



JUSTITIA AND DEMOCRACY

Justitia could examine the loss of democracy and civil liberties as we fight the war on terrorism, as it is called, but I don't want to go there in this issue. One could write about a Republican party that distorted the facts to fight a war (lying) or write about a Democratic party that doesn't have the courage (cowards) to stand up and continually press for a change of strategy because the focus is winning an upcoming election. I could write about the loss of habeas corpus, the secrecy of the Bush administration (a closed rather than an open society), the "Imperial Presidency," and on and on, but I'd rather address living a democratic life style. Democracy is a way of life, and we can never lose our democracy to those who are addicted to power rather than concerned about the needs of the members of its community.

What would our environments look like if we actually applied the principles of democracy to our communities (colleges and universities, classrooms, governmental institutions, business organizations, neighborhoods, personal relationships, etc.)? It would include living and modeling structures not based on power, but shared decision-making, collaboration, empowerment ("the capability of obtaining one's needs", "the capacity to influence others", and the "ability to affect the allocation of resources within a social arrangement," (Tucker, *Justitia*, Winter 2008), inclusion, respect for human dignity and basic human rights, openness, accountability, and so forth. Imagine if we followed the principles laid out by the **Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development**.

continued, page 7

FEMINIST THEORY AND DEMOCRACY

by Stacey Ussery Tucker

Democracy is an ideal promoted by the U.S. and internalized by its citizens as something inherent to a prosperous nation. It implies freedom and equality for all in making political decisions, decisions that shape the country towards a 'common good.' Critically examining the political system in the U.S. from a theoretical perspective, however, allows us to discern discrepancies between ideology and reality.

Democracy, as we know, is a highly contested concept. The Greeks coined the term (from δημοκρατία), which translates as the 'rule of the people', or 'common people rule.' The ideals and values of such a democracy have survived to this day, though very few societies around the world operate by direct or popular democracy. Modern philosophers contemplated democracy in relation to the nation-state and its legitimacy. Thomas Hobbes presupposed the animalistic nature of man and the need for a social contract, a mutual agreement among citizens, to prevent chaos and provide protection. John Locke saw man as good and industrious, rationally joining with other citizens in a social contract as a means to acknowledge and enforce man's natural rights. These 'European' ideas did not eradicate the monarchy. They did, however, emphasize the rights of individuals over those of the sovereign. Jean-Jacques Rousseau viewed man as innately good, but as losing his innocence within civilization. Rousseau argued that the recognition of common interests creates a bond between men as citizens, a 'general will.' "For Rousseau, neither kings nor represen-

tative parliaments can bring about justice; only the 'general will' can enforce justice, since it is based on mutual respect and the absence of the type of subordination that is the essence of what passes for 'civilization' in the modern world"ⁱ (659). In the mid-twentieth century, T.H. Marshall's theory of social citizenship expanded the perception of the 'social contract' as an agreement between citizens and the government to civic rights (and responsibilities), political rights, and ultimately social entitlements. He asserted that a citizen is only a full citizen if he possesses all three aspects of right. Marshall thought, when he wrote his lectures in the 1950's, that we were making great strides in social rights.ⁱⁱ

Joseph Schumpeter offered us a new definition of democracy: "the democratic method is that institutional arrangement for arriving

continued, page 3

IN THIS ISSUE

President's Message	2
JSA Officers.....	2
Beyond Community Policing	4
Belonging	6
Justitia Editor Sought.....	6
Focus on Members	6
Call for Contributors.....	7
Positions Available	7

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Now well into the second year of my term as President of this wonderful organization, I want to begin with some notes of thanks, wishes, and blessings.

At the very top of the list, I want to thank Peter Sanzen for the amazing job he has done with this newsletter. For those of you who don't know, Peter is stepping down after this issue. We have accepted his resignation with a heavy heart. Peter has been the editor, and occasionally principal author, of *Justitia* since its inception. I know I speak for every member and supporter of the Justice Studies Association when I wish him the very best. I hope (expect) that he will continue to play an active role in the JSA. [This might be a good time to mention that we are currently seeking someone to assume the editorship.]

I next want to thank those of you who attended our 2007 conference at Salve Regina University in Newport, RI. I appreciate those of you who have offered words of support and congratulations on a successful effort. It is often easier to evaluate such an undertaking as a participant than an organizer. Any success has to be attributed to a few folks I will now take the time to thank: Jo-Ann Della Giustina, who took care of most of the nitty gritty details of a conference, who kept me conscious of the bottom line, and who listened to me even when I was babbling; Robin Robinson, who did a terrific job with the program; Christa Drew, who designed the program, and calmed me (always!) with her gentle demeanor; and Alyssa Vaughan, a UMD student, without whom we wouldn't have had bottled water, milk for our coffee, or signs to the meeting rooms—her energy was endless.

