feeling that affirms everyone's decisions to act appropriately:

I feel very blessed that I was... you know? I don't believe... I don't believe there is a coincidence for anything. In this world, God has a reason for everything. And I think that just to be around and just the aura of how strong certain people are... you know, living with you and other Jesuit priests and how important Jesus is in your journey.

There are many times even when I was going through this whole job situation last summer, I just let God make a decision. I put it all, I learned that... Don't worry, I can't worry. It is all put into God's hands. Good or bad, and I just think there is always a feel to it, you know, of that. I don't know, it is just the work of the Holy Spirit, just that.

Even tonight, you know. I've seen Fr. Creamer, and I see you and, it is just... the feeling of the warmth and the happiness of the Holy Spirit of the heart, it is just amazing, it is just amazing to me (Rabbit, 2016, p. 6).

Also he recognizes it as a 'connection', in which others become 'like' family to him. He expands on this point in the following manner:

If you want to take it out of the Spiritual realm, and Jesus and the Holy Spirit, you explain it to anyone by saying being in a loving family, a close loving family that would never end. You know, no matter how long it's been since I've seen Kathleen, no matter how long it's been since we see each other, there is that connection, right? (Rabbit, 2016, p. 6).

This kind of ‘connection’ is also felt by Wolf, who ascertains that it is something he deeply needs:

I found out whenever I go to church, wherever I go throughout the city, now when I attend Mass at the Catholic Church, I feel like I am there with my family all the time. Even though these are people I never met before, it is just different than talking to someone on the street, talking to someone in the Church. Even though you can talk about the exact same stuff, I just feel more connected. So for me that’s fantastic, you know. And I think that was needed my whole life (Wolf, 2016, p. 15).

The connection is not only to people in the church but also to ‘God’, and this link is characterized as an ‘intimate’ relationship. This point is highlighted by Rabbit, who also went from being Jewish to becoming Christian in his own journey:

I speak to God, and I learned that the important thing is to talk to God when things are good, not when things are bad. People talk to God when things are terrible, and then when things are good they all forget whom they need to talk to. God wants to hear us when good and bad things are going on. It’s been so important to my life, my spirituality... I think that’s a thing that I really lost in my life before? It was the whole religious thing, because of the Jewish heritage; feeling guilty that, you know, I was letting the Jewish people down (Rabbit, 2016, p. 7).

This room for a spiritual journey at Quixote House is open ended and it has taken residents to different places, depending on the experience of each one. Panther, for example, decided to become a Roman Catholic because he felt it was important for his spiritual growth:

...if I hadn’t met Fr. Dave or Sister Carol I would never have become Catholic. I was baptized last year. At Easter Vigil, I went to the RCIA [Roman Catholic Initiation of Adults] course, and it’s something that has helped me. Going to Mass every Sunday, or trying to... (laugh), and the things that I’ve learned in the RCIA course, you know, reading the Bible... (Panther, 2016, p. 5).

Others have taken university courses about how to better understand the relationship between religion and spirituality. Bear, for example, sat in on a course at the University of Manitoba:

At that time, and then other times, Fr. Dave [Creamer] invited me to the University. I could go to the University. He invited me to sit in on one of his classes that he was teaching about Bernard Lonergan, who is another Jesuit. The methodology of thinking and the thought process of what a person does, was good too—for myself and the journey I was doing on a spiritual and intellectual level (Bear, 2016, p. 10).

However, Bear not only sought to understand. In addition, he found a change in his relationship with others, and the need for him to ‘give back’ to others. He explains it as follows:

And when I look back on it, I would have to agree with her [Sister Carol] in a lot of ways. Even today, I have to agree with her. It’s a way that I can give back, but in giving back I become deep spiritually for myself and so the compassion stuff that I now feel for the guys is more there than it would have been in the past.

I still have my moments when it is ‘ughh’, you know, depending on what’s going on and that is the human aspect over again. Overall, it’s really helped me. It helps me grow as an individual, it helps me grow as a person, and it’s really helped me grow to understand people, right?

It really helped me and I think this is one of the biggest things for myself I’ve always been an introvert, even though in public settings I come across as an extrovert. I do like my down time, to just be by myself and you know, sit and meditate and that is one of the things I developed through the years—meditation—that I didn’t have before. Looking back on it, it has kept me grounded (Bear, 2016, p. 11).

These new attitudes, activities and relationships, also opened up for him, the door of healing:

I got a lot of healing from that. Like the doors that have been opened, God has allowed healing to happen in my life and within that healing, I can’t heal other people, but I can certainly help them on their journey, hopefully, to a better place, where they can get spiritual healing themselves. That has really been the big thing. That’s really a big thing (Bear, 2016, pp. 11-12).

And then, it is safe for the goodness of everyone to come out. As Panther says: “Everybody really has the safety of having that home, which allows, whatever is inside themselves, the goodness inside themselves, to come out” (Panther, 2016, p. 9). This change is understood as ‘spiritual’. In fact, Bear affirms that the main change that Quixote House has made

in him is ‘spiritual’. He opines that this spirituality is linked also with self-awareness and accountability for his actions:

The biggest change I would say that I have come to and I give all the credit to Quixote House when I lived there—I would have to say is spiritual. And through that, for me, came the self-awareness. Coming into prison I wasn’t self-aware. I wasn’t self-aware at all.

That’s been through the process, as I mentioned with Sister Carol, the *Enneagram*, and probably I would have my tunes in Rockwood and in spiritual books and religious and Fr. Dave’s course on Bernard Lonergan, and talking to the Jesuits, and the Spiritual Exercises, which I gained all through the collective experience, I would say, of Quixote House, for the greater part. It has made me more self-aware (Bear, 2016, p. 18).

This kind of change, new understanding, awareness, and development of nonjudgmental attitudes is also found in the experience of Fox. He argues that in Quixote House he got more sceptical about religion than before:

You get to be more critical about how you think but, you know... I think getting to the value from your own Religion, which is completely about compassion, love, support—all those things. I think that’s the point, which often gets missed. That is definitely very strong here.

You know, other guys who’d come here, they may have some difficulties. I noticed some guys came here [Quixote House] and... I said: ‘Oh, I’ve been there’. But just as I used to be glued to the Bible, all these verses and, you know, their whole life is broken down into a regime and, I never saw that. But at the same time there is a lot of neutrality, not to feed them in that and make it more exacerbated (Fox, 2016, p. 6).

This freedom of opinions led residents to live a life in simplicity and focus on the essentials. For example, Moose contended that the fundamentals of every religion, and Quixote House, is love:

The spirituality part of it, as you know, is open-ended. It is up to you; up to the individual, up to the resident. And nothing has ever been brought to them. But the fundamental thing is—I probably just go right into speaking on spiritual things in religious contexts—I would just go right to ‘love your brother as yourself’.

That is the fundamental thing that is played out there! Between the residents and the staff, or the Jesuits who live there at any part of their spiritual program. Regardless of the Catholic denomination, which sponsors it—not

solely I don't think at least there are other volunteers, and there is another ecumenical volunteer... We are always encouraged to be our own...to find our own spirituality, spiritual path regardless of denomination or whatever, equality straight across. So, of course, everybody has their own expertise, you know, a lot more questions are easily answered.

For Catholic questions there is always a direction to search out, to seek, you know, always an answer, at least regarding direction. If you have something that could not be answered, the spiritual part is there.

There is the prayer, it is there too....There is a sanctuary there and yes, and it was always there. It is the fundamental underpinning of the house, the spiritual part of it as, you know. It is just God based on the basis of 'Love your brother or the other as yourself'. That is what I can really say, I guess (Moose, 2016, p. 7).

Thus, Quixote House, as a home, generates room for one's spiritual journey, where residents can grow in honesty, self-awareness, accountability and appreciation of their own story, as well as the stories of others. They also can find a safe space in which their own goodness can be expressed. Spirituality is not confined to the private, the intimate, nor is it shaped by a 'belief system'; instead, it is the daily exercise of self-giving actions.

The outcome is an appreciation for their life and the lives of others; a deep respect that will have a very important role in their 'desistence from crime'. To illustrate this journey, it is time to listen to Bear's story. He went from being suicidal to becoming a stable and productive member of the community, journeying towards compassion and self-awareness, with more than 6 years of living in the community as a free man:

I was told I'd be better off to commit suicide instead of living, by my ex-wife—so fair enough, she has her issues. So I tried, but through that process, and I am usually pretty good in what I do, a miracle happened to me. And... from that point onwards, going from not having a belief in God, I felt called twice in the past.

At different times of my life, that call was in my heart and there has been no doubt for me spiritually that there is a God, from that experience. And so, from there, prison was good in that aspect. In addition to that, it gave me time to read Scripture for many, many, many times over.

I read the Bible about three or four times cover to cover and, you know, there're certain parts that really developed my spirituality and relationship with God and so I have even seen this inner strength in a newer belief that I can

draw on now. This has been an ongoing source of wellness and support for myself (Bear, 2016, p. 6).

He also is able to see some ‘goodness’ in prison, as he points out in this segment of his story:

So it is about recognizing where I came from, what got me into the crime cycle, but also recognizing that emotions, and Scriptures talk about this too. And I’ve studied a little bit of Buddhism since I’ve become more spiritual; recognizing the emotional aspect of who we as human beings are and the depth of where that goes.

So, if you have an emotion, that emotion is real to you, at the time that you have it. And that alone has been important for me to understand, right? And that aspect of it, allows me to forgive others, because not knowing where they come from and knowing that maybe they’ve told me their stories—because I have some friends who are schizophrenics, and they are telling me their stories and it’s real to them.

And that’s what is important to me. It is that the story is real to them. Often it is not real to me, but they still believe it. And so, then, I can understand and have compassion for them, because they are caught in that (Bear, 2016, p. 7).

The differences I would say is that I found in my life, and in my experience, that there is a fundamental difference between reading the bible and saying you are spiritual, and actually having a spiritual conversion. And people that have had a spiritual conversion and movement within their life, on a very deep level, would understand what I am saying and the rest of the people won’t understand (Bear, 2016, p. 6).

I am taking that spiritual experience and I have applied it now to my life. So, you know, I’ve got a lot greater depth of compassion within myself and understanding toward other people and the issues that they go through, and also of myself (Bear, 2016, p. 6).

This drives him to take ownership of his own life and his own story, including the wrongdoings that led him to prison. He goes on to say that he can see himself and the whole picture in his crime story, and therefore take responsibility for those actions:

And so, coming back to myself, I can look in myself, and you know what, the emotions that I had were real to me. There wasn’t a bad intention behind my crime, in that it wasn’t preplanned or anything but the emotions I felt, and the despair I was in, and the bad relationship I was in, I can bring it all together as a collective picture and apply it to myself and say ‘yeah, this is the story!’ (sob) Right? This is the story, this is what happened and I can take ownership.

As Sister Carol says: Take ownership of it, of your actions and of your emotions. And that really is... that is spiritual! Right? That comes right after God. God says nobody is responsible for anybody else. Parents are not responsible for their child; the child is not responsible for the parent. Everybody is responsible for their own actions. And when you come to God and repent, you are taking responsibility. You're recognizing those actions (Bear, 2016, p. 7).

In summary, Quixote House offers an invitation to ex-offenders to build a home for themselves by living in simplicity and in a community where happiness and contentment can be found in everyday service to one another. This knowledge and practice comes about in contrast to the 'secularity' which they have lived during their incarceration experience. This 'spirituality' is not based on economic gain, or financial reward for work done, no matter what the person's religion (Bear, 2016, p. 13). An activity of care, voluntarily offered and with no financial reward, teaches everyone about the purpose of life and their relationship with God or with a 'higher power'. Of course, in this questioning, the existence of God and a higher morality, according to Sr. Carol, are crucial and are present without question in released offenders (Peloquin, 2016, p. 7). These questions can find people in diverse stages of their journey. Some even intentionally avoid the questions (Rabbit, 2016, p. 5).

In fact, it is necessary for some minimum of personal agency and willingness to change to exist in the person in order for this growth to occur. As it was pointed out by parole officer 'A', Quixote House will only help those who have the intention to search for spiritual help and guidance ('A', 2016, p. 3). So, Quixote House is not about belonging to an institutional religion or, about going to a certain church, or having certain practices in common, it is about searching together for a better way to be human. This search, however, is not lived in isolation. It is a common and every day journey upon which each resident of the home has embarked (Bear, 2016, pp. 12-13). So, spirituality is linked with the experience of home. To build home is not a

personal inner process but a call to be more involved in the common activities and to care for others. The words ‘compassionate’, ‘care’, ‘spiritual discovery’, ‘deep connection’ and even ‘religious’ are often used to describe the experience (Rabbit, 2016, p. 6; Panther, 2016, p. 10).

Another characteristic of ‘home’ at Quixote House is that it is not compulsory or obligatory. It is perceived as an option; not just to take it or leave it, but also to go deep into that “stuff”. (Wolf, 2016, p. 15). However, it is hard for residents to ignore that “stuff” because the voluntary service of building home permeates everyday life at Quixote House (Wolf, 2016, pp. 15-16). Building a home cannot be confined to the secretive, the individual ideas, nor can it be shaped by a merely external ‘belief system’; instead, it is exercised daily in self-giving actions. What happens in Quixote House is based on these everyday self-giving actions, which is one of its greater strengths. Paradoxically, this kind of simple and almost unstructured environment is also its major weakness.

9.5. The simple structure at Quixote House

The lack of a formal staff member at Quixote House and the absence of mandatory procedures around how things are conducted inside the house, are often criticized by residents and people responsible for the management of the house. This happens even though every resident has to sign a contract in which they commit to certain behaviours for the success of the community and the maintenance of the house. This may be a residue of nostalgia for the stability of the institution in which offenders spent years of their lives. At Stony Mountain Institution, the line of power is very clear, and the behaviour expected is well described by the formal and informal rules provided. In a home like Quixote House, with released offenders, a nun (Sr. Carol), and different Jesuits around, the rules are more implicit, sometimes blurred or even ignored by those who are living there. There is a lot of “grey area” at Quixote House (‘E’, 2016, p. 4).

Residents perceive this ‘grey area’ or lack of structure for the enforcement of rules in different ways. Fr. Creamer praised the lack of hierarchical structure in the house: “I quite like that environment too. It can be...I don’t know, I don’t like these hierarchical kinds of structures, you know what I mean? Like, you know... on paper in some ways we may have that, but in reality we don’t have that” (Creamer, 2016, p. 17). In his opinion, the absence of structure is taken over by a ‘history in common’ made by the multiple individual decisions for assuming common responsibility for behaviour and decision-making at the house:

So there is a story to it. People who came to Quixote House have gone out and lived their lives, totally apart from and free from prison, you know. Ram is a good example of that; he works in the Church now. He was the first guy at Quixote House, you know. It is hard to imagine Ram going to jail (laugh).

But, I mean, for others there is also a storyline of success, and I think that is one of the things that people know when they come to Quixote House. When people go there and try to play according to the rules and so on, chances are pretty good that they are going to stay out of jail and make a life for themselves and so on.

