

Restorative Justice & Sexual Abuse

Wiping Away the Tears: A Faith Community Responds to Clergy Sexual Abuse in the Roman Catholic Church

by the Albany Catholic Worker Community (Albany, New York)

[Editor's Note: The following is the first of several articles that will focus attention on the use of restorative justice in cases of sexual abuse and assault involving religious figures in the community. This article is a statement of the Catholic Worker Community of Albany, New York that originally was issued at the Feast of St. Monica on August 27, 2002. Contributors to this article include Diana Conroy, Bob Longobucco, Dennis Sullivan, Joan Cooney, Walt Chura, Christopher Ringwald and Fred Boehrer. For further information, contact Fred Boehrer, Emmaus House, 35 N. Main Ave., Albany, NY 12203, (518) 482-4966.]

1 Our church is broken. As people of God, we are saddened and angry that some Roman Catholic clergy have sexually abused teenagers and young children. This abuse has shattered the families, the faith, and the lives of these young people and the church as a whole. We are angry and hurt to learn that in response to these harms many U.S. bishops and their staff gave new assignments to these clergy without requiring adequate rehabilitation, penance, and opportunities for healing for all involved. These new assignments presented opportunities for further abuse. Amid allegations that sexual abuse occurred, many church leaders responded with disbelief, protecting the church's image, blaming the victim, and protecting abusers from the consequences of their behavior. The result is that persons surviving sexual abuse have been victimized twice: first by their abuser and second by their bishops and diocesan leadership. As Roman Catholics committed to the gospel practices of justice, forgiveness, and healing, how are we to respond to such pain?

2 In 2000, the bishops of New York State issued a pastoral statement on restorative justice and the criminal justice system, *Restoring All to the Fullness of Life*. This important document speaks about meeting the needs of persons who have been

harmful, those responsible for the harm, and society at large. Unfortunately, the document does not deal directly with issues of harm or crime that take place within our church. While the bishops call upon Christians to "incorporate restorative practices" in "our homes, schools, communities, and workplaces," noticeably absent from this list is "churches." How might we incorporate the restorative practices of forgiveness and healing in today's broken church?

3 Since we all suffer, we yearn for that moment when "God will wipe away the tears from all faces." (Isaiah 25:8). Through our baptism we are called to be Christ to one another, to manifest the reign of God to others, to help wipe away the tears. We are called to reach out to those persons who have been victimized by clergy, their families, and their parish communities. We are called to voice our concerns to our bishop and diocesan staff. We are also called to minister to those priests who have committed these grave sins. Jesus rejected retribution, instead calling for mercy and healing.

4 Locally, we acknowledge the restorative efforts made by Bishop Howard Hubbard and his staff since June 2002. He visited two parishes in our diocese where priests were assigned after they had sexually abused children and sent diocesan representatives to other parishes. "Town meetings" took place at these parishes. Bishop Hubbard publicly apologized and has invited all persons to write to him about this scandal. A telephone hotline, operated through Catholic

Charities, offers counseling for persons impacted by clergy sexual abuse. The diocesan Office of Prayer and Worship has offered a beautiful and compelling prayer service for healing. A panel of lay people has been selected to review and implement policy regarding the sexual abuse of children by clergy.

5 But these initial steps must be followed by a long-term view of how best to respond to a crisis that has impacted us gravely. Various proposals have been offered. Some reflect a sincere interest in enabling people to move on with their lives through justice and healing. Others contain agendas that appear to have little concern for alleviating the pain and suffering of the people involved.

6 Clearly, caution must be exercised in responding to the devastating experiences of those young persons sexually abused by priests. At one end of the spectrum, some have become blinded by a desire for revenge. At the other, some have publicly defended their pastors with such passion that they have shown little or no compassion to those who have survived the sexual molestation. Some have even denied the sexual abuse which their pastors have admitted committing. As Christians, we are called to love one another. To help wipe away the tears, we must embrace those persons who have been abused as well as reach out to those priests who are responsible, who are still part of our broken body of Christ. What expressions of

Wiping Away the Tears
continues on page 6

In This Issue

Wiping Away the Tears	1
Critical Issues in Restorative Justice	3
Restorative Justice: Expanding our Approach	5
Resources	7
Canadian Conference Report	8
Funding Restorative Justice	9
Book Review: Dignity Denied	10

VOMA Connections

VOMA Connections is published three to four times a year by the International Victim Offender Mediation Association.

The Mission of VOMA is Promoting and enhancing restorative justice dialogue, principles, and practices. Our mission will be achieved only with a commitment to full diversity and equality of participation for all people. VOMA holds this commitment as central in its work.

VOMA welcomes contributions, including short articles, literature reviews, case studies, program news, and other interesting information. Photos and graphics are Also welcome.

Please send submissions to
Editor Russ Immarigeon
 563 Route 21, Hillsdale, NY, 12529
 Phone: 518/325-5925
 E-mail: russimmarigeon@taconic.net

VOMA Connections

Russ Immarigeon, Editor

Publications Workgroup

Jan Bellard, Bobbie Boland,
 Thomas W. Olson, Barbara Raye,
 Ann Warner Roberts,
 Duane Ruth-Heffelbower (Webmaster)

Views expressed within VOMA Connections are those of the authors and not necessarily those of VOMA.

Publishing Schedule

Issue	Submissions Deadline
#13 February, 2003	January 15
#14 May, 2003	April 15
#15 August, 2003	July 15

Victim Offender Mediation Association

c/o Center for Policy, Planning,
 and Performance
 2344 Nicollet Avenue South, Suite 330
 Minneapolis, MN 55404 USA
 612/874-0570 Fax 612/874-0253
voma@voma.org
www.voma.org

Administrators
 Barbara Raye and Claire Harris

2002 VOMA Board of Directors

Lorraine Stutzman Amstutz, Secretary
 MCC Office of Crime and Justice
 21 South 12th St/PO Box 500
 Akron, PA 17501 USA
 717/859-3889
LSA@mcc.org

Jan Bellard
 PO Box 5
 Wentworth, NC 27375 USA
 336/951-3048
jbellard@vnet.net

Bobbie Boland
 270 Indian Meal Line
 Torbay, Newfoundland, Canada A1K 1B4
 709/437-5760
bobbieb@morgan.ucc.mun.ca

Hans Boserup
 Sekretariat, Dansk Forligsaevn
 Sundsmarkvej 20
 6400 Sonderborg, Denmark
 74 42 36 05 Fax 74 43 44 42
hb@bhc.dk

Dave Doerfler
 Concentric Journeys
 106 South Lake Hills Drive
 Austin, TX 78733 USA
 512/263-7442
safeplace49@aol.com

Kathy Elton, Treasurer
 Alternative Dispute Resolution Program
 Administration Offices of the Court
 PO Box 140241
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0241 USA
 801/578-3982 Fax 801/578-3843
kathy@e-mail.utcourts.gov

Bruce Kittle
 Iowa Peace Institute
 1846 Willow Boulevard
 Lockridge, IA 52635-8009 USA
 Office 641/990-4899
 Home/Fax 319/696-0914
bakittle@lisco.com

Dale Landry
 1940 Nanticoke Circle
 Tallahassee, FL 32303 USA
 850/553-4393 Fax 850/531-9602
drlandry11@earthlink.net

Doris Luther
 PO Box 297
 Hollis Center, ME 04042 USA
 Tel/Fax 207/727-4735
dluther@sacoriver.net

Martin McAnallen
 Probation Board for Northern Ireland
 26 Fort Road, Ballylesson
 Belfast, BT8 8LX Northern Ireland
 028-91817778 Fax 028-91818905
martin.tookie@btinternet.com