There have been too many losses and illnesses this year. For all of you who have dealt with a loss or illness, please know you are in our thoughts always.

I am writing this sitting in the airport in DC, having just completed my first visit to George Mason University, the site of our 2008 conference. I am thrilled with the spaces I have seen, and their willingness to offer us onsite assistance. The staff and faculty I have met are excited that we are coming to campus, and I expect to see some local participation. Now is the time

to begin thinking about attending and presenting. Next year's theme is the same as this issue of *Justitia*, "Democracy."

Now comes the difficult part. I feel as though I am supposed to offer some words of wisdom about democracy, without seeing what others have written. I will keep this VERY short. Knowing I was being called on to write this column, I took advantage of my time in DC. Yesterday I headed to the National Mall, hoping to see some sort of protest—democracy in action. Alas, all I found were families out enjoying the beautiful summer weather (I know it is fall, but here it still feels like summer); joggers; tourists with cameras, cell phones, cell phone cameras. . . The most excitement I came across was the solar decathlon, where schools from around the world compete to build a functional and attractive home that is completely powered, heated and cooled with solar power. I had a blast admiring their work, hoping their efforts weren't too little too late.

Continuing to seek inspiration I headed to one museum I had yet to visit, the newest addition to the Smithsonian Museum—The Museum of Native Americans. What I found there was the best and the worst of democracy: The sheer arrogance of the "American spirit" in believing that what is good for us is good for everyone—even if we have to kill you to convince you. (Forgive me for the overarching generalities. I will leave it to others to explore whether it is indeed "good for us.") And perhaps the best of democracy, in the voices of the native people who have contributed to the magnificent exhibits, and the mother next to me explaining to her children why these exhibits matter to them.

Reaching back to that which always inspires me, I am currently teaching a class where we read and discussed Bell Hooks' *Talking Back*. My students, twelve women from UMD and twelve women currently incarcerated at the Bristol County House of Corrections, have been deeply aroused by hooks' talk of "voice." I guess then, at its most basic, democracy means having a voice, speaking and being truly heard.

Susan

PUBLISHING CREDITS

Editor

Peter Sanzen,
Hudson Valley Community College

Graphic Design

John Heiser,
Hudson Valley Community College

Printing

Hudson Valley Community College
Print Shop

Publisher

Hudson Valley Community College

JSA OFFICERS

PRESIDENT

Susan Krumholz
University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth
285 Old Westport Road
N. Dartmouth, MA. 02747
E-mail: skrumholz@umassd.edu

VICE PRESIDENT

John F. Wozniak
Sociology / Anthropology
Western Illinois University
1 University Circle
Macomb, IL. 61455
E-mail: JF-wozniak@wiu.edu

TREASURER

Jo-Ann Della Giustina, J.D., Ph.D.,
Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
Bridgewater State College
131 Summer Street
Bridgewater, MA 02325
508-531-2582 - phone
508-531-1761 - fax
E-mail: jdellagiustina@bridgew.edu

COMMUNICATIONS

Christa Drew
Consultant
Worcester Advisory Food Policy Council
484 Main Street, Suite 300
Worcester, MA 01608
christadrew@hotmail.com

Tucker, continued from page 1

FEMINIST THEORY AND DEMOCRACY

at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote"ⁱⁱⁱ (269). This, Schumpeter said, implied nothing less than that "democracy is the rule of the politician." Walter Robinson (1996) in "Globalization, the world system, and 'democracy promotion' in U.S. foreign policy," calls this (U.S. democracy) *polyarchy*, or small group rule rather than the 'rule of the people' where mass participation in decision-making is limited to leadership choice. According to Robinson, polyarchy isolates the political sphere from social and economic spheres and situates democracy only within the political sphere, thus actually limiting democratic participation and legitimizing socioeconomic inequalities.^{iv} Empirically, these definitions correspond to today's society far greater than the classical doctrine of democracy we continue to assert.