And if they don’t, they are like the white-collar guy that we had with lots of money, but didn’t follow the rules. When his time to cook came he ordered Chinese food, paying a few hundred dollars for it. That is not how Quixote House works (Creamer, 2016, pp. 17-18).

However some parts of the grey area have more delineation than others. One of the non-negotiable rules is the cleanliness of the house, which seems more of an issue when Sister Carol randomly visits the house. Ram noted that: “We had the arguing and everything like that but it was always settled. So, at one point Sister Carol was worried about the cleanliness of the house, sort of things, and everybody was kind of like slacking off” (Ram, 2016, p. 3).

On the other hand, for other residents, this lack of structure allows room for abusive behaviours to occur; for example, by ordering TV pay per view movies. Ram argued that, “We had issues with guys ordering too many movies and stuff on the TV, ‘ratting’ at those who caught them out for a while. That was on the main floor TV, I think it was; guys were doing that”

(Ram, 2016, p. 5). Leaving responsibility for cooking suppers to individuals who sometimes did not show, left the whole community without supper. In this respect, Rabbit had this to say about individuals who do not follow up on their duties:

I mean, when I was here there were a couple of times when it was somebody's night to make dinner and they didn't show up to make dinner and nobody called... It is one of those things that you have to...

I have to be respectful. In the job that I've begun now, our owner says it is very important to be on time. If you are late you are actually disrespecting the other people you are working with. It is very disrespectful.

That they can be there on time but you are not. It is the same kind of thing. [Quixote House] is the start of going back to being responsible and to being accountable, and you have to be accountable (Rabbit, 2016, p. 4).

This informality in the structure of power was evident in moments of crisis and some residents' risky behaviour. Sr. Carol points out, for example, that it is important from time to time, to have a meeting in the house to clarify 'what is going on':

Sometimes, if the Next Step team is really separated for a while it could be, it would depend on the person and the situation. It could be myself, Eduardo and the other Jesuit.

Then [it is necessary] to meet and talk about it among ourselves as well. Like 'How is the house?' How is this going? Where do we need support from the outside, from Next Step and Sister Carol? What do you suggest? (Peloquin, 2016, p. 15).

The idea of working together to benefit somebody without any professional restrictions, but rather out of one's personal initiative, does give room for contradictory messages:

It is always several working on something together, which is better than that falling to one and each person. If each person is responding to a guy who is having some difficulty, one may be sort of enabling him, without meaning to; being nice to him, another trying to be strict...

We are all doing different things and we have to get on the same page. And that is probably when one of those things may be a meeting without them. But if we have meetings with them, whether it be myself and the two Jesuits, or if it involves Next Step, that is a question that could be decided, sometimes yes, sometimes no.

If it is only how Quixote House is, then to meet and talk about it to see how we can support each other and have a common effort of support for

the guy and also a common tough love that we can all do. So that, we are not doing different things (Peloquin, 2016, p. 15).

In fact, the existence of three different programs—Next Step, Quixote House and Massie House—in which released offenders can participate, even one or two of them at the same time, is also a factor for this ‘messy intervention’. Sr. Carol outlines this point while addressing who, and when, people should be involved in making decisions:

In the past, Dave and I met about every two months, just Dave and I about Quixote because sometimes that put us on the same page, or what we wanted to do in a house meeting or whatever. But it could be, you know, maybe should be bigger, maybe it should include whoever is going to be working in the house and sometimes Next Step, maybe sometimes not (Peloquin, 2016, p. 16).

When Sr. Carol was asked about what Quixote House needs the most, she did not hesitate to provide the following story:

Communication and structure...and response! Like people sign [a contract], they know what they are coming to, and in a way, in a way, they don't respect it, when they are able...they don't respect it... if they are allowed for a time not to follow those expectations.

And some are more serious and have the instinct to address others. But I say, every single way that there is not an expectation met, first it might be addressed gently from someone in the house, but very quickly it needs to be addressed in a way that it is a.. there is no other... ‘do you want to stay?

This cannot continue, and it can't be allowed to continue’. And as soon as there is a second or third time, a few months later you are too late (Peloquin, 2016, p. 16).

No registers are preserved on any of the participants; except for the articles they write, under a pseudonym for the Next Step program newsletter. Other documents might include copies of receipts for their monthly rents, or the mail that often comes to the house when they do not live there anymore. The peer support group (Next Step) and Quixote House are designed to be left as soon as parolees no longer feel the need of the support they provide. If the residents and people associated with Quixote House know of their whereabouts, it is because they are still in

touch with one another after leaving the group and the houses. This depends on the willingness of former residents to maintain a link with the community. The only source of physical coercion is external to the programs. As with other homes in the neighbourhood, this enforcement rarely happens, unless there is serious damage to property or theft. This absence of formal structure, kept records and paid staff at Quixote House is without doubt a source of program weakness. In fact, Quixote House is perceived as weak because it depends mainly on the good will of men released from prison to behave in a constructive manner. However, this perceived weakness is precisely what makes Quixote House a unique place with a high rate of success in the reintegration of offenders into society.

9.6 Experiences of home as a contribution exclusively of the third sector.

According to the analysis above, the third sector has found, in Quixote House, a strategy to assist in the process of the personalization of institutionalized people, by providing for men journeying out of prison, a ‘home’—a place to live, or at least, a different kind of presence compared to what they experienced in correctional facilities. In fact, in their interviews about Quixote House, many of the men identify it as a home, and associate belonging, togetherness, community, safety and care with this place. This kind of association rarely happens when they speak of Halfway Houses or Correctional institutions. Moose stated this clearly, when he addressed the “genuineness” of Quixote House as contrasted with the “lack of trust” he found in Correctional institutions in everyday life (Moose, 2016, pp. 7-8). However, even today, as was acknowledged by the parole officers interviewed in this research, the model for the reintegration of offenders into society has not considered how everyday activities in a home such as Quixote House can become a crucial component in the process of reintegration. Instead, policymakers insist on a Halfway House staffed by people who rely directly or indirectly on the state. Then, highly

trained staff immersed in CSC law enforcement matters, become primarily and almost solely responsible for the process of re-entry or “resettlement” of offenders in Canadian society; a process now seriously affected by federal budget cuts (Munn & Bruckert, 2013, p. 6). Even the contribution of the non-for-profit sector has diminished because of the decrease in public funding budgeted for those initiatives.

A place like Quixote House is a non-profit endeavour that responds to those needs expressed by McNeill (2012) and the concerns of Bahr (2015). It creates an environment and relationships that cannot be identified as part of the state or just in the individual sphere of the offender, as if the individual were living with relatives. It is a new kind of intervention model that exceeds the concerns of criminology and seeks to be in partnership with the broader community. It acknowledges the active or latent conflict of offenders that is hard to address from just the correctional and professional framework. As was already pointed out by McNeill (2012), the goals of the correctional institution in community are “not ‘correcting offenders’ so that we can reinsert them into ‘solid society’, but rather supporting service users and communities in working out how to travel together towards better lives” (p. 98). In this ‘travel together’ it is clear that Next Step and Quixote House, according to what has been outlined above, have impacted upon the work between offenders and parole officers. Quixote House has made a difference in offenders that extends far beyond their achievement of ‘desistence from crime’. It has built hope. It has addressed vulnerability in everyday life, toward not only better lives but also peaceful homes and communities. In the following chapter, PACS categories, concepts and approaches are used to better understand this initiative, so that it can become replicable.

9.7 Key findings

The following eight salient findings about Quixote House emerged from the interviews:

First, everyday activities, such as working, eating, resting and playing at Quixote House contrast with the way things are done in the prison structure, which grounds inmates in institutionalization. Everyday life activities are similar for everyone, but the way they are practiced changes significantly when offenders are released and come to live at Quixote House. Inside the institution, no matter how the inmate behaves, there is no variation in the way activities of everyday life are completed. Normally, the quality and access to the food, access to laundry facilities are standardized and cannot be changed by the people using them. The same happens with the spaces and times for playing and resting that they have.

In contrast, at Quixote House, everyday activities can vary across a wide spectrum depending on the needs and abilities of the residents. At Quixote House, men can exercise their freedom in activities like cooking, doing household chores, playing and resting. These external changes help offenders to discard the effects of institutionalization. They learn quickly to decide about when, how or which activities should be done daily. This gives them a sense of some freedom to display creativity, address their shame, cultivate connections and care, in a way they could not during their incarceration. In a homelike place such as Quixote House, offenders can show and embrace their vulnerability and live with the “normalizing discomfort” of being an “ex-con” (Brown B. , 2012, p. 198).

According to the data collected, when offenders find a home after prison, they not only embrace their personal vulnerabilities, but they also allow their theories and universal discourses to be tested. This real understanding and acceptance of their situation gives them room to create their new identity. Offenders can manage the different voices and find their own way to manage their conflicted identity and stop being victimized by institutionalization, prison culture, and stigma. In this new identity, despite other discourses that support the ‘vulnerability armoury’

(Brown B. , 2012, p. 112) and ‘disengagement’, concrete humanness lived at home is recognized by others inside and outside the home-like place. Then, thanks to the work of Next Step and Quixote House—a ‘useful but insufficient’ intermediary (Dayton, 2009)—a “transformed relationship” between offenders and the community in which they are released is encouraged. Consequently, Quixote House and homelike places for offenders are crucial for ‘transforming’ the conflict in offenders and their disengagement from the rest of society that would potentially lead them to reoffend. Such places should be part of the ‘multi-track’ peace system in which offenders are inserted to resettle as productive citizens after incarceration.

Second, offenders show in their everyday relationships how much they have changed and overcome institutionalization. Reintegration in community (or not) is determined by the capacity of offenders to relate and respect others daily. Parole officers and professionals mainly depend on the offender’s word, their confession, or on the results of biological analysis to check if released offenders are fulfilling the criteria imposed by the system in terms of resettlement in society. At Quixote House, it is how they do their chores or treat other people in the house, which indicates whether or not they are really getting rid of ‘prison mentality’. For example, I have seen residents still wearing the blue shirt they received from the institution, not because they do not have alternative clothing, but because it is what they are used to wearing. When they do stop wearing prison garb, this is a great indicator that their self-image is changing. The use of the laundry machines on the third floor of the house also denotes that change. They go from using the machines for small amounts of clothing all the time, to organizing their dirty laundry once or twice a week.

The use of the laundry machines also requires certain ‘everyday’ negotiations with other residents of the house, through which they can enhance their social skills. Those social skills are

crucial for reintegration into the wider community (Pink, Mackley, & Morosanu, 2015). If they live with the same expectations that they had in prison, this will be reflected in their everyday life; in terms of how they treat each other and whether or not they ask others for help. Once they break the institutional mindset in their daily lives at the house, they are ready for the next step of independent living without resorting to violence to meet their needs.

Third, everyday practices forge in residents the idea that they are not only consumers, but also contributors and recipients of efforts. As happens within the institution, residents of Quixote House are not passive recipients of whatever the house ‘staff’ is willing to provide for them. When they enter into the house, they become active members, both shaped by and a shaper of the community environment (Gilroy, 2012). They have the freedom to decorate their rooms, to change the way pieces of furniture are placed in the common areas, or find new recipes online to cook and search for the ingredients they need, when their turn comes. The ideas of occupying space and web-making are related to the notion of place, understood as a continuous and extraordinarily giving and taking process (Jack, 2012, p. 81).

Each resident gives his time to satisfy common needs and for this reason, the distribution and routine of sharing chores benefit community and individuals as well. Because of this, they can also organize their personal time in a better way. In this process, they have to define priorities in order to create their own personal schedule. This will give them the chance to see, for themselves, the meaning of Quixote House. Jack (2012) highlights the role of attachment to place in the development of personal identity in a world in which no tradition defines the individual. This attachment to Quixote House, and detachment from other places, such as the prison and correctional and rehabilitation centres, will be the basis for further decisions. These

decisions will help them to ground and appropriate the community and its relationships, instead of giving up the effort, which often leads to a breach of parole and recidivism.

Fourth, residents are able to appreciate Quixote House even when ‘nothing is done’, because these moments are occasions to distinguish themselves from the ‘rat race’ outside. It is in moments on the couch, while some are reading and sharing a common, clean and tidy living room, that residents build ‘togetherness’ and experience their house companions ‘like a family’. This environment is unique, and it is not endangered by competitiveness and by the fast pace frequently associated with work and public spaces. In addition, the residents of Quixote House are invited to share their stories in informal conversation, and then to become “constructive storytellers” in everyday life (Senehi, 2009, p. 203).

Prescriptive institutions that block their truth surround parolees. Parole officers and treatment providers use sentences, law, and medical health diagnoses in order to assess the situation of parolees. Prescriptive methods are based on oppression and supremacy, which appear to be justified by the legal system. The functionaries of the correctional system, acting under the law can even use coercion so that parolees forcedly maintain their “word”. However, through storytelling in everyday life, it is possible to find the true story from within themselves. These authentic stories emerge from within; during those times of silence and leisure as they share stories; not only as responses or reaction to people in society, but also as they share their struggles to appropriate their conflicted identity as parolees who are now living outside the prison.

Through a “constructive storytelling” process (Senehi, 2009), parolees can also deal with unresolved narratives that have hindered their humanization process and played a role in justifying their past criminal activity. Storytelling can provide parolees with a vision of the

complexity of their lives and the necessity for growth, which serves to reconstruct the self through linking past events to an understanding of the current situation. Finally, these stories can open up possibilities for the future by learning to distance certain painful events from oneself (Mansfield et al., 2010, p. 250). At this stage, because they are able to distinguish ‘mainstream’ and ‘personal’ narrative related to their ‘crime’, parolees may see their transgressions, not only as a shameful memory but also as a source of wisdom. As Mansfield, McLeana and Lilgendahl (2010) state:

One reason that we expected narrative processing of transgressions to predict wisdom is that our culture does not appear to have a clear template, or master narrative, to guide individual reasoning in transgressions. In fact, if there is any master narrative for dealing with transgressions it is one that does not explicitly encourage self-exploration (p. 252).

At this point, parolees learn to deal with their reality with “a word” that is outside the legal and medical (prescriptive) approaches which are ambiguous (p. 253). By tolerating their self-ambiguity, parolees will create strategies to deal with past painful events in light of opportunities for a better future. Mansfield, McLeana and Lilgendahl (2010) wrote:

...management of this ambiguity also invokes the potential for personal growth. Although we expected that narrative processing in the form of personal growth would be less common in transgressions than in traumas, we also expected that those who did the hard narrative work of finding personal growth in the context of a transgressive event would be especially likely to develop wisdom (p.253).

When parolees recall the painful events, which shape their stories, this can lead to the implosion of their emotions. In turn, storytellers and story-listeners’ emotions can hinder the whole process if they are not addressed properly. Unresolved narratives have the potential to keep the self “stuck” in the painful emotions of difficult events; an experience, which may be harmful to a healthy, positive sense of identity (p. 250). Therefore, using storytelling with parolees for their reinsertion into society requires that attention be paid to the parolees emotions

which these narrated events might spark in their search for a new and true identity. This is what Otter recalled from his memories of the conversations over meals at Quixote House: “It was kind of reflecting what they, what we, all did with our day; kind of listening to other people’s progress” (Otter, 2016, p. 2).