Shadell Permanand, Membership
 Conflict Mediation Services of Downsview
 95 Eddystone Avenue, 2nd Floor
 Toronto, Ontario, Canada M3N 1H6
 416/740-2522 Fax 416/747-7415
spermanand@cmsd.org

Jane Riese
 Family - Child Resources, Inc.
 3995 East Market Street
 York, PA 17402-2621
 717/757-1227 Fax 717/757-1353
jriese@f-cr.com

Ann Warner Roberts
 Center for Restorative Justice & Peacemaking
 University of Minnesota
 1406 Palace Avenue
 St. Paul, MN 55105 USA
 651/699-4532 Fax 651/699-5998
aroberts@umn.edu

Walter Drew Smith, Co-Chair
 565 Rutherford Avenue
 Trenton, NJ 08618 USA
 609/943-5456 Fax 609/943-5461
smitwds@aol.com

Sue Wiese, Co-Chair
 Coulee Region Mediation & RJ, Ltd.
 400 North 4th Street, Suite B01
 LaCrosse, WI 54601 USA
 608/784-7322 Fax 608/784-5910
swiese@centurytel.net

Welcome to New Members

Individual

Jenny Besch, Yonkers, NY
 Carol Chichester, Goshen, NY
 Melissa Crabbe, Philadelphia, PA
 Susan Dietrich, Missoula, MT
 Mary Freeman, Shelburne, VT
 Mary Hersey, Farmington, NH
 James Hukari, Carson City, NV
 Brenda LeClair, Langley, BC
 Joe Massey, Atlanta, GA
 Yolana Morales, Las Vegas, NV
 Kerry O'Donnell, Pittsburgh, PA
 Kathy O'Neal, Stockbridge, GA
 Brad Thrasher, Livingston, TN
 Stephen Ray, Tallahassee, FL
 Monica Rickenberg, Yonkers, NY
 Vicki Sanderford-O'Connor, Fair Oaks, CA

David Saunier, Charlottesville, VA
 Joyce Sawyer, Akron, OH
 Kathy Vaughan, Staten Island, NY
 Connie White, Salinas, CA

Student

Marinetta Hjort, McLean, VA
 John Manelos, Kennesaw, GA
 Carol Pulskamp, Sutter Creek, CA
 Lisa Singh, Beaver Creek, OH

Agency

Amy Dowell, Citizens for Community Justice Inc, Bloomington, IN
 Peter Keeley, Victim Offender Mediation Service, Dublin, Ireland
 Neil Nunamaker, Worth Township Youth Service Bureau, Alsip, IL

Critical Issues in Restorative Justice: An Inadequate and Overlapping Outline

by Howard Zehr

Howard Zehr writes: "This outline is a work in progress, part of a larger project. It is intended both to guide my thinking and to provide a framework for dialogue in the field. Barb Toews of the Pennsylvania Prison Society and I are working on an edited volume on critical issues in the field of restorative justice that will be published by Criminal Justice Press. As part of this project, I will be participating in palavers or consultations on critical issues in South Africa, England and New Zealand throughout the rest of this year. Subject to grant funding for which we have applied, we hope to hold or at least encourage a number of palavers and discussions on this within North America over the next year. There is a growing body of monographs on these issues. Gerry Johnstone's *Restorative Justice: Ideas, Values, Debates* (Willan Publishing, 2002) provides a succinct overview and evaluation of many of these issues. My thanks to Warwick Tie, Lorraine Stutzman Amstutz, Barb Toews and Vernon Jantzi for their suggestions about these issues."

Principles and concept

- Should we agree upon a definition or at least essential elements? Can we? How restrictive should it be?
- Can we establish benchmarks of restorative practice?
- To what extent is real-world restorative justice straying (being co-opted) from its principles?
- Can we articulate more clearly the values underlying restorative justice principles? How can discussions of restorative justice clarify or advance these values?
- To what extent is restorative justice biased by culture, gender, class?
- Who should define principles, values, benchmarks? Is the present circle of dialogue and leadership sufficiently diverse and representative?

Victim issues

- Is restorative justice living up to its promise to or for victims?
- To what extent is the victim focus of restorative justice theory being co-opted by offender or community concerns?
- What are the impressions and perceptions of restorative justice among victim service providers and what can be done to increase understanding and collaboration?
- What is the relevance and meaning of "putting right" and reparation in serious cases such as homicide?
- Should and can efforts to promote healing and to provide symbolic reparation fully take the place of punishment or retribution for victims?
- If justice is to be victim-oriented, how do we respond to victims who demand vengeance or retribution? Is there a ten-

dency for practitioners to distinguish between "good" and "bad" victims?

Offender issues

- What are offenders' perceptions and impressions of restorative justice? Has restorative justice listened to, has it been formulated so it can speak to, offender perspectives, concerns and worldviews?
- Is treatment or rehabilitation part of restorative justice? If so, what does this treatment look like in such a context?
- Is restorative justice adequately addressing prevention issues?
- Is restorative justice adequately addressing the needs of offenders?
- What, if any, place does punishment have in restorative justice?
- Is restorative justice adequately (or too) concerned about the overuse of prisons? To what extent is restorative justice (or should it be) an alternative to prison? To what extent could/should it provide a vision for transforming prisons?
- What forms can restorative justice take within prison? Could/should there be a restorative approach to imprisonment?
- What are the possibilities and dangers of shame theory as applied to offenders?
- What are offender advocates' understandings of restorative justice, and what are the implications of this?

Community issues

- How should community be defined in theory and practice?
- What is the place and role of community in theory and in practice?
- When should community needs take precedence over individual needs (e.g. of victim and offender)? How is this to be decided and safeguarded? What are the dangers?
- What dangers does community involvement pose in general? What safeguards are needed?
- How can we find an appropriate division between state, societal, community and individual concerns and interests?

Government and system issues

- What should be the relationship between restorative justice and the existing system?
- What should be the state's role?
- What should be the relationship between community-operated and state-operated programs?
- To what extent can/should indigenous and community-based justice processes operate independently of the system, and how can we provide adequate safeguards?
- To what extent should restorative justice be developed within the existing criminal system and the state bureaucracy as opposed to a separate system or "track"? In

the latter case, how can appropriate interfaces and safeguards be provided?

- Is restorative justice relying too heavily on the state-based "retributive" system? Is it providing an adequate challenge? To what extent should restorative justice aim to change the system? What are the possibilities and dangers of this? Will a gradualist strategy be successful?
- To what extent has restorative justice been co-opted and diluted (by the state as well as by other forces) and to what extent is it a problem? Can we do more to identify and counteract those co-opting forces?
- What are the actual and potential unintended consequences of the growing spread of restorative justice? How should they be evaluated and responded to?
- What kind of legislation, if any, is needed or desirable? Should model legislation be developed?
- Is restorative justice adequately addressing human rights and due process issues? Is it too predicated on an assumption of social order and a functioning legal system?
- To what extent can/should restorative justice be institutionalized? (Ivan Illich asks, Can you institutionalize "liberating practice" at all? But can there be real-world restorative justice without some form of institutionalization?)

Practitioner issues

- To what extent should practice be (and has practice been) professionalized, and what are the implications of this?
- How is restorative justice being impacted by the growing trend toward practice as income-generation?
- How can appropriate support and accountability be provided to restorative justice practitioners?
- What impact is restorative justice having on the personal lives of practitioners?
- Is current training adequate for practitioners, and especially in areas such as severe violence?

