

Denver Law Review

Volume 66
Issue 3 *Symposium - Dispute Resolution*

Article 2

February 2021

Errata

Denver University Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.du.edu/dlr>

Recommended Citation

Denver University Law Review, Errata, 66 Denv. U. L. Rev. (1989).

This Errata is brought to you for free and open access by the Denver Law Review at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Denver Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu, dig-commons@du.edu.

ERRATA

In the article by Prof. Robert A. Baruch Bush, *Defining Quality in Dispute Resolution: Taxonomies and Anti-Taxonomies of Quality Arguments*, 66 DEN. U.L. REV. 335 (1989), please affix this page over the portion of Table I appearing on page 349.

TABLE I

QUALITY STATEMENTS AND QUALITY STANDARDS

(Statements defining quality [sub-objectives], grouped according to general definitional categories [standards])*

"Dispute resolution processes or outcomes attain quality when . . . "

A. (INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION)

1. . . . the process is expeditious.
2. . . . both parties are satisfied with the process and outcome.
3. . . . both parties feel fully heard.
4. . . . both parties feel the outcome was not unduly favorable to the other side.
5. . . . trial in court is avoided. (I)
6. . . . the parties participate directly. (I)
7. . . . creative outcomes are possible and are actually attained. (I)
8. . . . the dispute is resolved finally and comprehensively.
9. . . . the parties comply with the resolution. (I)
10. . . . the parties have the choice whether to participate. (I)
11. . . . the process has a positive impact on the parties' relationship.
12. . . . the outcome meets the parties' needs, subjectively defined.
13. . . . the outcome does not depend on technicalities. (I)

(See also: INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY 3; SOCIAL CONTROL 2, 3; SOCIAL JUSTICE 22)

B. (INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY)

1. . . . the process educates the parties in dispute resolution skills.
2. . . . the process or outcome empowers the individual.
3. . . . the parties exercise control over the process or outcome.

(See also: INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION 6, 10; SOCIAL JUSTICE 19)

C. (SOCIAL CONTROL)

1. . . . the process or outcome reduces social conflict.
2. . . . the outcome serves dominant political interests. (I)
3. . . . the process diverts cases from court so that due process in court can be provided to certain cases. (I)

(See also: INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION 1, 3-5, 8, 9; SOCIAL SOLIDARITY 4, 5)

D. (SOCIAL JUSTICE)

1. . . . the process gives no procedural advantage to either side. (I)
 2. . . . the process neutralizes the advantage of a rich (advantaged) party. (I)
 3. . . . the outcome is not harmful to a poor (disadvantaged) party. (I)
 4. . . . the process assures access on an equal basis to rich and poor. (I)
 5. . . . the outcome produces institutional change.
 6. . . . the outcome favors a poor party, as an individual. (I)
 7. . . . the outcome redistributes goods or power to the poor as a class. (I)
 8. . . . the outcome delegitimizes existing institutions. (I)
 9. . . . the process challenges power relationships. (I)
 10. . . . the process aggregates individual disputes. (I)
 11. . . . the process encourages the surfacing of social conflict. (I)
 12. . . . the process suppresses and avoids prejudice.
 13. . . . the process promotes decent and unprejudiced behavior.
 14. . . . the process stops oppressive behavior.
 15. . . . the process or outcome empowers women or minorities.
 16. . . . the process or outcome validates women's and minority issues.
 17. . . . the process or outcome challenges patriarchal values or structures.
 18. . . . the process mobilizes the poor as a class.
 19. . . . the process avoids extension of state control over individuals. (I)
 20. . . . the outcome is based on legitimate norms. (I)
 21. . . . the outcome is not harmful to the public interest or interests of affected third parties.
 22. . . . injured parties receive compensation quickly. (I)
- (See also: INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION 9, 13; INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY 2; SOCIAL CONTROL 2, 3; SOCIAL SOLIDARITY 1, 4, 5; PERSONAL TRANSFORMATION 1, 4)

E. (SOCIAL SOLIDARITY)

1. . . . the process articulates norms or reasons for the resolution. (I)
 2. . . . the process creates shared narratives or texts.
 3. . . . the process strengthens community.
 4. . . . the outcome is determined by rules of law. (I)
 5. . . . rules of law are created for the future. (I)
- (See also: INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION 11; INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY 1; SOCIAL JUSTICE 7, 10, 18)

F. (PERSONAL TRANSFORMATION)

1. . . . the process stimulates personal growth in the parties.
 2. . . . the process causes the parties to recognize or appreciate the situation of the other party. (I)
 3. . . . the process stimulates the parties to be more honest, open or truthful with the other party (and with themselves). (I)
 4. . . . the process facilitates the expression of emotions. (I)
- (See also: INDIVIDUAL SATISFACTION 11; INDIVIDUAL AUTONOMY 1; SOCIAL JUSTICE 13, 17; SOCIAL SOLIDARITY 3)

ERRATA

In the article by Prof. Robert A. Baruch Bush, *Defining Quality in Dispute Resolution: Taxonomies and Anti-Taxonomies of Quality Arguments*, 66 DEN. U.L. REV. 335 (1989), please affix this insert over the last paragraph appearing on page 356.

Therefore, I reject that taxonomy and the underlying view that the opinions on quality expressed at this workshop can do no more than reveal political positions. Rather than subscribing to proposition (2), I adopt a third proposition about defining quality in dispute resolution:

ERRATA

In the article by Prof. Robert A. Baruch Bush, *Defining Quality in Dispute Resolution: Taxonomies and Anti-Taxonomies of Quality Arguments*, 66 DEN. U.L. REV. 335 (1989), please affix this page over the portion of Table I appearing on page 350.



JOHN PHILLIP LINN