According to Senehi (2009), regarding identity, storytellers as peacemakers have to balance the different experiences, worldviews, and meanings brought through stories and activities that are shared in order to gain mutual recognition and respect. This recognition and respect comes from stories that are very different from those supporting the ‘rat race’ on the streets in the city. Such stories will become part of their lives, but are now understood in a different way within the Quixote House context. Drawing on the ideas of Lederach (2005), and the role that place and vulnerability play in the constant creation and recreation of roles and personal identities, to build a home for former offenders is to build a peace system, in which personal stories can be told, their own personality can be exposed and the “moral imagination” is at work for building peace in the conflict between former offenders and society.

Fifth, residents’ individual identity is resituated in the power structure coming from society when they share everyday chores. In a home like Quixote House, everyone is responsible for his own activity, and no one can waive any privilege (i.e. wealth, social status, education) that the social structure provides. Power is seen and exercised in a very different way inside and outside Quixote House, and both are necessary for the success of the experience. In fact, interventions among the released offenders are possible due to the power that the state has over them, even after incarceration.

Kenneth Boulding (1990) classifies power in society from the point of view of its effects, as destructive, productive and integrative (p. 24). While destructive power is the common way in

which offenders see the power of the state and the social agents over them, after incarceration offenders need to find ways to exercise productive and integrative power, if they really want to challenge the oppressive social structure. Integrative power has the ability to create communications networks, mutuality and respect, even in hierarchical systems (Boulding K., 1990, p. 110). Integrative power is also closely related to the structures of identity and legitimacy (Boulding K., 1990, pp. 113-114). Integrative power is the “most significant of the three major categories of power”, although “it is an elusive and multidimensional concept that is very hard to quantify” (Boulding K., 1990, p. 109). To share everyday chores at Quixote House is an opportunity for them to exercise productivity and their integrative power in a very small and safe setting.

As I mentioned above, meals are opportunities to uncover and recreate each person’s culture. Residents have the chance to share their own culture through a dish they prepared for the community. No resident can get rid of his many labels, but each one’s identity is resituated from the power structure of society through sharing chores and intimate spaces, such as a washroom. Residents can see by themselves how society shapes power and how they can live in that power structure without adopting it in their home. When this is achieved, no one has to ‘defend the autonomy that comes from [someone’s] own personality’ (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 255). ‘What did you do today (for this place)?’ is the first and often the only question that arises in and opens daily conversations. Autonomy and trust are initially apparent in the way residents are perceived, no matter what their past experiences and actions are. This new way to see themselves and others is achieved by a persistent, stable and permanent everyday practice.

Sixth, the non-judgmental approach in the house is a major distinction between the environment of correctional centres and Quixote House. In fact, Quixote House allows ‘non-

professionalized' relationships with offenders, which is not possible in correctional centres. Often, I hear residents say to me 'you are one of us'. This happens because we share similar conditions (such as housing, food, remote families) and we invest our free time to build mutual relationships and give everyone freedom to be themselves. Correctional officers only offer specific professional and tightly regulated resources, financed by public funds. The origin of these funds compromises the criteria and way in which the service is given.

While the state and the market are compelled by prescriptive approaches and communities to build their identity with exclusionary narratives, at Quixote House, various approaches can be tested with the concrete language that comes from experiencing everyday life. In this sense, peacebuilding does not serve a certain doctrine or 'ideology', in Marxist terms, instead it serves people by providing them spaces in which relationships of love, free service, and equality can be experienced. Based on this premise, a new individual and collective narrative, which maintains the peace created collectively by the different actors in their everyday setting, can grow.

The rehabilitation of offenders and the construction and maintenance of peace require agents who can be situated outside prescriptive approaches; agents who are able to become role models in the perceptions and experience of those engaged in the transformational change; and, agents who can help guide individuals and communities "in navigating the restructuring process" (White, 2010, p. 269). Hence, the designation of such role models by legal authority, professions or traditions within the correctional service does not seem to be enough. The participation of the ex-inmate's natural community of belonging is required.

In spaces like Quixote House, where a person's full humanity can be achieved and peace built, offenders are capable of distinguishing more clearly between 'universal theories of values'

and ‘rights’ that often justify enforcement, and the practical means of implementing them. Space as seen through the experience of dwelling in a home, can counteract homogenizing effects of governmental administration and consumerism, through dialogue and conversations in everyday life (Senehi, 2009; Andermatt, 2012, p. 146; De Certau, 1988). This call is urgent considering the unfortunate legacy of the modernist era that has produced a pattern of intervention through “imposition, exclusion and domination” (Andermatt, 2012, p. 148). At home, this pattern can be replaced by a new ecology in which spaces are born through negotiation.

In fact, despite the stigmatization that occurs due to the homogenizing effects of governmental administration and consumerism, Quixote House still provides a platform for humanization; thereby preventing its members from falling into the dehumanizing patterns present in society and, in the case of offenders, through the dynamics of “internalized oppression, denial, addiction and despair” (Fontan, 2012, p. 59). At home, “one invites one’s friends and neighbors and avoids one’s enemies or boss, as long as the society’s power respects the fragile symbolic barrier between an obliged sociality imposed by the authorities and elective conviviality regulated by individuals” (De Certau, Giard, & Mayol, 1998, p. 147).

In the Quixote House community, no one is obliged to listen to others and no one is benefiting by receiving a payment for doing so. The same people give the support all the time, because there is no rotation of staff. In reality, there are no ‘staff’ and no ‘clientele’. What is given and received depends absolutely on the good will of the people who are investing their time and their money in building a community and supportive environment. The success of Quixote House relies on the creation of an environment and place in which all prescriptive models or practices can be tested. It is a place to enter into dialogue with those troubled by conflict or stigma, so as to create a new self-narrative that leads them to peace.

Seventh, nonjudgmental behaviour at Quixote House is possible and encouraged. This occurs through the combination of three factors: namely, the acknowledged brokenness of residents (being judged and condemned previously for their mistakes), the common experience of prison (recovering from a highly institutionalized environment), and the chance to deal everyday with the reciprocity needed in a shared home.

In Quixote House, there is a common assumption that nobody is perfect, including the Jesuits. Everybody, in a way, is ‘broken’. The stories most often told have to do with this. This honest approach to brokenness is different from pity or sorrow because no one can escape from simple accountability when sharing a home with others. The recognition of this condition in each person, allows room for exercising compassion and unrestricted acceptance. Mistakes are forgiven every day, and ‘second chances’ are always expected.

Also, most of the residents of Quixote House have been incarcerated, or at least know the situation of institutionalized people. Even Jesuits have the experience of institutionalization during the beginning of their formation (*novitiate*). Prisons and Jesuit houses of formation have much in common. People in these two places live, work and sleep, in the same building; surrounded by the same people (belonging to the same gender), all of the time. This shared background provides room for a mutual understanding about how the house is managed, used, and ‘owned’ by all residents.

With this appropriation comes the expectation of reciprocity through shared chores, meals, and everyday activities. Everyone must have trust in the other and must also have a greater tolerance for involuntary mistakes and diversity. When this kind of trust and reciprocity is routinely exercised, the expectation of reciprocity among the residents may be extended to the rest of society resulting in many former offenders becoming law-abiding citizens.

Eighth, the support given by Quixote House is perceived as ‘unconditional’ based on true acceptance; residents are even given the freedom to stumble, fall and try again. Residents associate the words, ‘safety’, ‘community’, ‘togetherness’, ‘belonging’ and ‘care’ with Quixote House. The trust received in reciprocity empowers each one of them to make timely and appropriate decisions. This rarely happens in the context of Halfway Houses or Correctional institutions. In such facilities, where management is safety-risk oriented, the priority is the security of the community and, only then, the individual. Often, staff members are conditioned to focus on good reports so as to keep their job and, only then, to attend to the needs of offenders under their surveillance.

Based on these assumptions, total submission and obedience from the offender are expected and there is very little room for personal decisions. Hence, their life is limited to fulfilling orders and a much-regulated general schedule. However, some Quixote House residents have identified a few individuals in CSC who are able to give the same kind of support that comes from Quixote House. They found this in officers who were able to show care and even forgive some mistakes and small violation of rules; e.g., curfew.

Released offenders have seen this caring style of management as a core characteristic of Quixote House. The trust given within the house makes room for freedom, personal decision-making, and commitment. To fail or stumble in those commitments does not automatically lead to a loss of trust as an immediate consequence, as happens in correctional institutions. The offenders living in the house experience the contrary. As part of the non-judgmental approach, they have the right to ‘stumble, fall and try again’. There is always an open possibility for people to rebuild their lives or their community in a place like home, in which memories, stories, songs and conversations are shared over and over again. This helps to prevent violence and to

experience repeatedly what is shared in common—kinship. As Fr. Boyle (2010) pointed out, with reference to his own childhood:

Our Mom, it turns out, before she decided to have eight kids, was an opera singer. We could barely fathom that the voice that hollered at us to come to dinner belonged to this magic emerging from our toy phonograph. We played the grooves off of this record.

Consequently, a line from the song found itself permanently etched in my brain—a mantra of sorts: “Long lay the world in sin and error pining—‘til He appeared and the soul felt its worth.” Sure—it’s a song about Jesus and Christmas, but how is it not the job description of human beings seeking kinship. It’s about “appearing,” remembering that we belong to one another, and letting souls feel their worth (p. 196).

Quixote House residents and volunteers in Next Step are examples of this “appearing” that reminds us that we belong to one another, without any distinction. As Moose said, “It is the fundamental underpinning of the house, the spiritual part of it ... just God based on the basis of ‘Love your brother or the other as yourself’” (Moose, 2016, p. 7). In various contexts, peacebuilding needs to be perceived as a work that provides satisfaction to certain people’s human needs, but more than that it is about believing that everyone can feel worthwhile and that we belong to one another. This is what happens at Quixote House. This kinship is one of the main aspects of Quixote House’s culture and this is how the house is managed. In addition, this attitude is replicable. Wolf found this ‘kinship management’ very valuable while labouring in his workplace with new volunteers, some of them, offenders. In fact, he was also able “to learn to love as a service”, “as well as to unconditionally accept them” (Wolf, 2016, pp. 22-23).

The support, then, becomes genuine. In order to become ‘credible and genuine’, everyday life sharing is an asset. In everyday living in an environment like Quixote House, those committed to peace can show the brilliance and flaws of their training, their personal and institutional vulnerability and their generosity in doing what they do that is not for personal gain.

Ninth, those associated with Quixote House are held in a web of mutual support. This network is open to all who dare to belong. The possibility of remaining connected to Quixote House is always open. Residents, as well as former residents and volunteers, are able to build their own networks of support, in which they are invited not only to receive but also to give. The responsibility for reinserting offenders into community belongs to the state, specifically to CSC. However, if PACS is used to analyse the conflict that arises from offenders' efforts to return to community, it can also be used to understand the reinsertion itself. Specifically, this book argues that a peacebuilding process is needed for the successful reinsertion into society of released offenders. Within this context, everyone has a role to play in passing on the Quixote House experience and even promoting it elsewhere.

In addition, if peacebuilders fulfill their role with deep respect everyday, even in front of those who have been stigmatized as anti-social, true listening is possible and ex-offenders' fear to live differently are dissipated. Peacebuilders, even in small settings, can become who they are meant to be by overcoming their own fear and their fear of/for others. As Wesela (2011) has pointed out:

Fearlessness has to do with being willing to feel our fear; it doesn't have to do with becoming superhuman and not having any fear. Not having any fear might be the result of ignorance, because we're ignoring the dangers that are really there. It turns out that when we allow ourselves to feel fear, often what we discover underneath is softness and gentleness. Because we can drop that extra layer of armor, that pretence of being stronger than we are, we find tremendous tenderness (p. 123).

The 'tremendous tenderness' in every human being is what brings peace to the world, even in the midst of the most horrendous situations. In reference to Victor Frankl, Winslade (2006) says that peacebuilders have the duty of "find[ing] their own meaning by helping others find the meaning of theirs" (p. 165). This is the space peacebuilders create when they are

spiritually animated. It is a space in which kinship is shown, peace is possible, and a new meaning based on that experience, is found. Residents and visitors at Quixote House attach this meaning to the tenderness, compassion and love that has been embraced and shared. Living their lives transformed, allows released offenders to transcend the experiences of places like prison, where tenderness is a sign of weakness and violence is so often perpetuated against them.

In this sense, the reinsertion process of offenders is reframed using the notions and insights given by ‘Multitrack diplomacy’, ‘Peace System theory’, and ‘Civil Society and Peacebuilding’ (Paffenholz, 2010, 2013). This background will help to situate a place like Quixote House within the ‘system’ and understand its dynamics. Mac Ginty’s (2011) ‘hybrid peace’, Senehi’s (2009) narrative approaches to trauma and community building, Lederach’s (2005) moral imagination, and cultural and conflict transformation— theories emanating from PACS—highlight the uniqueness and the necessity of having restorative justice centres like Quixote House for achieving lower rates of recidivism and contributing to a more peaceful society in Manitoba. Such places respect the freedom and agency of offenders in webbing their own networks of support.

Tenth, Quixote House is not about belonging to a particular religion. It is clear from the interviews that Quixote House is by no means a place to proselytize the Catholic Christian religion, forcing people to a certain kind of belief and behaviour. The presence of nuns, priests and lay collaborators from the Catholic Church is never intended to indoctrinate residents. Becoming involved in community and the care for others does engage the residents in interesting dialogues while searching for a better way to be fully human; but this is not done in a compulsory or obligatory way. The practice of a religion or spirituality has remained as an option for Quixote House residents and it has led various men to different places, ranging from the local

Jesuit parish to a Pentecostal church. This journey is fully respected by every resident. Indeed, there is no registry of church attendance at Quixote House, and residents can join any, or none, of the religious options existing in Winnipeg.

Paradoxically, religious communities, outside of the state and the market, are the ones able to provide this space in which a non-confessional peace can be forged, at its own rhythm and pace. For this to happen, providing a house, paying a staff, or advocating for those affected by conflict and stigma is not enough. Those activities are helpful on the road to peace, but what seems crucial is to provide the kind of relationships in everyday life where spirituality can be grasped and understood as the source of mutual service and self-giving for others—experiences by which everyone is found valuable, capable and accountable. In the past, churches offered buildings where people often found protection from oppressors, places where peace treaties were discussed and signed by powerful dignitaries and places where people gathered on special occasions to pray for peace or give thanks for the end of wars. In our globalized society, religious communities can contribute to peace, not only by teaching and preserving doctrines and narratives oriented to inner and social peace, but also by living peacemaking in a ‘credible way’. Such people need to do what they do out of compassion, not just for a wage, as Bear pointed out in his story below:

A secular person would do it out of compassion but maybe they aren’t spiritual as far as Christianity goes, or Islam or whatever maybe they are, even an atheist; but they have a strong belief in doing what is right. If they have that strong belief within themselves, which is still spiritual, whether they want to name it that or not, then it may not have the same level, but it potentially could have similar effects. But most secular people that I’ve been associated with through my life—I mean social workers and stuff—some can care very, very deeply but a lot of them don’t.