Indigenous and religious traditions

- When indigenous approaches to justice are part of restorative justice, to what extent has restorative justice stayed true to those traditions? Co-opted them? Been used to maintain separate-but-unequal and/or neo-colonial forms of justice?
- What is the appropriate relationship between state justice and indigenous justice?
- What are indigenous perceptions of and concerns about restorative justice?
- What roots or affinities does restorative justice have in various world religions?

Critical Issues*continued from page 3*

- To what extent is it fair for restorative justice to claim indigenous traditions? To what extent can the latter be fairly be characterized as restorative?

Social justice

- Does restorative justice adequately address causation and prevention issues in specific cases?
- Should restorative justice be speaking to larger issues of social justice? If so, what does restorative justice have to say – theoretically and practically – to the social structural conditions that create harm?
- Is there a “restorative economics?”

Some specific practice issues

- Is restorative justice practice too vested in certain (and rigid) models? Are some models “better” than others?
- Are the dominant forms of facilitation adequately transformative? How can practice be encouraged to be more transformative?
- Is restorative justice practice being adequately evaluated? Are restorative justice practitioners open to and heeding evaluation?
- Is restorative justice as a field offering adequate programming for victims where offenders are unidentified or uncooperative?
- Are processes adequate for genuine victim involvement?
- What are the implications of those models where authority figures serve as facilitators?
- Is restorative justice focusing too much on “lesser” offenses and, relatedly, becoming cautious and avoiding risks? Conversely, is it naively taking on severe or problematic cases?
- Can we establish standards of good practice? Who should do this and how should they be promoted?
- What is the appropriate role of professionals?
- Are conferences providing adequately for the safety of victims and/or offenders?

Some specific co-optation/dilution issues

- Are conferences becoming too settlement and/or restitution-driven (vs. the transformative model of mediation)? Not enough?
- Is restorative justice practice too offender-oriented (not victim-oriented enough)?
- Is restorative justice practice assuming an overall punitive framework?
- Is restorative justice becoming too inflexible and bureaucratic?
- Is the community co-opting the place of victims in some forms of practice?
- To what extent is restorative justice leading to net-widening, and to what extent is that problematic?
- To what extent, and how, is restorative justice being shaped by the self-interests of those promoting restorative justice, e.g. as a source of income?
- New ideas are often diverted by discrepancies in goals and vision between those who lead movements and actual practitioners.

ners. To what extent is that happening in restorative justice?

- Is it possible to realize a needs-oriented approach to justice within a culture characterized by a desserts-based ideology?

“Frontier” (overlapping and somewhat different) applications and issues

- Does restorative justice need to be more deliberate about creating and using rituals in the justice process?
- What application does restorative justice have to large-scale conflicts and wrongdoing?
- What are the dangers and possibilities for restorative justice application in domestic violence?
- What further applications does restorative justice have in non-criminal conflicts and harms such as in schools, homes, churches, organizations?
- What application does restorative justice have to prisoner commutation and release issues?
- How should defense-based victim outreach be further developed? What opportunities and dangers are there in this approach to death penalty cases?

Howard Zehr is Professor of Sociology and Restorative Justice, Conflict Transformation Program, Eastern Mennonite University, Harrisonburg, VA 22802, (540) 432-4492, email: zehrh@emu.edu.

New Book**The Little Book of Restorative Justice**

By Howard Zehr
\$4.95, 80 pages (2002)

Howard Zehr defies logic. Well known within the restorative justice community and elsewhere for his seminal study, **Changing Lenses** (Herald Press, 1990), Zehr might be expected to follow up with a bulky volume that chronicles the acceptance and application of restorative justice principles in new justice system structures. Instead, Zehr has come forth with two beautiful books of photography that picture different aspects of restorative justice, two bookmarks also addressing different aspects of restorative justice, and now, when long-windedness might surely be in order, a short – and affordable – overview of restorative justice.

The brevity of this volume belies its boun-
tifulness.

Zehr opens this fine volume with basic questions, “How should we as a society respond to wrongdoing? When a crime occurs or an injustice is done, what needs to happen? What does justice require?”

These are tall orders that are hard to fulfill, yet they are at the core of what we must think through as we grapple with large-scale events, from the September 11 as-

saults to recent sniper attacks, to events on a more modest scale, such as everyday violent or “non-violent” offenses against people and communities.

A theme of Zehr’s written contributions – and his photographic images too – is that we must focus on basics. As social movements grow, and restorative justice is not exception to this, adherents often stray from the founding images or impulses. In the rush to move forward, it is often difficult to stick to, or even remember, basic principles. Yet this is something that Zehr continually directs our attention to. This is an important service, one we would be foolish to overlook or insufficiently appreciate.

Zehr understands the growth of restorative justice. He writes: “Restorative justice began as an effort to deal with burglary and other property crimes that are usually viewed (often incorrectly) as relatively minor offenses. Today, however, restorative approaches are available in some communities for the most severe forms of criminal violence: death from drunken driving; assault, rape, even murder. Building upon the experience of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa, efforts are also being made to apply a restorative justice framework of mass violence.”

Zehr acknowledges his role of “a founder” of restorative justice, but he also recognizes the importance of other voices on restorative justice. He encourages acknowledgement of these other voices. In this book, however, his aim is repeatedly at basic principles. Wisely he says, “Our past experience with change efforts in the justice arena warns us that sidetracks and diversions inevitably happen in spite of our best intentions. If advocates for change are unwilling to acknowledge and address these likely diversions, their efforts may end up much different than they intended. In fact, ‘improvements’ can turn out to be worse than the conditions that they were designed to reform or replace.”

Within this framework, Zehr examines restorative justice principles and practices. He investigates the tension between retributive and restorative justice approaches, and he focuses on a continuum of restorative justice goals and options that adhere to basic principles of restorative justice. While this volume is designed for newcomers to the field, it remains, despite any pretence otherwise, a valuable resource for long time activists and advocates.

The Little Book of Restorative Justice is the first of a series of volumes in the Good Books “Justice and Peacebuilding” series.

Copies of The Little Book of Restorative Justice and other books by Howard Zehr can be purchased through Good Books, PO Box 419, Intercourse, PA 17534, (800) 762-7171, (website) www.goodbks.com.

Describing Restorative Justice

Restorative Justice: Expanding our Approach

by Catherine Barga

Victims sharing the impact of crime. Young offenders giving back to the community. Community members visiting inmates in prison. These are perhaps some of the predominant images we have of restorative justice. But it doesn't paint the whole picture.

Restorative justice has gained recognition around the world as a philosophy that promotes healing responses to crime. Growing frustration with our current punitive model of criminal justice has sparked an interest in responding to crime in ways that promote the restorative values of respect, safety, honesty, accountability and empowerment. Though the assumptions underlying our court system are still based on retributive ideals of blame and punishment, communities and governments alike are seeking ways to implement restorative justice principles when dealing with crime, victims, and offenders.

Restorative justice applies well to the arena of criminal justice, but is not limited to that arena. The values that inform restorative justice can be applied to all situations of conflict and harm, and one would be hard-pressed to envision areas of life that are immune to conflict and harm. The restorative justice philosophy can be applied to our communities of home, church, workplace, school, and neighbourhood and to our interpersonal relationships. Perhaps a more helpful term than restorative justice would be to use a *restorative approach* to life's conflicts. The accompanying chart demonstrates the close link between the restorative justice principles and situations outside the criminal justice model.

Practical applications of a restorative approach, then, encourage accountability, healing, and understanding in our everyday lives and encounters. Just as responses to crime require a shift in philosophy from punitive to restorative, we also need to shift our thinking about responses to the conflict and relationship tension we experience in our familiar environments. Below are some examples where a *restorative approach* might be applied:

Home

- ♦ Family conflicts and disagreements,
- ♦ Roommate conflicts,
- ♦ Child discipline, or
- ♦ Issues between partners.