The challenge for us, then, is identifying what is problematic about modern society, identifying social realities that are not obvious – recognizing those boundaries and parameters. The goal of man or woman in modern society is to attain agency, but the necessary precondition for agency is understanding the difference between the ideology (values) we have internalized and organized our lives around, and reality. Modern society has compelled us to construct our life histories based on ideology. It promotes values such as equality, freedom, democracy, and solidarity, and we internalize these values affirmatively. This becomes problematic, however, in that our notions of economic gain and prosperity are contradictory to those internalized values. In other words, our society operates with political, economic, and social systems in place that function on principles of efficiency, rationalization, and power relations, but we have defined these systems in terms of our internalized values of freedom, equal opportunity, and democracy. Modern society continues to function as is because dominant groups in the social order fail to recognize or intentionally ignore these contradictions. If the goal of man or woman is to attain agency, and if the economic framework in which we operate facilitates inequality and causes stratification, then at the political system, democracy as a whole should be an instance of agency whose purpose it is to implement qualitative changes in society.

Agency in this sense refers to the ability to act consciously, in relation to a purpose and in the knowledge of the confines one must confront and overcome (transform). It is important that one develop a critical understanding of the forces shaping the social context. Critically perceptive observation involves an intellectual understanding of power, and a personal sense of potential effectiveness.^v A lack of power, however, involves disproportionate access to resources, including material and social resources. Combined with such inequality are the sentiments of powerlessness fueled by oppressive social institutions leading to dysfunctional systems. The empowerment perspective defines power as the capability of obtaining one's needs, the capacity to influence others, and the ability to affect the allocation of resources within a social arrangement.^{vi}

Standpoint theory is a concept, expounded upon from neo-Marxist circles and developed within feminist spheres, that addresses knowledge formation and legitimation (necessary for empowerment) from feminist perspectives. It has been drawn upon in epistemological circles of race as well. Standpoint perspectives not only propose the situatedness of science within historical and social paradigms, but also advocate the validity of forms of knowledge of oppressed groups within society.

Theories of knowledge, or *epistemologies*, investigate the standards used to assess knowledge or *why* we believe what we believe to be true. Feminist epistemologies, in particular, have called into question *general knowledge*. They claim that science and knowledge have been rooted in dominant ideologies, conceived within sexist, racist societies. Knowledge that has historically been legitimated, especially in *western* nations, has been Eurocentric, white, male knowledge. Feminist theories, such as standpoint theory, seek to establish subjugated knowledges (i.e. female, minority) as legitimate forms of knowledge.^{vii}

Academic disciplines, particularly the sciences, and public policy (democracy) have claimed 'objectivity' and 'neutrality.' Standpoint theory argues that academia and public policy are situated within the dominant ideology that legitimates knowledge (i.e. findings). Harding refers to this as 'studying up.' Standpoint theory, she

argues, "set out to chart the way the dominant institutions, including research and scholarly disciplines, their cultures and practices, organized and explained away the diverse ways women were oppressed and dominated"^{viii} (30). Just as "science" was utilized to justify slavery by labeling blacks as an inferior *race*, science has also been used to oppress women as innately weak and foolish. Feminist theories have also examined how women have been "muted." Linguistics scholar Cheri Kramaræ explains how the muted group theory elucidates oppression: "The language of a particular culture does not serve all its speakers equally, for not all speakers contribute in an equal fashion to its formulation"^{ix} (19). Women are unable to express their experiences in a way that is legitimated. Those dominated or oppressed groups have been deemed "inarticulate." Consider the use of slang in institutional settings – such is considered inappropriate, illegitimate. Participation in politicized groups or meetings has been dismissed because forms of communication and messages of discontent do not conform to the dominant political discourse. "The framework can be applied, Edwin Ardener argues, with equal validity to research about any groups in society, including all-male groups (e.g., blacks and whites, children and adults, working class and middle class), in which members of one group are in an asymmetrical power relationship with members of another contrasting group. The concept of mutedness is partly a means of conveying the means in which boundaries of perception are defined by the experiences of the members of the groups, and the manner in which the dominant group engulfs the subordinate group and 'blocks the power of actualization of the other'^x (21). Feminist theory, however, has historically given women a voice to overcome much oppression.

The United States history is one of struggle, of dominance and liberation. Sexist, racist policies plagued our political system, while strides were made through great social movements. Still today, we face issues of intense classism, as the divide between the rich and the poor continues to grow. All the while, socio-economic policies are being developed by policy makers and elected officials, largely wealthy, well-educated men (and women). Why aren't those

continued, page 8

THE NEXT STEP BEYOND COMMUNITY POLICING

BUFFALO WORKS OUT NEW STRATEGIES FOR POLICE-COMMUNITY COLLABORATION

by Matt Leighninger, Executive Director, Deliberative Democracy Consortium

Residents in Buffalo, N.Y., felt that police failed to respond to neighborhood concerns. Buffalo police felt that residents failed to help fight crime. Finally, the two sides came together to talk, plan, and begin to attack some of their common problems.