They are just there for the wage and at 9 o’clock, at 5 o’clock, at 4 o’clock, whatever quit time is, the door is locked and away they go. Having said that, there is light in every aspect of community, little individual lights, and they are shining forth (Bear, 2016, p. 16).

Religious people are able to create those spaces in which these encounters may happen, when they share their everyday lives with others. They do this with the risk of being perceived as ‘different’ from popular culture. Tiger noted this point in the following manner:

Otherwise, you never experienced meeting different people and socializing with different people. Just like: “who the hell are these people?” Like, you know, they are different than I am. I would never otherwise be allowed to meet, you know, like some really, you know, powerful people!

Like Jesuits, you know, sisters, like people in the community and stuff like that. I was just like blown away about all of that (Tiger, 2016, p. 2).

In fact, the distinction between religious and secular powers has been proven to be a “useful tool in conceiving and developing tolerant practices within institutions” (Bartoli, 2004, p. 148). Moreover, the presence of religious members at home provides a possibility of mediation with other agents involved in the process of the reinsertion of ex-offenders into society, completing the ‘peace system’—e.g., offender-state-mediator (home/community). It is important to clarify that those religious members or peacemakers are not meant to substitute or take over the work that has to be done by the CSC (state), professionals or the market (jobs and supplies). In fact, all of these agencies provide services for the people who are involved in conflict. In the case of Quixote House, it aims to achieve social peace. However, when the religious/spiritual component of peacebuilding is present, the possibilities of building that space in which peace is enjoyed and extended to the rest of the social relationships are higher (Lederach, 2015). In addition, the everyday contact with religious members will prevent them from being caught by ‘commodification’ and other prescriptive approaches that may come from the market, the state and even from some approaches within institutionalized religion (especially when they base their identity on ‘membership’).

Eleventh, mentorship in Quixote House is not provided exclusively by ‘priests’ or ‘nuns’ but is open to volunteers, residents and members of Next Step. All can guide and help residents to grow in simplicity of life, self-awareness, accountability, and appreciation of their own story as well as the stories of others. This is not a privilege for the founders of the house, or the social worker. Everyone can mentor another person within the group.

Offenders and non-offenders risk living together in community, sharing the same home, even though they see themselves differently at the beginning. Gradually, a common and deep humanity develops, so that the goodness of everyone is exposed, through the sharing of their common vulnerabilities, aspirations, dreams and stories. For example, Panther recognizes that having such support ensures that the goodness in everyone emerges:

Everybody really has the safety of having that home, which allows, whatever is inside themselves, the goodness inside themselves, to come out. And also you have the Jesuit influence, the religious influence: Sister Carol too, Fr. Dave, you [author/interviewer], whatever other Jesuits that lived there. Everybody is involved ... and there is so much support for Quixote House, from the outside community as well (Panther, 2016, p. 9).

This perception gradually opens up to others in the broader community. Exclusionary narratives and the effects of being institutionalized, now have to contend with concrete experiences, which show that another kind of relationship with ‘the other’ is possible. As Fox pointed out, those relationships are where everyone is “getting to the value from your own religion which is completely about compassion, love, support, all those things. I think that’s the point, which often gets missed” (Fox, 2016, p. 6).

The mutual help they provide may be shaped by a ‘belief system’ but it is always exercised daily in self-giving and ordinary actions. In fact, dwelling in a common home, the religious and the non-religious person alike are called to inhabit the place and relate with others in a nonjudgmental way and without any privilege. Everyone learns from each other, including

visitors. Residents share a house with everybody else, completing chores and following mutually agreed upon rules, without any reward or profit (Douglas, 1993, p. 272).

Twelfth, Quixote House has a structure in which rules are implicit, sometimes blurred, or even ignored. Quixote House has made a difference in the lives of offenders that goes beyond their achievement of ‘desistence from crime’. Residents have built hope, and addressed their vulnerability in everyday life. The messy structure, whose effectiveness depends mainly on the good will of men released from prison to behave in a constructive manner, allows room for abusive behaviours to occur but also for the residents to build trust with each other. This is what makes Quixote House unique.

All of these findings point to the importance of providing a home in which offenders coming back to community can become law-abiding citizens as they interface with the different approaches coming from CSC and the rest of society. This home is not part of the correctional system. It is often disorganised and far from being ‘institutionalized’. But, precisely because of this, it is able to provide a nonjudgmental approach to these individuals through mutual reliance.

This reliance is based on the brokenness present in every human being and the desire in every human being to grow in humanity. This brokenness means that rules can sometimes be blurred or ignored, in order to accept the people as they are and help them more effectively in their desire to grow. The care that people exercise to each other at Quixote House, which resembles family, operates often through implicit rules that in an institution are clear and explicit. For example, as regards the use of laundry machines, it is implicit, as it is in any family, that if the machine finishes, the same person places the laundry in the dryer, or puts it on hangers to dry. If this does not happen, or this rule is ignored, as it is in a home, the consequence of the violation is not punishment, but a chance for learning and trying again.

This trust brings forth a change in identity, first realized at home in Quixote House and, then, extended to the rest of society. This change is nurtured constantly by the routine of shared chores, stories and people building self-confidence and trust in each other. It is only through the practices of everyday life (De Certeau, 1988) that offenders can grow in the simplicity and appreciation of their own lives, as well as the lives of others. Without a home to ground them, this is hard to accomplish and the road to reintegration remains an uphill battle, prolonging an ‘us-them’ mind-set and institutionalization.

9.8 Conclusion

The transition of released offenders from prison to society is defined by a fragile and tense dynamic, in which conflicts with individuals, organizations and institutions in mainstream society are often present. Individually, and as a group, they must deal with personal challenges and the demands and conditions of release imposed on them by CSC. At the same time, there must be a transition to a new way of building relationships with those in the community, through which they will find ways to grow and satisfy their own basic and human needs. If they fail in this milieu, released offenders are likely to go back to prison, remain institutionalized in hospitals, or become homeless.

Quixote House provides a chance for this group to manage their own conflicts while providing, in everyday life, tools for growth and the satisfaction of basic needs. If offenders deal with their conflicts within the community, the chances for reoffending decrease. The overly institutionalized mechanisms of CSC are left outside the picket fence in front of Quixote House. This scheme enjoys the benefits of having a third agent mediating in that conflict. The patterns that characterize the re-entry of offenders are transformed by a ‘home’ and the nonjudgmental support received by those living in it.

The lack of breathing space within the structures of public policy (Levasseur, 2015) affects how released offenders frame their conflict with the state. This is further complicated by a culture of immediacy and short-term commitment to the non-profit sector. However, as regards policies for released offenders, simple initiatives, such as Quixote House, create spaces for possible dialogue, the avoidance of violence, and arenas where perceived differences can be transformed and resolved. Such sites become platforms and small communities, which mediate between the “lowering risk” narrative from the state and the ex-offenders’ response to their institutionalization by the state.

Inside the home and through storytelling, residents can find authentic ways to deal with their conflicted identity as parolees and sort out unresolved narratives that have victimized them and justified their past criminal activity. At home, multiple identities can be addressed through authentic attentiveness and continuous inquiry about things and their meaning. Such activity, exercised in a non-professional way, provides a collective identity, a softening of individualism, as over against the preferred highly rational and formal approach coming from the state. Outside of the home, Quixote House mediates by deploying “integrative power” (Boulding K., 1990) to create space for “hybridization” (Mac Ginty, 2013), so that various institutional approaches in society towards offenders in community can be addressed. Hence, relationships can sustain a constructive change in offenders beyond the episodic expression of the conflict between them and mainstream society, exemplified by the persistence of stigmatization.

Religious communities often promote this transformative platform. Instead of proselytizing, they can contribute to peace by the instruction and preservation of narratives concerned with inner and social peace while living with parolees in a ‘credible way’. Fortunately, Quixote House occupies this ‘grey area’; providing a sense of home where

exclusionary narratives and the effects of being institutionalized are countered with concrete experiences that point to a healthier kind of relationship with ‘the other’.

These messy and ordinary practices lived in everyday life become by themselves an identifiable separate intervention—‘home’. The kinship built at Quixote House allows residents and participants not only to find housing, but to reframe their identities, embrace their personal vulnerabilities, test in a safe environment theories and universal discourses find acceptance and exercise generosity. This experience should be encouraged as part of the ‘multi-track’ peace system through which offenders can be incorporated into society as productive citizens after incarceration. This kinship, a main component of Quixote House, ought to be part of every thoughtful peacebuilding endeavour. In the next, and final, chapter some policies are outlined and further areas of study proposed, so that this experience can be better understood and replicated.

Chapter 10 – Conclusions

10.1 Introduction

This exploratory case study explored the perceptions and experiences of eleven ex-offender residents, six parole officers, two priests, and a nun who were associated with Quixote House. Throughout the process of doing my research, I received insights based on PACS coursework, as well as what I heard from the interviews and also from what I experienced myself as a resident of Quixote House for more than 6 years. These insights have contributed to a better understanding of offenders in community as well as the development of PACS and its practice.

Many questions preceded these insights. Such questions include: Why is there a high rate of recidivism? Why do so many ex-offenders go back to the jail? Do they go back to prison just because they are addicts, homeless, suffering from mental health issues, or because they are ‘unlawfully at large’? Is Quixote House contributing to a better reinsertion of an offender into community? What is the nature of this contribution? What can the experience of a bunch of ex-cons sharing chores, eating and living together in a three-story house in west-end Winnipeg contribute to having a more peaceful society free from recidivism?

In addressing these questions I found, that although the state is crucial for forging and preserving sustainable peace, it is not the only agent of peace. Its prerogatives, such as the “monopoly over the use of violence”, have to match the nonviolent initiatives for peace from other sectors in society, such as the non-profit voluntary civil society sector. Peace inventiveness includes matters related to offender’s rehabilitation and its failure, known as recidivism, and recidivism can be rampant not just because of the inadequacy of existing state run programs for

released offenders, but because of the absence in society, and specifically in the voluntary sector, of more supportive and inclusive environments like the Quixote House ‘home’.

So, what is Quixote House, and how does it work? PACS has provided a theoretical framework for assisting me in understanding that question and my hope is that, based on this framework, more homes like Quixote House will open in the future. In this last chapter, I want to highlight the overall key findings of the study as they relate to my own understanding of the experience of men living in Quixote House by framing the situation of released offenders in terms of conflict and tension, and the need for a third party in that process of conflict transformation. Quixote House becomes a peacebuilding intervention model by providing a ‘home’ and sense of belonging to its ex-offender residents in everyday life.

The voices I heard in this study point to the importance of home and kinship in the daily activities of the residents and third party peacebuilders. The findings of this book also impact other disciplines that address violence, rehabilitation and reintegration in our society. In fact, this study has shown how valuable everyday experiences and insights are for those interested in building peace in the current world, and how important it is to have volunteers in our community who can help in the provision of these experiences.

10.2 Overall key findings and discoveries

One of the most poignant discoveries of this research has to do with how messy and difficult it is for an offender to re-integrate into the community and rebuild credibility in society. It is as if they are destined to be ostracized as soon as they come from prison. Most of the interviewees spoke about how they had to deal with ‘loneliness’, ‘fear’, and becoming ‘depressed’ each time they recalled the ‘stigma’ associated with their incarceration.

Offenders interviewed in the community often purported that programs and officers in the community do their work based on suspicion and caution. This is identified as a structural failure in the correctional and rehabilitation system. Only exceptionally, do they meet individuals with whom they feel invited to open up and rely upon. Offenders also try to avoid being around such CSC facilities precisely because of the stigma associated with them. And, finally, they also express concern about the burden of programs and expectations placed on them by correctional officers. This situation leads offenders to hide information and pushes them to resolve their money shortage through illicit activities because required workshops and scheduled visits restrict their options in the job market.

Another important factor that is crucial to their reintegration is how they manage their relationships. They know that as soon as someone starts hanging around with the ‘wrong people’, the risk for reoffending and breaching parole escalates. However, due to stigma and their emotional turmoil, sometimes the only people who seem willing to understand and help them ‘cope’ are the very ones who may link them back to illegal or criminal activity. Under the fear of going back, they develop a strong need to feel ‘safe’. According to their own testimonies, correctional officers, surprisingly, do not provide this ‘safety’, nor is it usually found in Halfway Houses.

In this regard, they also perceive that Quixote House offers them the chance to stay and enjoy the stability and safety of a ‘home’. What they most appreciate about living at Quixote House are the opportunities for relaxation and opportunities to meet and interact with people, with whom they share their everyday lives. In most cases, they also come to understand by themselves the importance of following the simple rules of the house so that it is a ‘drug and alcohol free’ place. They understand, too, that their safety is based on relationships. They realize

that the most important threat to their safety is when they discover someone who is suffering from mental illness and is hiding ‘self-medicating’ street drugs at the same time. When this use of non-prescribed drugs is detected in a member of the community, it quickly escalates the conflict in the house which, often, extends into the broader community.

Another astounding discovery is that Quixote House is living proof that the safety and satisfaction of basic needs of parolees is based on trust in one another and their care for the house. This trust is something that they build everyday. At Quixote House, offenders as a group, become active participants in the third sector because they create a community of support for themselves, without any expectation of profit, and because they are not situated within the state or the business sector. This includes all residents and those who are willing to be part of this experience.

The relationships in this community are perceived as positive, respectful, and authentic—yet fragile—even for those interviewees who left the house before their warrant expiry, after breaking the rules of the community (Panther, Lion, Ram). With that in mind, Quixote House provides a sense of freedom and belonging that makes free commitments possible. All of this is in sharp contrast to what they have experienced in prison and Halfway Houses.

As was explained and illustrated in Chapter 8, residents are able to differentiate their personal agency from the agency of the community that comes from the people around them with regards to common chores and activities. Meals together had a great impact on their lives. In fact, the house community itself, becomes a source of joy, relaxation and gladness inviting the residents to persist in the 24-hour connection and participation of this experience. This foundation and determination remain even after leaving the house and it is attested to by the frequent return of ex-residents to visit and reconnect with ‘family’, and to ask for help especially

during their worst moments. This reconnection and belongingness differentiate Quixote House from government-run Halfway Houses and other transitional homes.

Released offenders are invited to feel at home with the authentic, familiar, '24/7 support' provided by a non-professional and often disorganized community. Quixote House is not meant to be professional and limited to 'office hours' because it exists to create and recreate an environment in which all of the professional and non-professional support received by the offender is secured. Volunteers, visitors and residents from different backgrounds and experiences all contribute. This support relies on those who constitute the community. Nonetheless, as is the case in most families, this support is in some ways chaotic.

Policies for offenders' reinsertion should not be limited to their acquisition of a means of livelihood but should also foster the building of social skills that can be practiced with others to solve common concerns and needs. For offenders, to freely decide to belong to a community of support like Quixote House is a big step. Many of the interviewees testified that this continuous process resembles life at home.