Church

- ♦ Church board functioning,
- ♦ Church policy for dealing with conflict,
- ♦ Divisions within the church, or
- ♦ Decision making involving youth, newcomers, or the marginalized.

Principle of Restorative Justice*	Criminal Justice model application	Restorative Approach (Broad application in the context of conflict or disagreement)
Invite full participation and consensus.	Victims, offenders and the community should have a voice in responding to criminal harm, and there should be as much agreement as possible in what the outcome should look like.	All those who feel they have a stake in the conflict should be invited to participate in dialogue around the issues and have a voice in the outcomes or decisions made.
Heal what has been broken.	When a crime is committed, the need for healing inevitably arises. This may take the form of emotional healing (for victims, and for offenders), relationship healing, and/or reparation of property damage.	Things that are said or done during conflict or disagreement can be hurtful. As much as possible, the restorative approach wants to bring those hurts to light and work at healing and reparation.
Seek full and direct accountability.	Offenders need to take responsibility for their own actions and choices. They are given the opportunity to explain their behaviour and fulfill the obligations created from their behaviour directly to the people they have harmed.	Nurture an environment where people are encouraged to take ownership for their own role in escalating a conflict. Respectfully expect people to be accountable for their actions in ways that are fair and reasonable.
Reunite what has been divided.	Victims of crime often experience a sense of isolation from the community, as do offenders. While the reasons for this sense may differ between these two groups, essentially a process that allows for reintegration needs to be sought in the wake of a crime for all that have been affected. Such a process can create a renewed sense of wholeness and closure, as well as a sense of reintegration into the community.	Conflict in our places of interaction can create feelings of isolation and of being an outcast. It can result in individuals taking sides and developing an "us"/"them" mentality. As much as possible, a restorative approach aims to take stock of where divisions have occurred in these communities and work toward understanding and reconciliation.
Strengthen the community to prevent future harms.	A justice process that is restorative will focus not only on the details of the crime at hand, but what the systemic causes of crime are in the community and how they can be addressed. In this way, a healthier and safer community is created for all, not just those wanting to be protected from crime.	Any kind of community can use a conflict to learn, grow and change where necessary. A Restorative Approach can help illuminate where opportunities for positive changes lie in order to make the community a healthier and more enjoyable place for all.

*Principles from Susan Sharpe, *Restorative Justice: A Vision for Healing and Change* (Mediation and Restorative Justice Centre, 1998). For further information, contact www.edmontonmediation.com or call (780) 423-0896.

Work

- ♦ As above, restorative approaches can be applied to board, general policy and decision making,
- ♦ Conflict in the workplace, or
- ♦ Personnel management.

Neighborhood

- ♦ Neighborhood issues, such as barking dogs, parking, property lines, and noise.

School

- ♦ Issues normally handled through suspension and expulsion.
- ♦ Harassment, or
- ♦ Conflicts between students, teachers, and parents.

Interpersonal

- ♦ Day-to-day relationships, especially when disagreement arises.

Ultimately, restorative justice need not inform only one aspect of human interaction. The values and principles on which restorative justice is based are a strong foundation for all arenas of human relationship. A commitment to restorative values helps inform the way we treat other people, especially during conflict, and helps create safer, healthier and more inclusive places to live and interact.

Catherine Barga works on restorative justice issues for the Mennonite Central Committee—British Columbia and as a mediator with the Fraser Region Community Justice Initiatives, #101—20678 Eastleigh Crescent, Langley, British Columbia, Canada V3A 4C4, (604) 534-5515; (e-mail) cjbc@axionet.com.

Wiping Away the Tears

continued from Page 1

love can lead us to justice and healing within our broken church?

7 In January 2002, Pope John Paul II offered us a powerful maxim, "No Peace without Justice, No Justice without Forgiveness." Although he was addressing war and military violence, his ideas are relevant here, that is, peace is fostered when the needs of all in a given situation are acknowledged, responded to, and met. Similarly, justice is enhanced, is made more human by forgiveness. Those nations, corporations, and persons who abuse their power, hoard material wealth, and secure their own pleasure at the expense of others must confess, apologize, and redistribute their resources as an act of penance.

8 Similarly, today's church must initiate processes that lead to forgiveness through confession, apology, and penance. Some institutional church leaders have already publicly apologized for the cover-ups and secrecy. Not all. Some priests who have abused children have apologized to their congregations. Not all. Some priests have apologized to all the young people they molested and mistreated. Most have not. Of this group, some remain in denial. Many have admitted their sinful behavior but experience too great a shame to face those they have abused. As a church, as a community called to wipe away the tears, we are called to help these priests to confess and repent for their destructive behavior. The open acknowledgment of what was done and sincere apology to those sexually abused may provide considerable healing for their pain.

9 To facilitate confession and penance among those priests who have abused and healing for adults who were sexually abused as children, we propose that our church embrace the principles and practices of restorative justice. In particular, we call upon each diocese to offer Victim-Offender Reconciliation Programs (VORPs) or family group conferences. These programs offer counseling to all parties involved and help those who have harmed to recognize and acknowledge the pain they have caused. For sure it is a

To facilitate confession and penance...we propose that our church embrace the principles and practices of restorative justice.

lengthy process, one that requires great effort from all involved, but ultimately this process is restorative because it offers an opportunity for all parties to meet -- at the discretion of the abused person. At such a

meeting the person harmed shares how her/his life has been devastated by the acts of the other. The person responsible for the harm has an opportunity to reflect on what she/he has heard, to confess, apologize, and offer restitution. The two persons are free to engage in conversation moderated by a trained mediator and shared in by family members and close friends. We reiterate that participation in such a process is purely voluntary and no one can predict the final outcome but significant evidence exists demonstrating that restorative processes can be healing and transformative for all involved.

...significant evidence exists that restorative processes can be healing and transformative for all involved.

10 Some may criticize such a process as naive and optimistic, but restorative justice processes have led to personal and communal healing for centuries. People have experienced healing in the United States, Canada, and in places of war and civil unrest, such as Northern Ireland, South Africa, Rwanda, and Burundi. John Paul II set a personal example of restorative justice when he met with and offered forgiveness to the person who attempted to assassinate him. Now is the time to initiate restorative justice within our broken church through processes such as VORPs and family group conferences.

11 Specifically, we call upon each diocese to convene a group specializing in mediation, counseling, and restorative justice. This mediation group should be independent of the institutional church to insure that the needs of all are respected. Those persons who have been sexually abused would be invited to contact this group, which will help with counseling and personal healing. Families and other persons intimate with abused persons will also have opportunities to participate in these meetings. Separate meetings can also take place between mediators and the priests responsible for abuse.

12 Only when the priest and the person he abused wish to meet and are willing to make preparations for such a meeting, the mediation group will prepare and host a meeting for them. Such a meeting will be in a safe place, determined by the person who has been abused, and facilitated by members of the mediation group. Utilizing a family conferencing format, family members and friends might also be invited as sources of support and as participants needing to heal themselves. Participation

in these conferences will be voluntary when the person abused and the priest who abused freely choose to participate. Through voluntary participation, the possibility for confession, apology and forgiveness is

May there be more opportunities for church leaders to apologize...

enhanced. During this process an opportunity exists for the person who has been abused to suggest a form of penance to the priest who has abused. Given the voluntary nature of mediation, no reconciliation can be guaranteed but the history of restorative justice through VORPs and family group conferences indicates its tremendous potential for healing.