James Giammaresi, chief of staff with the Buffalo Police Department, had been frustrated that residents wouldn't show up at meetings called by the department. "When we tried to be more open, we just couldn't get the community to participate," he says.

Community residents had their own complaints. "Citizens felt that the police weren't being aggressive at trying to root out criminals, that they were resigned to a certain level of crime. Instead of policing, they were 'depolicing,'" says Shakoor Aljuwani, director of Buffalo's United Neighborhoods Center. Many residents believed that officers spent too much time in their patrol cars and not enough time responding to neighborhood concerns.

To address these challenges, Buffalo developed a new approach to policing that has begun to quiet the complaints and help citizens and officers work together. The Police Department and the United Neighborhoods Center involved several hundred people in structured small-group discussions and collaborative neighborhood-level action efforts. The project reduced the level of local controversy over policing, led to new department policies, and fostered some intriguing new problem-solving partnerships between block clubs, community groups, and the police.

Buffalo is one of a growing number of communities that have used these kinds of citizen involvement strategies, which are sometimes called "democratic governance." Each effort relies on small-group meetings (study circles), large-group meetings (action forums), and the sense that every citizen can help to solve community problems. They are democratic in the sense that they involve large and diverse numbers of people, everyone has a say, and the dialogue leads to action in a variety of ways.

Several other cities, including Cincinnati, Ohio, Fayetteville, North Carolina, and Louisville, Kentucky, have used democratic organizing strategies to help people deal with crime and police-community relations. But the work in Buffalo has been unique, going beyond the city's previous community policing efforts, and involving much larger numbers of people, of more diverse backgrounds, in a more meaningful way than ever before. It gave citizens an unprecedented role in police decision making. It also goes beyond previous notions of community policing because it

doesn't force police officers into roles they were never trained for. Instead of asking officers to act like social workers, mediators, or youth counselors, the Buffalo approach helps the neighborhood and the police find the people who can do those jobs. By mobilizing residents, officers, and organizations, the Buffalo organizers gave the forces of crime prevention a fighting chance.

Buffalo's odd couple

The men at the forefront of the Buffalo project, Shakoor Aljuwani and James Giammaresi, make an unlikely pair. Practically the only thing they seem to have in common is a hard-to-spell last name.

Aljuwani, a longtime community activist and organizer, was born in Buffalo and spent most of his adult life in New York City. An African-American, he converted to Islam as a young man. Five years ago he was lured back to Buffalo to head the United Neighborhoods Center. The center is a project of the Margaret L. Wendt Foundation and the United Way of Buffalo and Erie County, and serves as a liaison between local government and the city's 300 block clubs.

Giammaresi grew up in one of Buffalo's Italian-American neighborhoods, and has lived in the city all his life, working his way up the police department ladder over a 20-year career. His job gives him a central role in the department. He is constantly managing deployment decisions, dealing with personnel issues, and interacting with community groups, public officials, and angry residents alike.

Despite their different backgrounds, the two share many traits. Both men are earnest, plain-spoken, and almost never defensive – even when they find themselves under attack. Both have been frustrated by long years of conflict between police and community, particularly between white officers and residents of color. Both believe strongly that citizens have a powerful role to play in preventing crime, working with the police, and solving problems that shouldn't require the police in the first place. Their partnership has been a model for the officers and neighborhood leaders who helped set up the project. It set the tone for the respectful, productive dialogue that took place in Buffalo's neighborhoods.

The two leaders were successful in their organizing efforts by working through their spheres of influence. Both by his reputation, and as director of the United Neighborhood Center, Aljuwani had credibility with Buffalo's block clubs, particularly in neighborhoods where distrust of the police was highest. Giammaresi's rapport with fellow

officers won over many of the skeptics inside the police department, and his support of the project convinced residents that the discussions might actually have an impact on policing decisions.

Their partnership combines the authority of government with the capacity to reach out to community organizations – a key to the success of democratic governance efforts. Since these programs rely primarily on one-on-one recruitment efforts by local leaders and organizations, Aljuwani's connection to the block clubs was critical for turning out a large number of people. Since people won't attend unless they think the program has the potential to create real change, Giammaresi's status as a high-ranking police official was equally important.

Putting the neighbor back in the 'hood

Beginning in fall of 2000, by the summer of 2001, the Buffalo organizers had involved 350 people in 32 study circles and a large-scale action forum. The organizations that recruited participants and hosted the circles included a number of block clubs, one public housing resident's association, one Nation of Islam faith community, an historic preservation group, and several Business Improvement Districts. Each of the circles was neighborhood-based, involving homeowners, renters, businesspeople, church leaders, young people, and police officers who live or work locally.