The idea of Quixote House as a 'home' is not shared among all of the interviewees. As illustrated in Chapter 9, some frame Quixote House as a transition house, a community, or a platform. However, those who call it 'home' stressed very strongly this characteristic of Quixote House as a 'positive environment' in which daily activities are done, such as cleaning, eating, resting and playing. The way the men relate with one another every day displays how much they have changed and have overcome prison institutionalization. They see themselves as participants and as contributors, not just as recipients or consumers. Another good thing mentioned about Quixote House, is that it is a place where they can relax and have time for themselves. They can also rid themselves of stereotypes by adopting a 'non-professionalized' relationship with those

people who are offering help at Quixote House. The openness and messiness of this experience allow residents and ex-residents to continue providing mutual and self-giving support through their own efforts.

The necessary reciprocity of a shared home makes possible a less critical approach in relating with others. Whenever this happens, prejudices are placed on hold in the house, and honest accountability is enjoyed and exercised. Hence, residents see Quixote House as a place where they belong and experience care; a community where they feel safe. This association includes everyone linked with the Quixote House initiative. Residents and ex-residents together have the possibility to keep in touch and build their own network of support especially if they 'graduate' and move to Massie House.

This messy intervention builds trust because it depends mainly on the good will of men released from prison to behave in a constructive manner. This specifically makes Quixote House a distinctive place for offenders with a high rate of success, according to the opinion of parole officers and residents alike. In fact, only one out of eleven offenders interviewed is currently incarcerated and, through his letter, he shared his tremendous appreciation of Quixote House and the people associated with it.

All of these findings point to the importance of having a home for offenders coming back to community as law-abiding citizens. It is home that helps them to interact with the different approaches coming from society. This home cannot be part of the correctional system since it is often disorganised, but it is precisely because of its ordinariness that it is able to provide a nonjudgmental approach to these individuals by nurturing trust with one another. This trust can generate changes in their identities, first at home and, then, extended to society in general. This

transformation is encouraged continuously by the predictable activities of collective chores, shared stories and people, and the building of self-assurance and trust in everyone.

It is only through everyday practices that offenders can grow in simplicity of life, honesty, self-acceptance, responsibility and appreciation of their own story, as well as the stories of others. Without an anchorage in a place like 'home', those practices would be hard to accomplish and the road to reintegration would remain an uphill struggle, perpetuating institutionalization and an 'us-them' framework. If offenders learn to manage their conflicts within the community, the possibility of reoffending decreases. Residents at Quixote House enjoy the benefits of having a third mediating factor in conflict. In this context, a 'home' and the nonjudgmental approach exercised by those living in it, transforms the conflict and patterns that characterize the re-entry of offenders in the often overly institutionalized mechanism provided and controlled by CSC.

Inside the home, and through storytelling and informal conversations, residents experience authenticity, which empowers them to deal with their conflicted identity as 'parolees' and unresolved narratives that have victimized them and justified their past criminal activity. At home, multiple identities can be addressed through authentic attentiveness and continuous inquiry about things and their meaning. Such activity exercised in a non-professional way provides a communal identity, challenging individualisms and the preferred highly rational and formal approach coming from the state where it is essential to quantify structures for achieving individual performance. Therefore, constructive change in offenders is sustained by authentic relationships at home, in contrast to the intermittent manifestation of the 'ex-con' stigma as an indicator of the conflict between them and mainstream society. Their willingness to maintain these authentic relationships creates kinship.

Members of religious communities who live and walk with them in a ‘credible real authentic way’ promote this kinship. This kinship is the real transformative platform that stimulates residents and participants not only to solve their needs together, but to also find a new identity and to encourage them to accept and to open up their personal vulnerabilities by testing their fears in a safe environment. Notwithstanding their personal preferences, theories and universal discourses, residents and volunteers at Quixote House promote acceptance and exercise generosity. This experience should be encouraged as part of a ‘multi-track’ peace system in which offenders are resettled as productive citizens after incarceration.

10.3 Recommendations:

This study provides the following recommendations for future theory building reflexive praxis projects.

10.3.1 The need for more places like Quixote House

In order to address the conflict and tension among offenders, interventions, like those provided by Quixote House, are necessary. This type of intervention is needed in everyday life, in a place like Quixote House that functions as a ‘third party’ in the conflict between offenders and the rest of the community: one that mediates towards transforming the conflict. This transformation reaches not only those immediately involved in the conflict but also focuses on fair relationships among all people in society. It is the everyday contact with religious members and other residents that creates this kinship among all members of the Quixote House community. This type of kinship can also be extended to the larger circle of social relationships. This experience of worthiness and belonging prevents ex-offenders from being caught by ‘commodification’ of the support they require to succeed; often characteristic of other prescriptive approaches that may arise from the market, the state, and even from institutionalized religion. In line with this,

religious peacebuilders can be encouraged to make this kinship ‘credible and genuine’ today in homes like Quixote House.

A peer support group like Next Step and a home like Quixote House can address the ‘us/them’ antagonism framing released offenders. Quixote House offers more than stable housing. It is a place where released offenders can find the necessary space, time and support to readdress their identity and to make decisions towards building a socially healthier lifestyle. Next Step and Quixote House also provide an alternate prescriptive criterion to that offered by professional agencies in the reintegration process. No records are kept about any of the Quixote House residents. The scant documentation to be found includes copies of receipts for their monthly rent, and mail that is often received by the house even when they no longer live there. The peer support group (Next Step) and the houses (Quixote House and Massie House Apartments) are designed for graduates to leave when the support they provide is no longer needed. If the residents and people associated with Quixote House know about ex-residents, it is because they are still in touch after leaving the group and both houses. Former residents are always welcome to be part of the community of support. The only source of physical coercion directed against ex-offenders is external to the Next Step-Quixote House-Massie House programs and is enforced by the police. For example, within our milieu, damage to property or theft rarely happens.

10.3.2 Do not take the community in which offenders will be resettled for granted

We have become increasingly aware that individual, as well as socio-structural and relational factors are obstacles in the process of successful reintegration of an offender into community. In the individual arena, these barriers are related to mental health, finances, management of emotions, stress, loneliness, fear and stigma. From the structural standpoint, proper employment,

lack of community programs, criminal records and housing are significant obstacles. On the relational sphere, family estrangement, lack of positive support, diminished citizenship and troubled relationships with peers and romantic partners are difficulties that prevent reintegration. CSC officers in community have to continue providing offenders the necessary encouragement to have better and new relationships through participation in volunteering and community programs. Also, CSC has to continue giving time management workshops that promote a beneficial use of time. CSC also needs to ensure that Halfway Houses and places in community that host offenders have the appropriate spaces and equipment for leisure and relaxation.

Regardless of the CSC component, the community has to provide chances for offenders to find real and practical connections when they are released. Opportunities are very limited if the behaviour of community members is based on ‘suspicion’. Quixote House offers some insights about effective engagement with these issues, in contrast to an antagonistic and disbelieving interaction between many agencies involved in the process as released offenders address hurdles to their reintegration back into society. Released offenders perpetuate the ‘us-them’ framework when those programs are perceived as a threat. This perpetuates in them attitudes such as secrecy and hidden agendas. These agendas, as heard in the interviews, often involve breaching ‘parole’, seeking downward relationships and reengaging in criminal activity.

10.3.3 Multitrack intervention strategy to reduce recidivism

PACS was helpful in providing some useful models for understanding the conflict faced by offenders released into the community as well as intervention models highlighting the kind of relationships needed for addressing and managing it. Prison codes and institutionalization, although unavoidable during incarceration, can actually hinder the process of re-entry into community. For example, during re-entry, public safety may be at risk because offenders are

extremely vulnerable to substance abuse (alcohol and drugs) and mental illness. This vulnerability can be lessened if released offenders find employment, a suitable place to live, and a positive set of relationships—all of which contribute to a new and fresh start. Released offenders often need to inhabit a ‘blurred zone’ in which they can safely be themselves without threatening anyone. It is also necessary to work with the family of offenders and, at times, to give them appropriate support. This transformative process represents a major shift in approach towards released offenders, which had formerly focused on individual capabilities and ‘desistance from crime’.

While the state and the liberal market are compelled by prescriptive approaches and communities often build their identity with exclusionary narratives, peacemakers from the non-profit sector can open up new spaces so that dialogue and experiences that nurture mutual understanding may happen. This calls for frequent meetings with CSC, the business sector, and third sector agencies supporting the re-entry of offenders in community. Churches and other faith-based organizations, as well as similar entities from the third sector, should take the initiative to organize more restorative justice meetings, and events in the community to support houses that host offenders. This is urgent in a society in which fundamentalist ideas, emanating from the market, the state, and some religious communities are currently promoting violence and conflict.

Policies geared toward the new non-profit sector are necessary. Based on the lived experience of Quixote House residents, the current, overburdened, third sector can no longer be seen as the sole response to the failure of the state and the market place. Instead, the third sector has to expand its work by developing its own programs and grow as an independent force from which the changes needed in society can be channelled productively to assist the downtrodden;

for example, by building a network for ex-offender's first new employment opportunities. In this task, they must listen, and give a voice to those who have been marginalized or mistreated by the state and the marketplace. Offender re-entry requires a multi-track 'diplomacy' approach (Diamond & McDonald, 1996b) in which all players, including ex-offenders, work together while acknowledging their different roles and backgrounds. Only in this way can the state, the business sector and non-profits, build a peace system that guarantees the full rehabilitation of offenders into the community and also ensure that harmonious relationships among the different communities can flourish successfully within Canadian society.

10.3.4 Education and Social Media campaign

The Media has a great impact on how the community perceives offenders living in the community. To counteract prejudices often perpetuated through misinformation by the Media: a Media Information Campaign about 'second chances' ought to take place. This campaign would raise awareness of the vulnerability of offenders in community, the 'transitory nature' of Halfway Houses, and the need for more houses in the community that can host released offenders. Documentaries, public broadcasting and research from universities and social science institutes (to name a few), focusing on how offenders in community cope with their daily struggles and 'survive' everyday life, are also necessary. Indicators of success in their reintegration should not be measured just in terms of risk or 'not going back to prison', but by highlighting their successful stories.

10.4 Future Research

This research has only scratched the surface of the social situation facing offenders when re-entering community. The focus has been on a particular experience in Manitoba, which is linked with other initiatives to ensure the success of the process of re-entry into community for those

offenders willing to start anew. The complexity shown in the findings calls for further research in offender rehabilitation, the continued work of communities, and the importance of everyday practices in addressing violence.

10.4.1 In the area of offender rehabilitation

There is a need for more systematic research into the situation of offenders in community, in which ‘non-professional voices’ involved in the process can be heard. Examples include those coming from families and relatives, friends, and members of communities (e.g., rural, Aboriginal, church, or youth groups) to which they belong. It is necessary to increase our knowledge about how offenders in community relax and cope with daily struggles, and to link this with a wide range of government and third sector sponsored research about offenders in community and their connection with addictions and mental health issues. This type of research should match the investigation within the correctional service and the findings in the medical and psychological fields. Of top priority should be inquiry about their experiences of ‘being safe’ and ‘stable’, and how this relates to issues of mental illness and substance abuse. This, in my opinion, is crucial for their reintegration into society and in the prevention of recidivism.

In addition, there is little research addressing how third sector initiatives contribute to the reinsertion of offenders in Canada. Most of the research done in this area shows the need for funds or approval from the business sector and state. For this reason, the research has focused on ‘measurable’ outcomes and not on the process. Research in this area should be more ‘systematic’ or ‘holistic’, and analyse how agencies from business and the third sectors impact the myriad of relationships offenders must rebuild when they are back in community. I would be interested to see, in the future, research addressing the work of other initiatives in Manitoba, such as those of *The John Howard Society*, *Open Circle*, and *CoSA*.

10.4.2 Small communities in Manitoba.

The contribution of small communities in the forging of peace is another important area for further research. Quixote House is but one of many ‘intentional’ communities that exist in Manitoba. In the local newspaper, we often read about these communities which are linked to rehabilitation from addictions, receiving newcomers and refugees, or hosting the elderly. It is important in the sociological and PACS fields to research how small communities contribute to peace, by meeting the basic needs of former offenders, offering housing and providing hospitality. The success of this kind of initiative seems to be working in Quixote House. Further, it would be important to link these communities with violence prevention programs, so that their success will have an impact on the policies of other sectors.

10.4.3 Everyday practices

Another research area that needs to be explored in depth is the connection between everyday practices at home and the development of non-judgemental approaches in individuals and communities. These ‘practices of everyday life’ suffer from marginalization because they are not situated within the professional realm (Mac Ginty, 2015). Recent publications of Scicluna (2017) and Pink, Mackley, and Morosanu (2015) are exceptions that confirm the rule. In addition, the ethical component of this kind of research must secure the protection of delicate and intimate information. For this reason, the home of visible religious or cultural minorities within the broader communities has been undervalued in investigations about violence.

This kind of research entails the creation of indicators for the identification and measuring of non-judgmental approaches, and also how they contribute to the prevention of violence and promotion of reconciliation. In addition, research should also address the role of faith based agencies and members of religious organizations in the development of these kinds of

approaches within their communities. This book is a first attempt to analyze these practices, as lived by the residents of Quixote House, and to connect them with the successful reintegration of offenders in society.

10.5 Final remarks

Quixote House is a community of support built in various ways by members of the third sector. It is like a jigsaw puzzle. Everybody plays their part in the functioning of the home in a somewhat informal, yet structured, way. This informal but regular interplay allows residents to develop a sense of belonging and authenticity that is different from what they had experienced in prison, and in other correctional facilities and Halfway Houses.

The Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, who host the Next Step meetings in their convent, and the Jesuits of Winnipeg, are not alone in facilitating this ‘non-professional’ corridor for rehabilitation. Instead, its management lies under the direction of a lay Board of Directors, including representatives of the Jesuits and the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, which works towards the stability and sustainability of Next Step, Quixote House, and Massie House.

However, what makes Quixote House successful is not just the commitment of the religious members and the Board of Directors of *Future Hope, Inc.*, but also the genuine friendships and kinship that arise there among the residents co-mingling in everyday life activities. The family-like ‘non-judgmental approach’ taken by everyone implies honesty and mutual respect. I am, after almost 7 years of living in this place, not afraid to encounter any one of the former residents of Quixote House on the streets of Winnipeg. I often invite them to come over for supper on Fridays. I am happy to welcome them again to a ‘safe’ place; not because of the keys and security devices within the building, but because of the quality of the relationships

and their willingness to connect with residents and volunteers. The only condition is not to be under the influence of alcohol or drugs, not just because it is a CSC rule, but because relationships of mutual support are harder to maintain in a milieu where addictions are rampant.

This is made more possible because the ultimate goal of sharing a house is to satisfy individual needs by building, day-by-day, an inclusive community. Quixote House is successful because residents have the freedom to show gratitude for the support given and received. Winnipeg has become all the richer because of this three-storey house, shared by the most rejected people in our society who are living successful stories of home.