13 We also advocate that a similar process be made available to all persons in the Roman Catholic church who have been impacted by this scandal. Bishops and other institutional church leaders must listen to the sorrow and pain experienced by all members of the community. Hopefully, priests who have abused will acknowledge and apologize for the harms they have done to children and their families, and seek forgiveness from their fellow priests, parishioners, and the church as a whole. May there be more opportunities for church leaders to apologize for the secrecy and gross mishandling of this scandal. Open forums should be developed so that all people have the opportunity to revise diocesan policies regarding the sexual abuse of children by clergy.

14 Since the principles and processes of restorative justice are unknown to many Roman Catholics, we encourage our bishops, pastors, and church ministers to initiate workshops where people can learn about the many ways that restorative justice can heal in all areas of our lives. We call upon Christian educators to incorporate restorative justice at all levels of religious education. Young people are yearning for ways to practice peace and nonviolence but have not been sufficiently challenged with Christian learning experiences to foster a commitment through forgiveness and reconciliation. All people are encouraged to fully participate in these workshops and to agree upon ways to heal our broken church. Let us begin speaking to each other about these matters without delay and in the spirit of Christian love.

Resources

Restorative Justice Comes from Many Quarters

by Russ Immarigeon

Restorative justice is not only a rapidly expanding field of inquiry and practice, but also a field that is influenced or shaped through contributions from many disciplinary quarters and practice domains. The interdisciplinary nature of restorative justice augurs well for its future. The more fruit in one's basket, the greater the likelihood of good subsistence. As this column grows to meet the challenge of reporting on the important work being produced from around the world, we will learn the extent of restorative justice's indebtedness to others and to its application beyond the rather confining borders of juvenile and criminal justice.

Juvenile Justice

Restorative justice holds a central role in the ten articles collected by Ido Weijers (Utrecht University) and Anthony Duff (Stirling University) for **Punishing Juveniles: Principle and Critique** (Hart Publishing, September 2002, \$48.00). These articles cover historical perspectives, assessments of the relationships between education and punishment, and the concepts of shame, guilt and remorse. Carter Hay (Washington State University) and Mark Stafford (University of Texas at Austin) provide a helpful historical overview of the development, demise and rebirth of rehabilitation in the United States. They argue that restorative justice is one of a series of responses to the "nothing works" ideology (the others being abolish the juvenile court, lowering the age of accountability, increased incapacitation, and the "just deserts" approach). Other key articles include Lorraine Gelsthorpe (Cambridge University) on recent changes in juvenile justice policies in England and Wales, Lode Walgrave (Catholic University of Leuven) on the problematic nature of using punishment with young people, Ido Weijers on moral dimensions of restorative justice, and Allison Morris (formerly Cambridge University and Victoria University of Wellington) assess shame, guilt and remorse associated with the use of family group conferences in New Zealand.

Community Justice

Several new publications explore the restorative justice concern with community justice. In **Community Justice** (Wadsworth, \$33.95, 2003), Todd R. Clear and Eric Cadora, with Sarah Bryer and Charles Swartz, offer an introductory monograph that points out the parameters of this new paradigm. Clear and Cadora first note that community justice assumes that "critically important differences (exist) from one community to another, and these differences suggest that criminal justice strategies need to be tailored to fit those differences." They also assume that informal social control (family, friends, neighbors), rather than formal social control (police, courts, corrections), is the primary mechanism of public safety. Community justice, they argue, is a

three-part strategy that includes a focus on high-impact communities, strengthening the capacity of informal social control networks, and developing partnerships with community agencies, businesses, and residents. For them, community justice is both a strategy and a philosophy. Community justice is laid out in this book as a positive, proactive response to criminal events, through a decentralized, organizationally flexible process of problem solving. Clear and Cadora argue that place matters. Separate chapters focus on the integration of community justice with traditional policing, court, and corrections activities and practices. Clear and Cadora offer a four-part conceptual model of community justice strategies, involving partnership, intermediary, involvement, and mobilization models. The future of community justice, they suggest, depends as much on evidence of effectiveness as on political will and the ability to establish and fund community justice initiatives. Copies can be obtained from Wadsworth/ Thomson Learning, 10850 Toeppen Dr., Independence, KY 41051, (800) 354-9706.

International Developments

Kathleen Daly and Hennessey Hayes observe that Australia and New Zealand stand out in their application of restorative justice programming because they have largely relied on legislatively imposed mandates of diversionary conferencing practices, especially within the juvenile justice system. Daly and Hennessey sum up the Australian and New Zealand experiences with diversionary conferencing in a tidy overview essay, "Restorative Justice and Conferencing," recently published in **The Cambridge Handbook of Australian Criminology** (Cambridge University Press, 2002, \$70.00) edited by Adam Graycar and Peter Grabosky. Copies of this volume can be obtained from Cambridge University Press, 110 Midland Ave., Port Chester, NY 10573-4930, (800) 872-7423.

An irony of the persistent use of incarceration in many countries, says Dermot Feenan of the University of Ulster, Northern Ireland, is that it highlights "the need for non-legal forms of punishment." In **Informal Criminal Justice** (Ashgate/ Dartmouth, 2002, \$79.95), editor Feenan collects eight essays that examine diverse dimensions of the term "informal criminal justice," used here roughly to suggest alternatives to formal, state-based interventions that at least suggest a form of restorative justice. The "blurred boundary" between formal and informal criminal justice is explored in the historical and contemporary context of paramilitary punishment in Northern Ireland, political murders in Weimar Germany, fear of crime in British cities, and vigilantism in South Africa.

This volume is a useful addition to previous significant works about informal justice, including Richard Abel's two-volume **The Politics of Informal Justice** (Academic Press, 1982) and Roger Matthews' **Informal Justice** (Sage Publications, 1988). Copies of this book are available from Ashgate Publishing Company, 2252 Ridge Rd., Brookfield, VT 05036, (802) 276-3162; www.ashgate.com (15% discount with online orders).

Jenny Bargen, Director of Youth Justice Conferencing for the NSW Department of Juvenile Justice, reports that information on restorative justice and conferencing in Australia is available at www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/tandi186.html. For information on the NSW, Australia scheme of youth justice conferences operating within the legislative framework of the Young Offenders Act 1997 (NSW) see <http://www.lawlink.nsw.gov.au> and follow links to Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research for reports published in 2000 and 2002.

Additional international perspectives can be found in **Conferencing, Circles, and Restorative Practices**, the conference book published by the International Institute for Restorative Practices for its Third International Conference, a three-day affair held this past August in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In addition to the conference schedule, presenter biographies, workshop abstracts, and educational resources, this handy and helpful volume contains seven keynote or plenary papers from the conference, including Vidia Negrea on "Dreaming of a New Reality for Troubled Youth in Hungary," the Hon. Lilo Lilles on "Circle Sentencing: Part of the Restorative Justice Continuum," and former prison governor Tim Newell on "Restorative Practice in Prisons: Circles and Conferencing in the Custodial Setting." Other papers cover restorative justice practices in schools and child welfare agencies. Copies can be obtained (\$10.00 per copy) from ICRP, PO Box 229, Bethlehem, PA 18016, (610) 807-9221. Also the IIRP website (www.restorativepractices.org) posts additional papers delivered at the conference, including an excellent journalistic report on the conference proceedings by *Delaware Valley News* reporter Laura Mirsky (<http://fp.enter.net/restorativepractices/mirsky.mn02.pdf>).