In each of the small groups, 8-12 people met for several two-hour sessions. The circles had several other defining characteristics:

- **A facilitator who was a neutral party in the discussion.** Rather than giving their own opinions on the issue, the facilitator tried to help others feel comfortable and contribute productively.
- **Ground rules set by the group.** Giving group members the opportunity to decide how they will behave toward one another tends to create an atmosphere of respect, familiarity, and group autonomy.
- **A discussion that helps people understand each other first, before they move into bigger issues and questions of action.** In the first session, participants shared experiences and talked about how the issue affects their daily lives. The middle sessions helped the group delve more deeply into the policy arguments – what the police ought to do, what citizens should do. The final session helped the group brainstorm about action possibilities, ranging from simple, individual actions, to much more complicated projects

continued, next page

Leighninger, continued from page 4

- **A discussion guide that frames the issue and presents a range of viewpoints** to help spark the discussion while keeping it even-handed.

Some of the officers who took part were a little worried that the circle would turn into a shouting match. But once the participants began to see that they all had some of the same hopes and concerns, they began to form a bond. "At first they vented a lot – they definitely weren't intimidated – but then they got to know me, too," says Officer Brian Ross. "Shortly thereafter I started to get calls from them, asking questions, giving me information I needed." Patricia Webb, who serves on the resident council for the Schaeffer Village public housing development, says, "The circles have done wonderful things. They showed neighbors and the police that they could work together."

At the conclusion of the circles, Aljuwani and Giammaresi held a large-group meeting, called an "action forum," to allow participants to share the action ideas they had generated. During the forum, some people who had not attended the study circles peppered Giammaresi with questions and complaints about past police practices. Giammaresi defused the situation by calmly acknowledging some of the criticisms and explaining how the department was addressing them through the study circle project. Aljuwani's description of the actions taken by neighborhood groups in partnership with the police also helped turn the frustration into optimism.

From talk to action

The initial round of circles produced results that are typical of democratic organizing efforts. First, rank-and-file officers established better relationships, and a higher level of trust, with the residents of the neighborhoods they patrol. Second, residents and community organizations realized there were significant ways they could contribute to crime prevention. Third, the circles affected police policy at a number of levels.

In one neighborhood with several halfway houses for the mentally ill, police officers and small-business owners had complained about ongoing disturbances. In this circle, people discussed how business owners often called the police about incidents involving mentally ill people. They also pointed out that officers are not trained to handle such situations. A state legislator, the director of mental health services for the county, and several peer leaders who had successfully battled mental illness attended the circle. As a result of their collaboration, a trained emergency response team is now on call for every neighborhood in the city. For Aljuwani, this outcome illustrates how "the community can get better at dealing with situations that shouldn't really require the police."

In two other neighborhoods, residents and police officers shared their concerns about local businesses that weren't doing their part to prevent crime – the places were poorly lit, and lacked adequate security. The business owners participating in those discussions pledged to work with residents and police to improve security, including hiring private guards.

Using the slogan, "Putting the Neighbor back in the 'Hood,'" one circle promoted stronger police-neighborhood communication, an end to racial profiling, and a number of new anti-crime measures. The group, which was organized by a block club and Masjid-Nu'Man, a local Nation of Islam community, initiated a citizen effort to identify suspicious "people hanging out on corners," and cooperates with police in monitoring possible criminal activity.

In many of the discussions, citizens got their first chance to form relationships with police lieutenants and inspectors. These middle-ranking officers make some of the most important decisions about how the department operates and how community policing is administered. "They're the ones who make things happen," says Aljuwani, "but the block clubs just hadn't connected with them before." "In the past, lieutenants and inspectors didn't have a big role in terms of interacting with residents," says Giammaresi, "but they are critical for helping the department and the community work together successfully."

The need for more officers on the street was a common theme in all the groups. Despite budget shortages and a threatened strike by the police union, Giammaresi has made significant progress on this front. In the summer of 2001, for the first time, the entire graduating class of Buffalo's Police Academy spent its first tour of duty walking the beat instead of sitting in patrol cars. Giammaresi has also begun a pilot "Park and Walk" program in South Buffalo, where police officers park their patrol cars for part of the day to visit all the businesses and organizations in the neighborhood.

As the program unfolded, Aljuwani and Giammaresi began to see the terms of a new bargain at work. Citizens and community organizations were offering their support, resources, and volunteer time in exchange for the opportunity to give meaningful input into law enforcement policy. Unlike most collaborations, this trade was being made at every level of the system: the residents of a street with the cop on their beat, the block clubs with the lieutenants and inspectors, the citizens with the police department as a whole. Partnerships were forming all the way along the line.