Quixote House has been crucial for transforming the conflict in me and in ex-offenders. At Quixote House, the Jesuits, as religious members, interact with non-religious members freely without prejudice, sharing our stories and experiences, showing our flaws and vulnerability, reframing our conflictive identities, and accepting failures as part of our journey toward harmony and peace with the rest of society. This experience of home comes through everyday in conversation and interaction among residents when we express what we believe, and how these beliefs illuminate our lives. We try to be honest, to accept our own vulnerability and brokenness, and display a willingness to work for a better way to have genuine human relationships. Home and kinship must become part of a 'multi-track' peace system into which offenders can be resettled as productive citizens after incarceration. This transformative practice embodies a key change in methodology towards released offenders in community, one that has been highlighted at Quixote House.

Bibliography

'A', P. O. (2016, Noviembre 29). Interview #15. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Aboriginal Justice Implementation Commission. (1999, November). *The justice system and aboriginal people*. Retrieved March 04, 2017, from Manitoba Government Home Page: <http://www.ajic.mb.ca/volume1/toc.html>

Abracen, J., Axford, M., & Gileno, J. (2011). *Changes in the profile of offender populations residing in community facilities: 1998 and 2008*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.

Abracen, J., Gallo, A., Looman, J., & Goodwill, A. (2016). Individual community-based treatment of offenders with mental illness: Relationship to recidivism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 31(10), 1842–1858.

Abracen, J., Langton, C., Looman, J., Gallo, A., Ferguson, M., Axford, M., et al. (2014). Mental health diagnoses and recidivism in paroled offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(7), 765–779.

Aertsen, I., Daems, T., & Robert, L. (2006). *Institutionalizing restorative justice*. Portland, OR: Willam Publishing.

Alaszewski, A. (2006). *Using diaries for social research*. London, UK: Sage publications.

Amos, W. E., & Newman, C. L. (1975). *Parole: legal issues, decision-making, research*. New York, NY: Federal Legal Publications.

- Andermatt, V. (2012). *Spatial ecologies: Urban sites, State and world-space in French cultural theory*. Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
- Augsburger, D. W. (1992). *Conflict mediation across cultures: Pathways and patterns*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Augsburger, D. W. (1992). *Conflict Mediation across Cultures*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- 'B', P. O. (2016, November 30). Interview #17. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Bahr, S. (2015). *Returning Home: Reintegration after prison or jail*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.
- Bakken, N., DeCamp, W., & Visher, C. (2014). Spirituality and desistance from substance abuse among reentering offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(11), 1321–1339.
- Bale, W., & Mears, D. (2008). Inmate social ties and transition to society: Does visitation reduce recidivism? *Journal on Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 45(3), 287-321.
- Barnsley, J., & Ellis, D. (1992). *Research for change: Participatory action research for community groups*. Vancouver, BC: The Women's Research Centre.
- Bear. (2016, June 26). Interview #6. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Benson, M., Alarid, L., Burton, V., & Cullen, F. (2011). Reintegration or stigmatization? Offenders' expectations of community re-entry. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 385-393.

- Berdes, C. (2005). The necessary and sufficient conditions of community: Recreating home and family in an intentional community for the elderly. *The Gerontologist*, 45, 421.
- Berg, M., & Huebner, B. (2011). Reentry and the ties that bind: An examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(2), 382-410.
- Berreby, D. (2005). *Us and them: understanding your tribal mind*. Boston and New York: Little, Brown and Company.
- Blunt, A., & Dowling, R. (2006). *Home*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boccagni, P. (2017). *Migration and the search for home: mapping domestic space in migrants' everyday life*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Bonta, J., Rugge, T., Dauvergne, M., & Cormier, R. (2003). *The reconviction rate of federal offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Solicitor General Canada.
- Boulding, E. (2000). *Cultures of peace: The hidden side of history*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Boulding, K. (1990). *Three faces of power*. London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Bowlby, S. (2011). Friendship, co-presence and care: neglected spaces. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 12(6), 605-622.
- Boyd, S. C., Chunn, D., & Menzies, R. (2000). *[Ab]Using power: The Canadian experience*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

- Boyle, G. (2010). *Tattoos on the heart: The power of boundless compassion*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989). *Crime, shame and reintegration*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Braithwaite, J., & Braithwaite, V. (2001). Shame, shame management and regulation. In E. Ahmed, N. Harris, J. Braithwaite, & V. Braithwaite, *Shame management through reintegration* (pp. 1-69). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Braswell, M., Fuller, J., & Lozoff, B. (2001). *Corrections, peacemaking and restorative justice: Transforming individuals and institutions*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Bromwich, D. (1993). Alienation and belonging to humanity. In A. Mack, *Home: a place in the world* (pp. 139-156). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Brooks, N. (2001). The role of the voluntary sector in a modern welfare state. In B. Chapman, D. Stevens, & J. Phillips, *Between state and market: Essays on charities law and policy in Canada* (pp. 166-216). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Brown, B. (2012). *Dare greatly: How the courage to be vulnerable transforms the way we live, love, parent and lead*. New York, NY: Gotham Books.
- Brown, J. (2004). Challenges facing Canadian federal offenders newly released to the community. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 39(1), 19-35.
- Burley, D. G., & Maunder, M. (2008). *Living on Furby: Narratives of Home, Winnipeg, Manitoba 1888-2005*. (I. o. Studies, Ed.) Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: University of Winnipeg.

- Burrowes, R. J. (1996). *The Strategy of Non Violent Defense. A Gandhian Approach.* . New York: State University of New York Press.
- Burrowes, R. J. (1996). *The strategy of non violent defense: A Gandhian approach.* New York, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Burwell, J. (2008, October). Sisters of Holy Names and Jesuits initiate Quixote House. *The New Wine Press*, p. 7.
- Bussidor, I., & Bilgen-Reinart, U. (2006). *Night spirits: the story of the relocation of the Sayisi Dene.* Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Byrne, J. (1989, July). Reintegrated the concept of community into community-based corrections. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35(3), 471-499.
- Byrne, S., & Senehi, J. (2012). *Violence: Analysis, intervention and prevention.* Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- 'C', P. O. (2016, Noviembre 24). Interview #14. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Callahan, C., & Elliot, C. S. (1996). Listening: a narrative approach to everyday understanding and behavior . *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 17, 79-114.
- Canada, C. S. (2017, January). *CSC statistics - key factors and figures.* Retrieved February 20, 2017, from Correctional Service Canada: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/092/005007-3024-eng.pdf>

- Canada, S. (2017, March 01). *Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2015/2016*. Retrieved November 2, 2017, from Statistics Canada - The Daily: <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/170301/dq170301c-eng.htm>
- Canton, R. (2011). *Probation: working with offenders*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Carter, J., & Smith, G. (2004). Religious peacebuilding: From potential to action. In H. Coward, & G. Smith, *Religion and peacebuilding* (pp. 279-301). New York, NY: SUNY.
- Casey, E. (2009). *Getting back into place*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Caslor, M. (2003). *The effects of positive peer culture on the recidivism rates of male young offenders in Manitoba*. Winnipeg, MB: University of Manitoba.
- Chamberlain, J. (1995). Rehabilitating ourselves: The psychiatric survivor movement. *International Journal of Mental Health*, 24(1), 39-46.
- Cheldelin, S., Druckman, D., & Fast, L. (2003). *Conflict: From analysis to intervention*. New York: Continuum.
- Christian, D. L., & Adams, P. (2003). *Creating a life together: Practical tools to grow ecovillages and intentional communities*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Cobbina, J., Huebner, B., & Berg, M. (2012). Men, women, and postrelease offending: An examination of the nature of the link between relational ties and recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*, 58(3), 331-361.
- Combs, G., & Friedman, J. (2012). Narrative, poststructuralism and social justice: current practices in narrative therapy. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 1033-1060.

- Comfort, M. (2007). Punishment beyond the legal offender. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 27(3), 1-97.
- Comfort, M. (2008). *Doing time together: Love and family in the shadow of the prison*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2004). *Community residential facilities in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: Research Branch Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2005). *The Safe return of offenders to the community: Statistical overview*. Ottawa: Research Branch Correctional Operations and Programs.
- Correctional Service Canada. (2011, June 01). *Correctional Service Canada*. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from Report of the evaluation of CSC's community corrections: Chapter 1 Correctional interventions: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/005007-2008-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service Canada. (2013a, August 15). *Federal Community Strategy Framework for Action*. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from Correctional Service Canada: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/parole/092/002007-1001-eng.pdf>
- Correctional Service Canada. (2013b, 08 15). *Correctional Service Canada*. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from Federal community corrections strategy: Vision to 2020: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/parole/092/002007-1001-eng.pdf>
- Correctional Service Canada. (2013c, June 28). *Forum on corrections research*. Retrieved February 13, 2015, from Correctional Service Canada: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/forum/e101/e101j-eng.shtml>

- Correctional Service Canada. (2017, January 03). *Correctional Service Canada*. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from Community Corrections: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/005007-3008-eng.shtml>
- Cox, M., & Matthews, B. (2007, June). Faith-based approaches for controlling the delinquency of juvenile offenders. *Federal Probation*, 71(1), 31-36.
- Craig, L., Dixon, L., & Gannon, T. (2013). *What works in offender rehabilitation*. West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Creamer, D. (2013, April 20). *Next Step – Quixote House and Massie Apartments*. Retrieved February 10, 2014, from igNation.
- Creamer, D. (2016, May 1). Interview #2. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Cukier, W. (2008). *Effective Canadian regulation of small arms and light weapons*. Ottawa, ON: The Canadian Peacebuilding Network.
- Cullen, F., Lero Jonson, C., & Nagin, D. (2011). Prison does not reduce recidivism: The high cost of ignoring science. *The Prison Journal*, 91(3), 91(3) 48S–65S.
- 'D', P. o. (2016, November 30). Interview #16. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Daigle, M., & Naud, H. (2012, October). Risk of dying by suicide inside or outside prison: the shortened lives of male offenders. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 54, 511-528.
- Day, D. (1997). *The long loneliness: The autobiography of Dorothy Day*. San Francisco, CA: Harper.

- Dayton, B. (2009). Useful but insufficient: Intermediaries in peacebuilding. In B. Dayton, & L. Kriesberg, *Conflict transformation and peacebuilding: Moving from violence to sustainable peace* (pp. 61-73). London and New York: Routledge.
- de Beaurepaire, C. (2012, February). La vulnérabilité sociale et psychique des détenus et des sortants de prison. *Revue du MAUSS*, 40(2), 125-146.
- De Certeau, M. (1988). *The practice of everyday life*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- De Certeau, M., Giard, L., & Mayol, P. (1998). *The practice of everyday life. Volume 2: Living and cooking*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deines, H. (2008). The Catholic Worker movement: Communities of personal hospitality and justice. *Social Work & Christianity*, 35(4), 429-448.
- DeMott, D. (1987). *Peacebuilding: A textbook*. Geneseo, NY: High Falls Publications.
- Descombes, V. (2014). *The institutions of meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Diamond, L. (2012). The hidden dimensions of peacemaking: a system perspective. In S. Allen, Z. Cherian, & A. Bartoli, *Peacemaking: From practice to theory. Volume 2* (pp. 622-639). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Diamond, L., & McDonald, J. (1996b). *Multi-track diplomacy: A systems approach to peace*. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press.
- Douglas, M. (1993). The idea of home: A kind of space. In A. Mack, *Home: A place in the world* (pp. 261-281). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Douglas, M. (1993). The idea of home: A kind of space. In A. Mack, *Home: A place in the world* (pp. 261-281). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Dubinskas, F. A. (1991). Culture and conflict: the cultural roots of discord. In D. a. Kobl, *Hidden conflicts in organizations* (pp. 187-208). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

'E', P. O. (2016, November 23). Interview #13. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Edwards, E., & Mottarella, K. (2015). Perceptions of the previously convicted: The influence of conviction type and therapy participation. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59(12), 1358–1377.

Edwards, M. (2009). *Civil society*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

Ellis, C., Adam, T., & Bochner, A. (2011). Autoethnography: An overview. *Historical Social Research*, 36(4 (138)), 273-290.

Evans, B. M., & Shields, J. (2010). The third sector and the provision of the public good: Partnerships, contracting and the neo-liberal state. In C. Dunn, *The handbook of Canadian Public Administration* (pp. 305-318). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

'F', P. O. (2016, October 24). Interview #11. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Farrall, S., Bottoms, A., & Shapland, J. (2010). Social structures and desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 7(6), 546–570.

Farrall, S., Sharpe, G., Hunter, B., & Calverley, A. (2011). Theorizing structural and individual-level processes in desistance and persistence: Outlining and integrated perspective. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 44(2), 218-234.

Feit, M., & Wodarski, J. (2004). *The conundrum of human behavior in the social environment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Fellowship of Intentional Community. (2016, January 04). *Intentional communities*. Retrieved April 7, 2017, from Fellowship of Intentional Community:
<http://www.ic.org/directory/listings/?cmtty-country=Canada&cmtty-prov=Manitoba>

Fontan, V. (2012). *Decolonizing peace*. Lake Oswego, OR: Dignity Press.

Forward House Ministry. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from Forward House Ministry: <http://www.forwardhouse.ca/about-us-5/>

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punishment: the birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Pantheon books.

Fox, E.-o. (2016, May 28). Interview #4. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Fox, M. (2016). *Home: a short introduction*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Frieberg, A. (2001). Affective versus effective justice: Instrumentalism and emotionalism in criminal justice. *Crime and Punishment*, 3(2), 263-278.

Future Hope. (2014). *The Next Step program*. Retrieved April 03, 2017, from Future Hope:
<http://www.futurehope.ca/nextstep2.html>

Future Hope. (2015). *About Future Hope: F.A.Q.* Retrieved April 7, 2017, from Future Hope:
<http://futurehope.ca/aboutus.html>

Future Hope. (2015). *Home*. Retrieved April 7, 2017, from Future Hope:
<http://futurehope.ca/home.html>

- Future Hope. (2015). *Massie House Apartments- From crack house to safe haven*. Retrieved April 06, 2017, from Future Hope: <http://futurehope.ca/massie2.html>
- Future Hope. (2015). *The Massie House Apartments project*. Retrieved April 7, 2017, from Future Hope: <http://futurehope.ca/massie.html>
- Gaard, G. (2007). *The nature of home: Taking root in a place*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Gacek, J. (2015). *The impact of 'life' behind bars: Understanding space, impression management, and masculinity through former inmate narratives*. Winnipeg: University of Winnipeg.
- Galtung, J. (1990). Cultural violence. *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(3), 291-305.
- Gaskew, T. (2014). *Rethinking prison reentry: transforming humiliation into humility*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Gauthier, F., Woodhead, L., & Martikainen, T. (2013). Introduction: Consumerism as the ethos of consumer society. In F. Gauthier, & T. Martikainen, *Religion in consumer society: Brands, consumers and markets* (pp. 1-24). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Gellert, G. (1997). *Confronting violence: Answers to questions about the epidemic destroying America's homes and communities*. Boulden, CO: Westview Press.
- Gilman, C. P. (1972 [1903]). *The Home: Its work and influence*. Chicago, IL: Univeristy of Illinois Press.