Utopia

The editors of **Contemporary Justice Review**, an important quarterly journal covering community justice, restorative justice and peacemaking issues, has issued a Call for Papers to invite authors from all

Conference Report

Canadian Conference Explores Critical Restorative Justice Issues

This past September, the same week as VOMA's annual conference, the Canadian Criminal Justice Association (<http://home.istar.ca/~ccja>), the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy (www.icclr.law.ubc.ca) and the Simon Fraser University Centre for Restorative Justice (www.sfu.ca/crj) joined with provincial and federal government departments and community agencies in Gatineau, Quebec to develop an interactive conference that was designed to critically and constructively assess the state and future of Restorative Justice in Canada.

The conference, which served as a follow-up to the First National Symposium on Restorative Justice, held in March 1997, in Vancouver, British Columbia, brought together advocates, practitioners, researchers and governmental leaders, as well as victims and ex-offenders/prisoners to further define and explore restorative justice in Canada.

According to Catherine Barga of the Mennonite Central Committee – British Columbia and the Fraser Valley Community Justice Initiative in Langley, British Columbia, "Conference registrants represented the experiences of corrections, police, the voluntary sector, probation, courts, community organizations, academics, faith communities, victims, government, aboriginals, and the general public. The mandate over the three days was to engage in dialogue around the current implementation of Restorative Justice, identify obstacles to be surmounted, and consider new directions for the future."

Carol Grenier, Project Officer in the Restorative Justice Branch of Correctional Service of Canada, further notes, "This conference explored the creative opportunities and challenges that restorative justice poses in the daily lives of individuals working in the field. The structure of this event was not the traditional conference style that most participants are accustomed to. There were plenary sessions, but they were followed by true discussion workshops. Workshop resource people were invited to engage with participants in structured restorative circle dialogue about their topic. Serious critique was encouraged, but through respectful process."

Conference participants were encouraged by the progress of Restorative Justice and challenged by some concerns posed by its application and implementation.

British Columbia's Barga observes, "Plenary sessions were formatted to reflect this balance of encouragement and challenge. The previous national restorative justice conference, which was held in 1997, has been accused of being a Restorative Justice 'Love-In.' In order to stimulate more critical thinking this time around, the format of the plenary sessions integrated challenging questions in addition to encouraging and inspirational words to move the work of

Restorative Justice forward. For example, many processes based on Restorative Justice depend on truth telling. So, how do we operate restoratively when people are unwilling to tell the truth? Another example: Are Restorative Justice programs 'band-aids' for bigger problems? Is the Restorative Justice movement doing all it can to look at and address root causes of crime, such as poverty and racism?"

Barga also reports, "Individual workshops were structured to promote the sharing of Restorative Justice innovations and success stories, while providing opportunities for dialogue around tough issues. I found hearing people share their joys and struggles in this work a particularly enriching experience that prompted much food for thought. It struck me that many people in this work, either in the voluntary or government sector, struggle with burn-out, lack of support in the commu-

I found hearing people share their joys and struggles in this work a particularly enriching experience... I noticed a tenacious passion for the work and an enduring commitment....

nity, and concerns around how to implement effective programs for unique cultural/social groups. In addition, however, I noticed a tenacious passion for the work and an enduring commitment to face the struggles, simply because Restorative Justice is "a good cause."

What came of the hard work invested at conference workshops?

Correctional Service Canada's Grenier reports, "Some of the key messages that emerged in many of the sessions that I attended included:

1. It is tough to work outside the margins of the Canadian criminal justice system without the financial resources that are needed to make Restorative Justice programs work. It makes us realize the importance of the people who do the work, who have the passion and commitment to work with little resources and the need to take time to celebrate the small successes, share the stories and the rewards that this work provides.
2. Restorative Justice is still growing and moving forward even with all the challenges. There is a sense of more mainstream acceptance and knowledge of this approach to justice and the need for it.
3. It is also important for funders to look at the lessons learned in pilot projects to develop guidelines and evaluation criteria for

projects while still maintaining respecting the uniqueness of each program. It is important to continue to develop restorative justice programs at the grassroots level and not allow them to be predetermined by government.

4. Governments have to start looking at the way they fund projects, to move away from short term pilot project funding, and towards more long term initiatives so projects can have meaningful research components built into their development. This research can then help ensure their future sustainability.
5. Victim's voices need to be heard clearly at all stages of planning and implementation of Restorative Justice initiatives.
6. Restorative Justice has something to say in relation to Aboriginal and Inuit peoples but it is important to recognize that these nations are diverse and have healing and spiritual traditions which need to be uniquely understood in their own right.
7. Restorative Justice is an important and growing area of influence on the entire Canadian criminal justice system, something that offers a renewed hope in creating safer, more peaceful communities and solutions."

"As for new directions," Barga concludes, "that remains to be seen. We had the opportunity to work within intensive groups - first by sector, then by geographical region - to discuss questions intended to shape vision and direction. Fortunately, each group had a recorder and the content of each discussion will soon be available for review. Overall, the conference successfully connected participants with the human dimensions of Restorative Justice and left them with valid and difficult questions to ponder as they continued to grapple with restorative justice issues and practice."

A report on VOMA's own Training Institute and Conference is being prepared for publication in our next issue of VOMA *Connections*. Held September 23-27, 2002 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, the event was attended by 196 participants representing eight nations from Africa, Europe, and North America.

VOMA invites you to submit articles or reflections on this most special gathering by January 15, 2003. Please write editor Russ Immarigeon, 563 Route 21, Hillsdale, NY, 12529 or e-mail russimmarigeon@taconic.net.

Thank you!

Resources

continued from page 7

disciplines to submit essays for a special issue on *The Birth of Another World: Utopian Visions of Justice and Human Well-Being in Literature, Theory, and Practice*.

Essays should focus on visions of a new social order in which humanly disabling differences are eliminated and new social arrangements created in which the needs of all are taken into account and met. Submissions might focus on an analysis of the work of authors who have grappled with the creation of a just world in their writing and how their vision of a new world moves us forward to get along as an interdependent global community. Authors selected might include Ursula LeGuin, Marge Piercy, William Morris, Edward Bellamy, Samuel Butler, Charles Nordhoff, R. Buckminster Fuller, B. F. Skinner, George Bernard Shaw, Henry David Thoreau, George Orwell, or Walt Whitman. Submissions might also focus on different forms of community that were and are still being tried, discussing how such communities are demonstration projects of sorts for directing us toward a new world community. Communities examined might include the Shakers, Catholic Workers, The Farm, Jonah House, Twin Oaks, Oneida, or Disney's Celebration. With respect to theoretical perspectives, an essay might offer ideas on what alternative forms of family (kinship), school (learning), and work (livelihood) might look like and how we might bring such forms about. Discussions might include views of how design influences human well-being and justice and how forms of community (from intentional community to co-housing) can prevent pain and suffering and foster joyful living. The value of restorative and transitional justice for healing human trauma and furthering human well-being within communities would also be appropriate. We are also looking for film and book reviews and review essays that are consistent with the theme of the issue.

A title/abstract of about 200 words should be sent by March 15, 2003 to Lisa Trubitt, CJR Managing Editor, University at Albany, LC SB 31, 1400, Washington Ave., Albany, NY 12222, (e-mail) LTrubitt@uamail.albany.ed. Inquiries might be made of Lisa or CJR Editor-in-Chief, Dennis Sullivan (gezellig@global2000.net). Notification of acceptance will be made by May 1, 2003. The finished essays (circa 25 typed double-spaced pages) will be due May 1, 2003 for inclusion in the September and December 2003 issues of CJR.