Making it sustainable

The lessons in Buffalo embody some of the main strengths of democratic organizing: inclusiveness, diversity, face-to-face dialogue, shared decision-making, and shared action. To

move from a temporary exercise to more democratic system of crime prevention, it will be important to embed these principles into the way that block clubs, neighborhood associations, and police departments operate. Neighborhood groups need to be able to engage larger numbers of people, in regular meetings that employ small-group breakout discussions where people can make connections and feel heard. Raising the level of participation can help raise each neighborhood's capacity for action, and give police officers and other public employees a more regular way to connect with neighborhood residents.

One of the keys to involving more people in regular neighborhood meetings is giving them additional reasons to participate. Many organizers recruit by appealing to people's desire to see a change on a public issue – in this case, crime and policing. But if neighborhood meetings can become more social occasions as well, places where residents can meet their friends and bring their kids, they can attract more and more people.

Finally, sustaining this level of dialogue and action depends on how effectively the meetings lead to action and change. That means that citizen discussions must have an impact on police department policy. Leaders also need to communicate to participants how policies changed, and how their input made a difference. They must look for ways to connect fledgling neighborhood action groups with the information, public employees, and decision makers needed to help citizens implement their ideas.

It isn't quite clear where this next stage of civic experimentation will take us. This is partly because we are relying on citizens – block club leaders, police officers, residents – to help answer some of the questions about how to establish a system that moves beyond community policing. There probably won't be any master plans handed down from above; organizers like Shakoor Aljuwani and Jamie Giammaresi will have to encourage neighborhood-level innovations and try to support the ideas that work. They do have a clear sense of the principles that have aided them so far; dialogues that take place on the neighborhood's terms, with the participation of the police, will involve more people, yield better input to police policy, and generate greater citizen commitment to action. The core values of participation, joint decision-making, and shared action aren't just improvements to the philosophy of community policing; they represent the next step in the development of law enforcement.

The Buffalo organizers also have a clear sense of the long-term goal they are moving toward, and Giammaresi has a straightforward way of putting it: "Overall, we feel we're establishing better processes for police and community to solve problems."

FOCUS ON MEMBERS - TEN YEARS IN JSA

By Bill Davis

I think it was ten years ago (it could have been eleven) that I traveled to St. Anselms in Manchester, NH, to learn more about the too-sensible-to-be-true potential of restorative justice. I had been to New Zealand and, thanks to Judge Fred McElroy, seen the youth justice practices there and come home reeling. Could such simplicity, clarity and respect for conflict resolution in criminal justice be possible? Howard Zehr was a leading figure at the gathering in Manchester. He had been to New Zealand many times, even advising NZ practitioners about the implications of what they had been doing in youth justice since 1989 (and are still doing today). Eight years later, I decided that it wasn't possible – at least in Maine, either at the youth or (certainly not) adult levels.

I had been teaching for forty years at that point, twenty-nine in youth corrections in Maine. The Maine Council of Churches tried hard to introduce restorative justice principles and practices in the state, and I did what I could to help. Ultimately restorative justice was coopted by the system and drained of its power to the stakeholders (victims, offenders, community), as I saw it. But I couldn't forget or abandon

what it represents: a true view of the effects of criminal offending, "harm," to the victims, families of both victims and offenders, communities, and offenders themselves. Practical and justified ways to address the harm (attend to the victim, stop the offending, address the personal and community causes). Remedy what can be remedied, impose restrictions appropriate to fixing the harm, stopping the offending and, as Dorothy Day said, making it easier for people to be good.

Since the criminal justice system in America seems not to be ready to absorb such good sense, I have decided to take the restorative philosophy to a country more deserving. I am devoting my efforts to infuse some restorative practices in Haiti by supporting a grass-roots project in Port-au-Prince – developing a school, food and neighborhood self-help program to make it easier for natives of Jacquet in Haiti to be good. With a little help from their friends here in the States and from the United Nations, the project is flourishing and expanding to other neighborhoods in Port-au-Prince. Much of my motivation and even a little skill has resulted from my JSA contacts and,

especially, the conferences with old friends and always new ones.

BELONGING

*A Message from Lois Presser,
Membership Chair*

Lately I've been reassessing all of the things that I used to take for granted on personal, spiritual, and intellectual fronts. I mean mesmerizing new experiments in thinking and living! Along these lines, I was contemplating the word "belong" the other day. I realized that "belong" contains within it a certain message about power. When people ask "Who does this cat belong to?" they imply a particular power relation: the creature taken to be less powerful always belongs to the creature taken to be more powerful. Surely it would seem strange – or in any case funny – to ask me "Do you belong to a cat?" or (as a follow-up) "What cat do you belong to?" Likewise, the pen belongs to me, and how dare anyone imply that I belong to a pen?! I'm a human; that's a pen, a lesser sort of object.