- Gilroy, R. (2012). Wellbeing and the neighborhood: Promoting choice and independence for all ages. In S. Atkinson, S. Fuller, & J. Painter, *Wellbeing and place* (pp. 73-88). Surrey, UK: Ashgate.
- Glassman, M., & Erdem, G. (2014). Participatory action research and its meanings: Vivencia, praxis, concientization. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 64(3), 206-221.
- Goff, C. (2001). *Criminal justice in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Nelson Thomson Learning.
- Goffman, E. (. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental health patients and other inmates*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma; notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gonzalez Buelta, B. (2015). *Letra Pequeña: La cotidianidad infinita*. Maliaño, Spain: Sal Terrae.
- Goodchild, P. (2013, March). Exposing Mammon: Devotion to Money in a Market Society. *Dialog: A Journal of Theology*, 52(1), 47-57.
- Gouvis Roman, C., & Travis, J. (2006). Where will I sleep tomorrow? Housing, homelessness and the returning prisoner. *Housing Policy Debate*, 17(2), 389-418.
- Green, J. (2003). Cultural and ethnic fundamentalism: The mixed potential for identity, liberation, and oppression. *Public Lecture at the Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy* (pp. 1-17). Regina, SK: University of Regina.
- Griffiths, C. C., & Verdun-Jones, S. N. (1994). *Canadian criminal justice*. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace & Company.

- Griffiths, C., Dandurand, Y., & Murdoch, D. (2007, March 04). *The social reintegration of former offenders and crime prevention*. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Centre.
- Gunnison, E., & Helfgott, J. (2013). *Offender reentry: Beyond crime and punishment*. London, UK: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Guzman Bouvard, M. (1975). *The intentional communities: building a new moral world*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press.
- Hacking, I. (1986). The archeology of Foucault. In D. Hoy, *Foucault: A critical reader* (pp. 27-40). Oxford: Blackbell.
- Hackman, M., & Porter, B. (2014). *Advancing social rights in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Irwin Law.
- Hammond, L. (2004). *This place will become home: refugee repatriation to Ethiopia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univeristy Press.
- Haney, C. (2001, December 01). *The psychological impact of incarceration: Implications for post-prison adjustment*. Retrieved June 22, 2017, from U.S. Department of Health and Human Services: <https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/75001/Haney.pdf>
- Hanson, K., & Wallace-Capretta, S. (2004). Predictors of criminal recidivism among male batterers. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10(4), 413-427.
- Harris, K. (1991). *Moving into the new millennium*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Harting, H., & Kamboureli, S. (2009). Discourses of security, peacekeeping naratives and the cultural imagination in Canada. *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 78(2), 659-686.

- Hauss, C. (2010). *International conflict resolution: International relations in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Havens, L. (1996). *A safe place*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Heinemann, I. (2012). *Inventing the modern family: Family values and social change in 20th century United States*. Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.
- Hiram, M. (2014). *Offender reentry: background, Federal Programs, and an annotated bibliography*. New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- hooks, b. (1990). Homeplace: a site of resistance. In b. hooks, *Yearning race, gender and cultural politics* (pp. 41-49). Boston: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2009). *Belonging: a culture of place*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Horrocks, A., & Callahan, J. (2006). The role of emotion and narrative in the reciprocal construction of identity. *Human Resource Development International*, 9:1, 69-83., 9(1), 69-83.
- Huerbner, B., & Pleggenkuhle, B. (2015). Residential Location, household composition, and recidivism: An analysis by gender. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(5), 818-844.
- Hurlbert, M., & Greenbert, H. (2011). Restorative justice. In M. Hurlbert, *Pursuing justice* (pp. 272-300). Black Point, NS: Fernwood.
- Hutton, J. (2014, August 08). *Justice Requires Hope*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives - Manitoba:

https://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/Manitoba%20Office/2014/08/Justice_Requires_Hope.pdf

Initiatives for Just Communities. (2017). *A faith-based, charitable organization in Manitoba offering friendship, support and care to those who need it most*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from Initiative for just communities: <http://www.initiativesjc.org/wpblog/>

Jack, G. (2012). Role of place attachment in wellbeing. In S. Atkinson, S. Fuller, & J. Painter, *Wellbeing and place* (pp. 89-104). Surrey, UK: Ashgate.

James, N. (2014). Offender reentry: correctional statistics, reintegration into community, and recidivism. In M. Hiram, *Offender reentry: background, Federal programs and an annotated bibliography* (pp. 1-42). New York, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Jamieson, L., & Simpson, R. (2013). *Living alone: Globalization, identity and belonging*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jensen, K., & Gibbons, S. (2002). Shame and religion as factors in the rehabilitation of serious offenders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 35(3-4), 209-224.

Jeong, H.-W. (2000). *Peace and conflict studies: an introduction*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Jeong, H.-W. (2002). Peacebuilding: Conceptual and policy issues. In H.-W. Jeong, *Approaches to peacebuilding* (pp. 3-17). New York, NY: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Jeong, H.-W. (2005). *Peacebuilding in Postconflict societies: strategy and process*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Jesuitas Social. (2015, July 3). *Communities of hospitality*. Retrieved April 09, 2017, from Jesuitas Social: www.socialjesuitas.es/documentos/download/9-comunidades-de-hospitalidad/17-communities-of-hospitality
- John Howard Society of Ontario. (2007). *The missing link: Discharge planning, incarceration and homelessness*. Toronto: John Howard Society of Ontario.
- Johnson Listwan, S., Sullivan, C., Agnew, R., Cullen, F., & Colvin, M. (2013). The pains of imprisonment revisited: The impact of strain in inmate recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(1), 144-168.
- Johnson, B. (2004). Religious programs and recidivism among former inmates in Prison Fellowship programs. *Justice Quarterly*, 21, 2, ., 21(2), 329-354.
- Johnstone, G. (2011). *Restorative justice: Ideas, values, debates*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Jorgensen, D. L. (1989). *Participant observation: A methodology for human sciences*. London, UK.: Sage publications.
- Joshi, K., & Billick, S. B. (2017). Biopsychosocial causes of suicide and suicide prevention outcome studies in juvenile detention facilities: A review. *Psychiatric Quarterly*, 88, 141–153.
- Karmen, A. (2000). Poverty, crime and criminal justice. In W. C. Heffernan, & J. Kleining, *From social justice to criminal justice: Poverty and the administration of criminal law*. (pp. 25-46). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kateb, G. (1993). Exile alienation and estrangement panel: Introduction. In A. Mack, *Home: a place in the world* (pp. 137-138). New York: New York University Press.

- Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (2007). *Participatory Action Research Approaches and Methods Connecting People, Participation and Place*. Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Kinsman, G., Buse, D., & Steedman, M. (2000). *Whose national security? Canadian state surveillance and the creation of enemies*. Toronto, ON: Between the Lines.
- Klenowsky, P. (2009). Peacemaking criminology: etiology of crime or philosophy of life? *Contemporary Justice Review*, 12(2), 207-222.
- Korostelina, K. (2007). *Social identity and conflict: Structures, dynamics, and implications*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Koschmann, M., & Peterson, B. (2013). Rethinking recidivism: A communication approach from prisoner reentry. *Journal of Applied Social Science*, 7(2), 188-207.
- Krigman, Y. (2010). The role of community development in affordable housing. *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law*, 19(2), 231-253.
- Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies. (2017). *Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies*. Retrieved July 06, 2017, from Strategic Peacebuilding Pathways: <http://kroc.nd.edu/alumni/strategic-peacebuilding-pathways/>
- Kuntz, A. (2010). The politics of space in qualitative research. In M. Savin-Baden, & C. Novel Major, *New approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 145-153). London and New York: Routledge.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of Qualitative research interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lages Ribeiro, F., & de Souza Minayo, M. C. (2013). *The role of religion in the promotion of health, in the prevention of violence and in the rehabilitation of individuals involved in criminal activity: Literature review*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: Centro Latino-Americano de Estudos de Violência e Saúde Jorge Carelli, Escola Nacional de Saúde Pública Fundação Oswaldo Cruz.

Lauer, Q. (1965). *Phenomenology: Its Genesis and Prospect*. New York: Harper & Row.

LeBaron, M. (2003). *Bridging Cultural Conflicts: a New Approach for a Changing World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies*. Washington, DC: USIP.

Lederach, J. P. (1995). *Preparing for peace*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (2005). *The moral imagination: The art and soul of building peace*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J. P. (2015). Chapter 21: Spirituality and religious peacebuilding. In A. Omer, S. Appleby, & D. Little, *The Oxford handbook of religion, conflict and peacebuilding* (pp. 541-568). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lederach, J. P., & Mansfield, K. (2010). *Strategic peacebuilding paths*. Retrieved July 06, 2017, from Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies: <https://kroc.nd.edu/assets/231045/>

Leung, H. H. (2018). Introduction: home, community and identity. In R. Compton, H. H. Leung, & Y. Robles, *Dynamic of community formation: Developing identity and notions of home* (pp. 3-12). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Levasseur, K. (2015). Unearthing the hidden gems of registered charities and their participation in the 2011 Manitoba election. In A. Rounce, & J. Wesley, *Disengaged?: Fixed date, democracy, and understanding the 2011 Manitoba election* (pp. 271-299). Regina: University of Regina Press.
- Leverentz, A. (2011). Barriers to reintegration. In L. Gideon, & H.-E. Sung, *Rethinking corrections: Rehabilitation, reentry and reintegration* (pp. 359-381). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Levine, D. (2010). Rule of law, power distribution, and the problem of faction in conflict interventions. In M. Sellers, & T. Tomaszewski, *The rule of law in comparative perspective* (pp. 147-175). New York, NY: Springer.
- Lewis, M., & Staehler, T. (2010). *Phenomenology: An Introduction*. New York: Continuum.
- Liebmann, M. (2007). *Restorative justice: How it works*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Lion, O. (2016, November 30). Interview #19. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Lovell, N. (1998). Introduction: Belonging in the need of emplacement. In N. Lovell, *Locality and belonging* (pp. 1-24). London: Routledge.
- Mac Ginty, R. (2006). *No war, no peace: The rejuvenation of stalled peace processes and peace accords*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mac Ginty, R. (2012). Hybrid reconstruction: The case of Waad in Lebanon Authonomy. In O. P. Richmond, & A. Mitchell, *Hybrid forms of peace: From everyday agency to post-liberalism* (pp. 208-225). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mac Ginty, R., & Williams, A. (2009). *Conflict and development*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mac Ginty, R. (2013). Introduction. In R. MacGinty, *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding* (pp. 1-8). London and New York: Taylor Francis Group.

Mac Ginty, R. (2013). *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*. London and New York: Taylor Francis Group.

Mac Ginty, R. (2015). Where is the local? Critical localism and peacebuilding. *Third World Quarterly* 36(5): 840-856.

Mack, A. (1993). *Home: A place in the world*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

MacKinnon, S. (2017, July 11). Low-income housing progress impeded by poor policy choices. *Winnipeg Free Press*, p. A7.

MaDonna Rose, M. (2006). *Doing time on the outside: deconstructing the benevolent community*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto.

Maes Nino, C., Godoy, M., McCullough, S., Retzlaff, B., Wiebe, A., & Wurcherer, L. (2016). *The Winnipeg street census 2015: Final report*. Winnipeg: Social Planning Council of Winnipeg.

Mallet, S. (2004). Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. *The Sociological Review*, 62-89.

Maltz, M. D. (1984). *Recidivism*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

- Manitoba Justice. (2017, February 23). *Manitoba Justice*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from Recidivism Indicators:
https://www.gov.mb.ca/justice/manitoba_corrections/recidivism.html
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers in prison reform. *The Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- Martire, K. (2010). An examination of the implications of financial strain for Forensic Psychology. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 10, 159-176.
- Matthews, R. (2006). Reintegrative shaming and restorative justice: reconciliation or divorce? In I. Aertsen, Daems, Tom, Roberts, & Luc, *Institutionalizing restorative justice* (pp. 237-260). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.
- Maxwell, J. (2006). *Strategies for social justice*. Ottawa, ON: Community Foundation Canada.
- Mc Evoy, K., & Newburn, T. (2003). *Criminology, conflict resolution and restorative justice*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McNeill, F. (2012, February). Counterblast: A Copernican correction for community sentences? *The Howard Journal*, 51(1), 94-99.
- McNeill, F. (2012). Four forms of 'offender' rehabilitation: Towards an interdisciplinary perspective. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 1-19.
- McNiel, D., Binder, R., & Robinson, J. (2005). Incarceration associated with homelessness, mental disorder, and co-occurring substance abuse. *Psychiatric services*, 56(7), 840-846.

- Mead, S., Hilton, D., & Curtis, L. (2001). Peer Support: A theoretical perspective. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 5(2), 134-141.
- Meijering, L., Huigen, P., & Van Hoven, B. (2007). Intentional communities in rural spaces. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98(1), 42-52.
- Meisenbach, R. (2014). Stigmatization, Coping with. In T. Thompson, *Encyclopedia of Health Communication* (pp. 1337-1338). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Mobley, A. (2005). From "weeds" to "seeds": A commentary. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 29(1), 97-107.
- Monahan, P. J. (2006). *Constitutional law*. Toronto, ON: Irwin Law.
- Montemaggi, F. (2013). Shopping of a church? Choice and commitment in religious behaviour. In F. Gauthier, & T. Martikainen, *Religion in consumer society: Brands, consumers and markets* (pp. 109-126). Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Moore, K., Stuewig, J., & Tangney, J. (2013). Jail Inmates' Perceived and Anticipated Stigma: Implications for Post-release Functioning. *Self and Identity*, 12(5), 527-547.
- Moose, E.-o. (2016, July 16). Interview #8. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Moses, M. (2012, August/September). Ex-offender job placement programs do not reduce recidivism. *Corrections Today*, 106-108.
- Mounier, E. (1952). *Personalism*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.
- Mowen, T., & Visser, C. (2015). Drug use and crime after incarceration: The Role of family support and family conflict. *Justice Quarterly*, 32(2), 337-359.