John Perry's **Repairing Communities through Restorative Justice** (American Correctional Association, \$29.95), available now from the ACA [4380 Forbes Blvd., Lanham, MD 20706, (800) 222-5646], contains 11 articles that capture a wide range of restorative justice roots and results from familiar writers such as Paul McCold, John Braithwaite, Gordon Bazemore, Mark Umbreit, David Moore, Lauren Abramson, Ron Claassen, Chris Dinnan, and David Karp, who address a range of theoretical, practical, and assessment issues central to the development, implementation, and enhancing of restorative justice initiatives.

Funding Restorative Justice

by Phyllis Turner Lawrence

It is always exciting to see the words "restorative justice" in federal legislation that provides money!

The good news is that the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) re-authorization bill (HR 2215) that Congress has sent to President George W. Bush specifically provides funding to the states to be used "in partnership with local units of governments or nonprofit organizations, for the purpose of establishing juvenile offender reentry programs. Funds may be expended by the projects for the (purpose of) convening victim impact panels, restorative justice panels, or victim impact educational classes for juvenile offenders."

It is important to note that the original House of Representatives language that led to this section of the overall re-authorization bill was sponsored by both Republicans and Democrats and it provided a definition of "restorative justice program" as "a program that emphasizes the moral accountability of an offender toward the victim and the affected community, and may include community reparations boards, restitution (in the form of monetary payment or service to the victim or, where no victim can be identified, service to the affected community), and mediation between victim and offender."

We don't know now what will result from this provision (promising appropriations language does not always result in actual funding), but I'll be tracking the DOJ regulations that will be created to implement this legislation for a definition of "restorative justice panels" and to determine if "re-entering" refers to any post-dispositional situation, or only post-incarceration.

All fundraising experts say that it is critical for nonprofits in particular, but governmental agencies as well, to diversify their sources of financial support. Therefore, Restorative Justice efforts should not rely only on government, private, or community fund-raising resources, especially in these tricky financial times.

Government funding for juvenile case conferencing

Many victim-offender dialogue programs serving juveniles are starting up with grants of federal dollars that are passed through to the states under Titles II and V of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 (Pub. L. 93-415, 42 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) and subsequent amendments. In either case, applications are made, usually in late winter, through state agencies that administer these funds. For help in finding that agency and the status of funding in your state, contact the Juvenile Justice Specialist in your state. The Juvenile Justice Coalition's webpage (www.juvjustice.org/resources/jjspec.html) maintains a list of these important contacts. Now is the time to begin building a case with local agencies to make an application for such funding.

JJDP Title II money has been used by many programs that take diversion referrals, even though these funds are commonly referred to

though these funds are commonly referred to as "post-disposition." No matching funds are required and grants may be renewed for up to five years. However, 100% funding occurs only for the first two years and then the maximum allowable grant (if renewed) steps down to 75% the third year, 50% the fourth, and no more than 25% the fifth year. Each proposal is required to demonstrate how it will be moving from JJDP dollars to other sources of support.

JJDP Title V provides funding for the Community Prevention Grants Program, which creates and implements three-year collaborative, community-based delinquency prevention efforts. Grants are awarded in 12-month increments for no more than three years. The plans should be designed to reduce risk factors associated with juvenile delinquency and decrease the incidence of juvenile problem behavior.

Prevention Policy Boards in your community can be helpful, especially when they are seeking or have already received Title V money, because your program may fit into ongoing delinquency prevention efforts. For example, you could offer to become a community coalition partner and to provide truancy case conferencing or victim impact panels, all potential uses of these funds.

Do not be afraid of the 50% match of funds required under Section 505(b)(7) of Title V. The grant page information page states, "Cash or an in-kind match provided by a third party, such as a volunteer or a public or private agency, may count toward the required match." And we know, because of research conducted by Gordon Bazemore and Mara Schiff of Florida Atlantic University, that most programs have only one full- or part-time coordinator and volunteers do much of the actual conferencing.

To get further information, go to <http://ojdp.ncjrs.org/titlev/grant.html>. This webpage gives contact information for each state's Title V Coordinator and the amount of your state's portion of the \$26 million FY 2002 allocation nationwide. The Spring 1999 issue of **VOMA Connections** also contains additional information about funding. This issue (<http://www.voma.org/docs/connect2/connect2.pdf>) contains information about Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) grants that flow through to the states, suggestions for fund-raising resources and grant proposals, and an excellent matrix that details the advantages, disadvantages, motivations, and roles of various generic sources of funding, such as government, foundations, corporate, special events, and donors.

Phyllis Turner Lawrence, a Restorative Justice consultant, can be reached in Alexandria, VA, (703) 379-4575; (e-mail) phyllis@us.net. She will be writing regularly for VOMA Connections about finding financial and training resources for restorative justice efforts. She welcomes your input about original funding ideas, valuable resources for funding, training and technical assistance, and other useful tips.

Book Review

Dignity Denied: The Experience of Murder Victims' Family Members Who Oppose the Death Penalty

by Robert Renny Cushing and Susannah Sheffer

No charge, 33 pages (2002)

by Russ Immerigeon

Restorative justice is not simple. Whereas the slamming of a prison gate suffices to satisfy the needs of punitive justice, opening the sanctioning process to a discussion of societal and individual responses that go beyond simplistic forms of punishment is a much more complicated, and even difficult, approach.

Two of restorative justice's core features are the ability to listen to the concerns of all parties involved - directly or indirectly - in criminal (or other) conflicts and the ability to challenge the existing paradigm of justice with an approach that often produces as much "magic" as good, satisfying outcomes.

Restorative justice is a struggle, however, and one part of that struggle is the need to challenge existing practices. Interestingly, crime victims are often revictimized by punitive justice approaches and this is never more apparent than when capital punishment is involved.

In this new report, **Dignity Denied: The Experience of Murder Victims' Family Members Who Oppose the Death Penalty**, Renny Cushing, the executive director of Murder Victims' Families for Reconciliation (MVFR), and Susannah Sheffer, a writer for MVFR, which is a victim-founded, victim-led organization that represents murder victims' families who oppose the death penalty, describe "a startling picture of bias and discrimination by those who serve victims against surviving family members who, contrary to popular stereotype, oppose the death penalty."

...crime victims are often revictimized by punitive justice approaches and this is never more apparent than when capital punishment is involved.

"Too often, family members who oppose the death penalty are silenced, marginalized, and abandoned, even by the people who are theoretically charged with helping them," Cushing said in a press release issued at the report's mid-August launch at the annual conference of the National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA), which was held in Nashville, Tennessee.

In this report, MVFR challenges current criminal justice practices - and especially those found in victim assistance units affiliated with prosecution offices - for not listening to the voices of certain crime victims. As MVFR notes, the victims' rights movement established victim rights laws and victim assistance programs that worked to give victims the ability to be "informed, present, and heard" throughout the criminal justice process. However, says Cushing, "victim services usually operate under the auspices of the prosecutor, so rights are granted and enforced only at the prosecutor's discretion."

The MVFR report identifies and illustrates three ways that victims who oppose the death penalty face discrimination:

- ♦ **Denial of the right to speak and be heard.** Victoria Lamm was murdered in Nebraska in 1980, and the perpetrator was given a death sentence. When the Nebraska Board of Pardons was considering commuting the death sentence years later, three family members of the victim asked to present testimony, but only one was allowed to do so. Victoria's sister, who supported the death penalty, was allowed to testify. Victoria's husband and daughter, who opposed the death penalty, were denied that right - even though the Nebraska Constitution specifically guarantees victims the right to make a statement at such proceedings.