In the spirit of that discovery about "belonging" and "power," I have decided that I do not belong to this organization, to JSA. After all, JSA is not more powerful than I. Nor am I more powerful than JSA, but for the sake of thinking in a new way, I am trying on the idea that JSA belongs to me. And JSA belongs to you.

We have a few lifetime members of JSA. These are folks who have- money: just kidding. These are folks who have decided that JSA belongs to them and will always belong to them, for as long as they live. I love thinking about that. Our lifetime members have essentially assimilated JSA into who they are. Whatever else they are, they are also some part JSA.

I hope you join JSA if you never have, or renew your membership, or consider a lifetime membership if you possibly can. Make JSA a part of you.

Lo Presser, Membership Chair

THE JUSTICE STUDIES ASSOCIATION'S PUBLICATION, JUSTITIA, IS IN NEED OF AN EDITOR!

To learn about this exciting volunteer opportunity, please read below:

Justitia EDITOR RESPONSIBILITIES

Justitia is the official publication of the Justice Studies Association (JSA). Historically one edition has been published annually for the past 7 years. *Justitia* provides information to the JSA membership; relaying the activities of the association and providing a forum for an open exchange of ideas. The Editor of *Justitia* is responsible for the development of the theme, focus, or approach of each edition. This process involves contacting individuals for articles and collaboratively identifying the topical approach and length of the articles. The Editor works with the leaders of JSA to ensure that

relevant JSA information and news is distributed to the membership. The Editor is also responsible for the layout, printing, and mailing of *Justitia*. Ideally, design, printing and postage costs (\$300-\$500 per issue) will be provided by the institution of the Editor's affiliation.

The *Justitia* Editor position is available after the Fall/Winter 2007 publication.

If you are interested in assuming this volunteer position, please email Susan Krumholz, JSA President skrumholz@umassd.edu

Thank you for your interest!

CALL FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) invites proposals for its 58th Annual Meeting, to be held July 31-August 2, 2008 at The Boston Park Plaza Hotel and Towers, Boston, MA. Theme: **CROSSING BORDERS: ACTIVIST SCHOLARSHIP, GLOBALIZATION, AND SOCIAL JUSTICE.**

Papers or extended abstracts (2-3 page summary of your intended presentation) for presentations at division sponsored sessions must be sent electronically to session organizers no later than January 31, 2008. If your paper does not fit into one of the sessions listed in the Call for Papers, send your submission electronically no later than January 31 to Program Committee Co-Chairs: Hector Delgado, delgadoh@ulv.edu and Wendy Simonds, wsimonds@gsu.edu. Questions relating to the program should be directed to them as well. When sending an e-mail, please place SSSP in the subject line. For further information, visit <http://www.sssp1.org>.

The Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) is recruiting applications for the 2008 Racial/Ethnic Minority Graduate Scholarship. Persons accepted into an accredited doctoral program in any one of the social and/or behavioral sciences who will have attained ABD status by September 1, 2008 are invited to apply for the \$12,000 Racial/Ethnic Minority Graduate Scholarship. Applications are due by and must be received no later than February 1, 2008. Applicants will be notified of the results by July 15, 2008. All applicants must be a current member and a citizen of the United States or permanent resident when applying. For further information and an application, visit <http://www.sssp1.org>. Contact Joya Misra, Chair with all questions (W: 413-545-5969; F: 413-545-0746; misra@soc.umass.edu).

Michele Smith Koontz
Administrative Officer and Meeting Manager
SSSP, 901 McClung Tower,
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
W: 865-689-1531; F: 865-689-1534
<http://www.sssp1.org>

2008 Annual Meeting, July 31-August 2,
The Boston Park Plaza Hotel and Towers,
Boston, MA

POSITIONS AVAILABLE

Women In Distress of Broward County, Inc. in Fort Lauderdale, Florida has 20 Americorps positions available for persons interested in making social change to end domestic and dating violence. Members will

receive a \$11,100 annual living allowance, health coverage, student loan forbearance, extensive leadership development training, career networking opportunities and up to \$4,725 in an education award upon completion of service. You can help imagine a world in which every home is safe and every relationship is healthy! Interested persons should contact Nancy Leve, Director of Volunteer Services, at 954.332.3455 or e-mail nleve@womenindistress.org

Sanzen, continued from page 1
JUSTITIA AND DEMOCRACY

These principles are listed below:

"Governance should be open and accessible."