- Muhlnickel, R. (2010). The vulnerability book and the peacemaking virtues. In A. Fitz-Gibbon, *Positive peace: Reflections on peace, education, nonviolence and social change* (pp. 13-22). Amsterdam - New York: Rodopi.
- Mungan, M. (2017). The certainty versus the severity of punishment, repeat offenders, and stigmatization. *Economics Letters* 150, 150, 126-129.
- Munn, M., & Bruckert, C. (2013). *On the Outside: From lengthy imprisonment to lasting freedom*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Murphy, D., Fuleihan, B., Richards, S., & Jones, R. (2011). The electronic “scarlet letter”: Criminal backgrounding and a perpetual spoiled identity. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 50, 101-108.
- Murray, H. (1990). *Do not neglect hospitality: The Catholic Worker and the homeless*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- National Parole Board. (1994). *Parole: balancing public safety and personal responsibility*. Ottawa: National Parole Board.
- Nelissen, P. (1998). The re-integration process from the perspective of prisoners: Opinions, perceived value and participation. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 6, 211–234.
- Nouwens, T., Motiuk, L., & Boe, R. (2015, March 05). *So you want to know the recidivism rate*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from Forum on Corrections Research: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/forum/e053/e053h-eng.shtml>

- O'Connor, T. (2002). Introduction. Religion-offenders-rehabilitation: Questioning the relationship. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 35(3-4), 1-9.
- Olden, P. (2008). Spirituality in health care. In J. Biberman, & L. Tischler, *Spirituality in business: Theory, practice, and future directions* (pp. 73-88). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olfa Mandhouj, O., Aubin, H.-J., Amirouche, A., Perroud, N., & Huguelet, P. (2014). Spirituality and religion among French prisoners: An effective coping resource? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 58(7), 821-834.
- Orrick, E., Worrall, J., Morris, R., Piquero, A., Bales, W., & Wang, X. (2011). Testing social support theory: A multilevel analysis of recidivism. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 499-508.
- Otter, E.-o. (2016, May 02). Interview #1. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Paffenholz, T. (2010). Conclusion. In T. Paffenholz, *Civil society & peacebuilding: A critical assessment* (pp. 425-430). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Paffenholz, T. (2013). Civil society. In R. MacGinty, *Routledge handbook of peacebuilding* (pp. 347-359). London & New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Palmary, I., Clacherty, G., Núñez, L., & Ndlovu, D. (2015). Remembering, healing, and telling: Community-initiated approaches to trauma care in South Africa. In B. Hamber, & E. Gallagher, *Psychosocial perspectives on peacebuilding* (pp. 187-222). London, UK: Springer.

Panther, E.-o. (2016, May 10). Interview #3. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Peloquin, C. (2003). *Next Step: Peer support program for released offenders*. Winnipeg: Sisters of the Holy Names.

Peloquin, C. (2009). *Quixote House. Report on its first year: January-December 2008*. Winnipeg: SHNJM.

Peloquin, C. (2009). *Quixote House: A Work in Progress (January, 2008-)*. Winnipeg: Sisters of the Holy Names.

Peloquin, C. (2010). *Next Step Pastoral Plan 2009-2010*. Winnipeg: Sisters of Holy Names.

Peloquin, C. (2015). *Future Hope Board granted charitable status: An update*. Winnipeg: SHNJM.

Peloquin, C. (2016, June 2). Interview #7. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Perkins, H., & Thorns, D. (2012). *Place, identity & everyday life in a globalizing world*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Petersilia, J. (2009). *When prisoners come home: parole and prisoner reentry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pineda, A. M. (2012). Chapter 20: Hospitality. In M. Palmer, & S. Burgess, *The Willey-Blackwell companion to religion and social justice* (pp. 306-318). West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Pink, S. (2012). *Situating everyday life: Practices and places*. London, UK: SAGE.

- Pink, S., Mackley, K., & Morosanu, R. (2015). Hanging out at home: laundry as a thread and texture of everyday life. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 18(2), 209–224.
- Power, M. (2007a). *From Ecumenism to Community Relations: Inter-Church Relationships in Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.
- Power, M. (2007b). Getting to know 'the other': Inter-church groups and peacebuilding in Northern Ireland. In M. Elliot, *The long road to peace in Northern Ireland* (pp. 192-206). Liverpool, UK: Liverpool University Press.
- Pranis, K., Stuart, B., & Wedge, M. (2003). *Peacemaking circles: From crime to community*. St Paul, MN: Living Justice Press.
- Presbey, G. (2014). Dorothy Day's pursue of peace through word and action. In G. Presbey, & G. Moses, *Peace philosophy and public life : Commitments, crises, and concepts for engaged thinking* (pp. 17-40). Amsterdam: Brill Academic Publishers.
- Prior, L. (1993). *The social organization of mental illness*. London, UK: SAGE publications.
- Public Safety Canada. (2015, November 26). *Frequently asked questions about the release of offenders*. Retrieved March 24, 2018, from Release of offenders:
www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/cntrng-crm/crrctns/protctn-gnst-hgh-rsk-ffndrs/faq-en.aspx
- Public Safety Canada. (2016, 04 21). *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved February 22, 2017, from 2015 Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview:
<https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/ccrso-2015/index-en.aspx>

Public Service Foundation of Canada. (2015). *Crisis in correctional services: Overcrowding and inmates with mental health problems in provincial correctional facilities*. Winnipeg:

Public Service Foundation of Canada.

Rabbit, E.-o. (2016, May 31). Interview #5. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Ram, E.-o. (2016, October 4). Interview #10. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)

Reimer, L., Schmitz, C., Janke, E., Askerov, A. S., & Matyók, T. (2015). *Transformative change: An introduction to peace and conflict studies*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Richmond, O. P., & Mitchell, A. (2012). *Hybrid forms of peace: From everyday agency to post-liberalism*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Riso, D. R. (1990). *Understanding the Enneagram*. Boston, MS: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Roach, K. (2006). The institutionalization of restorative justice in Canada: effective reform or limited and limiting add-on? In I. Aertsen, T. Daems, & L. Robert, *Institutionalizing restorative justice* (pp. 167-193). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Roberts, M., & Stacer, M. (2016). In their own words: Offenders' perspectives on their participation in a faith-based diversion and reentry program. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 55(7), 466-483.

Robinson, G., & Shapland, J. (2008). Reducing recidivism: A task for restorative justice? *Brit. J. Criminol.*, 48, 337-358.

Rodgers, S., & McIntyre, S. (2010). *The Supreme Court of Canada and social justice: Commitment, retrenchment or retreat*. Markham, ON: LexisNexis.

- Rogers, C. (1940 [1992]). The Process of Therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60(2), 163-164.
- Rosemberg, M. (2003). *Non violent communication: A language of life*. Encinitas, CA: Puddle Dancer Press.
- Ross, I., & Richards, S. (2009). *Beyond Bars: Rejoining society after prison*. New York, NY: Alpha.
- Ross, R. R., & Fabiano, E. A. (1983). *The cognitive model of crime and delinquency prevention and rehabilitation*. Toronto, ON: Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Russell, S. (1992). The new outlawry and Foucault's panoptic nightmare. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, XVII(1), 39-50.
- Rykwert, J. (1991). House and home. *Social Research*, 58(1), 51-62.
- Sarup, M. (2005). Home and identity. In G. Robertson, M. Mash, L. Tickner, J. Bird, B. Curtis, & T. Putnam, *Travellers' tales: Narratives of home and displacement* (pp. 89-101). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Saskatoon Housing Initiatives Partnership and Saskatchewan Association for Community Living. (2000). *Housing persons with an intellectual disability in intentional communities: Identifying relevant physical and governance structures*. Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation: Ottawa, ON.
- Scheff, T. (2006). *Goffman unbound! A new paradigm for social science*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Schirch, L. (2005). *Ritual and symbol in peacebuilding*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Scicluna, R. (2017). *Home and sexuality: the other side of the kitchen*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sellers, M. (2010). An introduction to the rule of law in comparative perspective. In M. Sellers, & Tomaszewski, *The rule of law in comparative perspective* (pp. 1-9). New York, NY: Springer.

Senehi, J. (2009). Building peace: Storytelling to transform conflict constructively. In D. Sandole, S. Byrne, I. Starosta-Sandole, & J. Senehi, *Handbook of conflict analysis and resolution* (pp. 199-212). Oxford: Routledge.

Senehi, J. (2015). Our tree of life in the field: Locating ourselves in the Peace and Conflict studies field through the tree of life experience. *Peace Research*, 27(1-2), 10-28.

Shapland, J. (2008). Contested ideas of community and justice. In J. Shapland, *Justice, community and civil society: A contested terrain* (pp. 1-29). Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Sherif, M. (1958). Superordinate goals in the reduction of intergroup conflict. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(4), 349-356.

Shinkfield, A., & Graffam, J. (2009, February). Community reintegration of ex-prisoners: Type and degree of change in variables influencing successful reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 53(1), 29-42.

- Skubak, M., & Vose, B. (2011). Social ecology, individual risk, and recidivism: A multilevel examination of main and moderating influences. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 452-459.
- Smith, L. (1994). *Intimacy & mission: intentional community as crucible for radical discipleship*. Scottdale, PA.: Herald Press.
- Soto Parra, E. (2016, September 12). Journal. *Quixote House*. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada: not published.
- Sousa, C., Kemp, S., & El-Zuhairi, M. (2014). Dwelling within political violence: Palestinian women's narratives of home, mental health and resilience. *Health & Place*, 30, 205-214.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2014). Critical narrative analysis: the interplay of critical discourse and narrative analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Educacion*, 27(2), 159-180.
- Soyer, M. (2016). *A dream denied : Incarceration, recidivism, and young minority men in America*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- SpearIt. (2012). Chapter 32: Gang intervention in the United States: Legal and extra-legal attempt at peacemaking. In S. Allen Nan, Z. Cherian Mampilly, & A. Bartoli, *Peacemaking: From practice to theory. Volume two*. (pp. 511-528). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Squirrel. (2016, November 12). Interview #12. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer).
- Steward, F. (2013, May). Intentional communities: A spark to spread renewal across the church. *Presbyterian Record*, 137(5), p. 33.

- Street, T. G. (1967). *Canada's parole system : Brochure on parole for judges, magistrates, police and parole supervisors*. Ottawa: National Parole Board.
- Strickland, R. (2004). *Restorative justice*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Sullivan, D., & Tifft, L. (2005). *Restorative justice: Healing the foundations of our everyday life*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press.
- Swan, M. (2012, November 8). *Axing chaplains put prisoners at risk*. Retrieved April 03, 2017, from The Catholic Register: <http://www.catholicregister.org/item/15378-axing-chaplains-puts-prisoners-at-risk>
- Swanson, C. (2009). *Restorative justice in a prison community: Or everything I didn't learn in kindergarten I learned in prison*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
- Tanasichuk, C., & Wormith, S. (2012). Changing attitudes toward the criminal system: Results of an experiemental study. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 54(4), 415-441.
- The Correctional Investigator Canada. (2016). *Annual Report of the Office of the Correctional Investigator 2015-2016*. Ottawa: The Correctional Investigator Canada.
- The John Howard Society. (2013). *Welcome to the John Howard Society of Manitoba*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from John Howard: <http://www.johnhoward.mb.ca/wp/>
- The John Howard Society of Manitoba. (2016, Octobre 21). *Through the bars: A guide for visiting at correctional facilities in Manitoba*. Retrieved February 23, 2017, from The John Howard Society of Manitoba: <http://www.johnhoward.mb.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/ThroughTheBars-JHSManitoba-VisitorsGuide-Nov21-16.pdf>

- Tica, G., & Roth, M. (2012). Are former male inmates excluded from social life? *European Journal of Probation*, 4(2), 62 – 76.
- Tiger, E.-o. (2016, December 2). Interview #18. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Tillyer, M., & Vose, B. (2011). Social ecology, individual risk, and recidivism: A multilevel examination of main and moderating influences. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 452-459.
- Troshynski, E., & Magnus, A. (2014). Institutionalization. In B. Arrigo, *Encyclopedia of criminal justice ethics* (pp. 480-482). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- U.S. Department of Homeland Security. (2014, October 21). *Official website of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security*. Retrieved February 11, 2015, from Creation of the Department of Homeland security: <http://www.dhs.gov/creation-department-homeland-security#>
- Veysey, B., Christian, J., & Martinez, D. (2009). *How offenders transform their lives*. Portland, OR: Willlan Publishing.
- Visher, Chirsty; La Vigne, Nancy; Travis, Jeremy. (2004). *Returning home: Understanding the challenges of prisoner reentry: Maryland pilot study: Findings from Baltimore*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute: Justice Policy Center.
- Volkan, V. (2001). Transgenerational transmissions and chosen traumas: An aspect of large-group identity. *Group Analysis*, 34(1), 79-97.
- Wacquant, L. (2010). Prisoner re-entry as myth and ceremony. *Dialect anthropol*, 34, 605-620.

- Wadd, T., & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: Beyond the risk paradigm*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Walker, L., Pann, J., Shapiro, D., & Van Hasselt, V. (2016). *Best practices for the mentally ill in the criminal justice system*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Wang, X., Hay, C., Todak, N. E., & Bales, W. (2014). Criminal propensity, social context, and recidivism: A multilevel analysis of interactive relationships. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(3), 300-317.
- Ward, T. (2011). Human rights and dignity in offender rehabilitation. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, 11(2-3), 103-123.
- Wehrman, M. (2010). Race, concentrated disadvantage, and recidivism: A test of interaction effects. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 538-544.
- Weinrath, M., Donatelli, G., & Murchison, M. (2016, July). Mentorship: A missing piece to manage juvenile intensive supervision programs and youth gangs. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 58(3), 291-321.
- Weir, A. (2008). Home and identity: In memory of Iris Marion Young. *Hypatia*, 23(3), 4-21.
- Wesela, K. (2011). *What really helps: Using mindfulness & compassionate presence to help, support, and encourage others*. Boston, MS: Shambala.
- White, A. (2010). Rewriting narratives: In the new South Africa: A story of reconciliation. In C. Sampson, M. Abu-Nimer, C. Liebler, & D. Whitney, *Positive approaches to peacebuilding: A resource for innovators* (pp. 269-285). Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.

- Whitehead, P. (2011). Faith moves mountains and sometimes reduces recidivism: Community chaplaincy and criminal justice re-formation in England and Wales. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 9(3), 27-40.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing.
- Winnick, T., & Bodkin, M. (2008). Anticipated stigma and stigma management among those to be labeled 'ex-con'. *Deviant behavior*, 29(4), 295-333.
- Winnipeg Housing Rehabilitation Corporation. (2008). *Tenant information package*. Winnipeg: WHRC.
- Winslade, W. (2006). Afterword. In V. Frankl, *Man's search for meaning* (pp. 155-165). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Wolf, E.-o. (2016, August 25). Interview # 9. (E. Soto Parra, Interviewer)
- Wright, G. (1993). Prescribing the model home. In A. Mack, *Home: a place in the world* (pp. 213-223). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Young, M. (2014). Sleeping rough and shooting up: Taking British Columbia urban issues to court. In M. Jackman, & B. Porter, *Advancing social rights in Canada* (pp. 413-441). Toronto, ON: Irwin Law.
- Yuill, C., Crinson, I., & Duncan, E. (2011). *Institutionalization*. Retrieved June 23, 2017, from SAGE key concepts: Key concepts in health studies:
<http://search.credoreference.com.uml.idm.oclc.org/content/entry/sageukkcheal/institutionalization/0>

Zehr, H. (2002). *The little book of restorative justice* . Intercourse, PA: Good books.

Zimbardo, P. (2007, March 30). Revisiting the Stanford Prison Experiment: a lesson in the power of situation. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(30), pp. 1-2.

Zinger, I. (2012). Conditional Release and Human Rights in Canada:A commentary. *Canadian Journal of Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 54, 117-135.

Illustrations:**Illustration 1: Indoor photos of Quixote House**

Illustration 2: Outdoor photos of Quixote House