- ♦ **Denial of the right to information.** Often, when prosecutors learn that a surviving family member opposes the death penalty for the perpetrator, that person will be denied information about upcoming hearings, court dates, or other important information about the case. In Austin, Texas, for example, when Jeannette Popp, who opposed the death penalty for the murderer of her daughter, "the district attorney's office cut off communication with her and would not inform her of upcoming court hearings involving her daughter's murder."

"Sometimes this denial is made explicit, as when members of a district attorney's office warn families that if they advocate against the death penalty the office will no longer communicate with them," Cushing says. "At other times, the office may communicate with the family but do so in a way that is incomplete, inaccurate or misleading."

- ♦ **Denial of the right to assistance and advocacy.** Victim SueZann Bosler

came close to losing her life when an assailant severely injured her and murdered her father. The state of Florida decided to seek the death penalty against the perpetrator. She reported that during the first two trials of her father's murderer, the victim witness advocate "held my hand, got coffee for me...[but] on the third trial, when I wasn't doing what they wanted, they wouldn't talk to me or sit next to me or look at me. They wouldn't have anything to do with me."

Dignity Denied makes a series of nine recommendations that challenge lawmakers,

In this report, MVFR challenges current criminal justice practices... for not listening to the voices of certain crime victims.

government agencies, and victim advocates and service providers to address the discrimination described in this report and to provide equitable treatment of survivors of homicide victims. These recommendations include: amending victims' rights laws to ban discrimination based upon a victim's position on the death penalty; administering victims' services independently, not as part of the prosecutor's office; establishing parity in the use of state and federal funds to provide services to crime victims who oppose capital punishment as well as to those who support it; and developing protocols for serving victims' families who oppose the death penalty.

Minimally, this report should encourage much debate and discussion; more significantly, this report should guide the reform of victim services, not just within a punitive justice approach that supports capital punishment, but also within a restorative justice approach that opposes it.

For further information about this report, contact Renny Cushing, Executive Director, MVFR, 2161 Massachusetts Ave., Cambridge, MA 02140, (617) 868-0007, (e-mail) cushing@mvfr.org. This report can be downloaded at www.mvfr.org.

VOMA Membership Information & Application

- **Agency membership** is available to any organization that has an interest in victim offender mediation, conferencing and circle processes, the philosophy of restorative justice, or the criminal justice system. Annual agency dues are **\$150.00**.
- **Individual membership** is available to those persons interested and/or involved in victim offender mediation and conferencing programs. Annual individual dues are **\$40.00**.
- **Student membership** is available to full-time students. Annual student dues are **\$25.00**.
- **Library and educational institution memberships** are available, which consist of a subscription to the newsletter. Annual library and educational institution dues are **\$30.00**.

VOMA membership benefits include the *VOMA Connections* newsletter, the Annual Directory of Members, access to VOMA resources, and discounts on Annual Conference registration.

----- Membership Application -----

Please print:

Name/Contact Person _____ Title _____

Organization/Agency Name _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State/Province _____ Postal Code _____ Country _____

Telephone (_____) _____ Fax (_____) _____ e-mail _____

Type of Membership (full-time students, please list name of school) _____

Amount Due \$ _____ (Please enter credit card information below or enclose check or money order in U.S. funds, payable to **VOMA**)

or • VISA • MasterCard Card Number _____ Expiration Date _____

Print Name of Cardholder _____ Cardholder Signature _____

As a service to members, VOMA may provide the following information in the Membership Directory and on the Website.

Please check all appropriate boxes:

Areas of Interest:

- Community • Restorative Justice (work with victims, offenders, and communities)
- Environmental/Public Policy • Workplace/Organizational
- Research • Other

Type of Practice:

- Mediation • Peer Mediation • Circles • Facilitation • Training • Education • Other

Areas of Practice:

- Victim Advocacy • Offender Advocacy • Domestic Violence • Serious and Violent Crime
- Court Annexed • Reintegration • Community • Faith-Based
- Schools/Universities • Youth • Cross-Cultural • Environmental/Public Policy
- Family • Schools and Youth • Training & Teaching • Indigenous Peoples specify:

Clients: • Victims • Young Offenders • Adult Offenders • Community Members • Other

Organizational Setting:

- Court-Based • Government • Community-Based • Educational • Nonprofit • Law Office
- Faith-Based • Private Practice • Human Rights • Insurance • Organizational/Workplace
- Other

Language: Services offered in • English • Spanish • French • Other specify:

I am interested in volunteering or working in these areas:

- Board Committee • Newsletter • Website • Conference • Book Reviews • Membership
- Training • Fundraising • Videos/Other Resources

Part of VOMA's mission is to increase the diversity of its membership.

It would help us to achieve success with this goal if you provide the following information (Optional):

I am a member of an equity seeking group:

- Gender • Race/Ethnicity • Gay/Lesbian/Bisexual/Transgender • Faith-Based • Disability
- Other specify:

VOMA lists the following information on our website: name, organization, mailing address, phone, fax, e-mail, web address.

- I do **NOT** want to have my information listed on the VOMA website.
- Please publish **ONLY** the following (circle): name, organization, mailing address, phone, fax, e-mail, web address.

Please clip application form, enclose payment, and send to:

VOMA, c/o Center for Policy, Planning, and Performance, 2344 Nicollet Avenue South, Suite 330, Minneapolis, MN 55404, USA.

THANK YOU!

VOMA Co-Chairs' Corner

On behalf of VOMA and its Board of Directors, we want to extend our thanks to everyone who attended, presented, or contributed in other ways to the 2002 Training Institute and Conference. It was a GREAT conference that reinforced and energized people in the work that we do. We hope that you have had the opportunity to continue the connections and relationships made at this conference.

There are exciting opportunities in VOMA as well, and ways for members to get involved. As the Board continues to implement the strategic plan and with the support of the Hewlett Foundation, we are developing training opportunities as well as the opportunity to support member programs through mini-grants. But, we need the input and participation of all our members. Please be an active part of VOMA! You can find Board Members' contact information on page two of this newsletter and on the website.

The election process for new Board members is well under way. We encourage ALL members to be part of this process and let your voice be heard. The Board represents the members, and we want to be effective in representing your voice.

The mid-year meeting for the VOMA Board will take place in March 2003 at our offices in Minneapolis. Now is the time for any member to

start to formulate questions or concerns and forward them to the co-chairs via e-mail to be discussed. More information about the mid-year will be forthcoming.

Once again, we would like to sincerely thank the members and everyone who assisted VOMA with having such a successful and great conference.

Walter Drew Smith
and **Sue Wiese**, co-chairs

Note from Sue:

I would like to express my thanks to the membership of VOMA. As the outgoing co-chair, and an outgoing Board member, I would like to express my thanks to the Membership of VOMA for giving me the opportunity to serve you in these positions. It has truly been an honor and privilege to be a part of the VOMA Board. The people I have met through this experience — both members and Board members — are truly the "heart" of VOMA. I am continually impressed with the dedication and integrity that all bring to this work. It has been a wonderful, enriching, and growing experience to serve this organization.

Thank you!



'Tis the Season . . .

... to extend to all our members and friends a most peaceful and nourishing holiday filled with glad tidings and an abundance of warm memories. At this time of fellowship, celebration, and sharing, please allow us to offer a gentle suggestion for your gift list.

Your tax deductible contribution to VOMA (*any size would suit!*) will better enable us to ensure and continue our mission of promoting and enhancing restorative justice dialogue, principles, and practices.

As always, our most sincere thanks for your continuing involvement and generous support. Please know you have our very warmest wishes to you and yours this holiday season and throughout the year to come!



Victim Offender Mediation Association

c/o Center for Policy, Planning, and Performance
2344 Nicollet Avenue South, Suite 330
Minneapolis, MN 55404 USA