"Governance composition should reflect the diversity of its constituency."

"Degree of participation in decision-making should be related to the degree that a person is likely to be affected by this decision."

"Decisions should be reached through "informed debate" and dialogue."

"Democratic institutions need to conduct regular, ongoing, and rigorous self-evaluation of how their practices reflect what they "preach" about democratic principles."

"Democratic principles thrive in a soil of social justice and equity."

"All people have an inherent right to participate in the decisions that affect them."

Democracy is an ethos that organizations and people alike must apply to their daily living and work relationships.

I would like to thank Stacey Ussery Tucker, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, for her theoretical analysis of democracy. Also, I would like to thank Matt Leighninger for providing for the readership a case study relating to the application of democratic governance. Matt has recently published **The Next Form of Democracy**, Vanderbilt University Press (www.vanderbiltuniversitypress.com) and is the Executive Director of the Deliberative Democracy Consortium, and Senior Associate of the Study Circle Resource Center.

This is my last edition as editor of **Justitia** after seven years. I was honored to have been asked to get **Justitia** off the ground and I set as a goal to develop a newsletter that is worthy of the membership of JSA. It is time, however, for another to edit **Justitia**. Such change will only enhance the quality of the newsletter for JSA members by providing different insights and perspectives in the continuing evolution of **Justitia**.

What I need to do is say thank you to a great group of people who were very supportive in assisting me in the publication of **Justitia**. I wish to thank all of the authors of articles and other contributors over the years whose insights made **Justitia** what it is today. I especially need to thank my colleagues at HVCC and the HVCC administration. I can't say thank you enough to Ann Geisendorfer, Criminal Justice Department Chair, for her moral and financial support and to John Heiser for his wonderful assistance in the design and layout of **Justitia**. I owe a big thank you to Debbie Conners and Betty Roberti in the college Print Shop, both of whom have been super in that **Justitia** would just be on their doorstep and an hour later they had it back to me for distribution. Also, Eric Bryant was kind enough to proof read every edition to ensure the quality of the publication. And one can't forget family, my wife, Sheila Mahan, and her Dad Bill and my friend John Roy who proof read **Justitia**. All were very helpful and supportive of my efforts relating to **Justitia** and JSA.

Peter Sanzen

Tucker, continued from page 3

receiving the 'benefits' of these policies involved in developing them? If feminist standpoint theory looks at the ways in which identities and social locations shape the production of knowledge and seeks to empower women and minorities to analyze one's own standpoint and its implications, why can't such a theory apply to any marginalized or underrepresented group within our society?

Theory, though useful as a framework for identifying reality, must inevitably produce action. "Therefore," bell hooks says, "it is necessarily a struggle to eradicate the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels as well as a commitment to reorganizing society so that the self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expansion, and material desires"^{xi} (52). Without a real voice for the underprivileged, the elites will

continue to make decisions and structure the economy to benefit themselves and other elites. Standpoint theory provides a point of intersection between theory and empowerment. Once the marginalized have been legitimized as contributing to the whole of knowledge, they can begin to act once again on behalf of their own material interests (and in the interests of other oppressed groups) and will no longer be forced to accept only the dominant ideology as "truth."

References

ⁱ Graubard, Stephen R. *The Dictionary of the History of Ideas*. Maintained by: The Electronic Text Center - University of Virginia Library. Charlottesville: the Gale Group, 2003.
<http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/cgi-local/DHI/dhi.cgi?id=dv1-78>

ⁱⁱ Hicks, Alexander and Gosta Epsing-Anderson. "Comparative and Historical Studies of Public Policy and the Welfare State," From *The Handbook of Political Sociology*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.

ⁱⁱⁱ Schumpeter, Joseph A. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. 3rd ed. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1950.

^{iv} Robinson, William I. "Globalization, the world system, and 'democracy promotion' in U.S. foreign policy," *Theory and Society*. 25, 1996: 615-665.

^v Speer, Paul W. "INTRAPERSONAL AND INTERACTIONAL EMPOWERMENT: IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY", *JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY*, Vol. 28, 1, 2000: 51-61.

^{vi} Gutierrez, Lorraine, et al. "Understanding Empowerment Practice: Building on Practitioner-Based Knowledge," *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*. November 1995: pps. 534-542.

^{vii} Benton, Ted and Ian Craib. 2001. *Philosophy of Social Science: The Philosophical Foundations of Social Thought*. New York: PALGRAVE.

^{viii} Harding, Sandra. Winter 2004. "A Socially Relevant Philosophy of Science? Resources from Standpoint Theory's Controversiality." *Hypatia* 19, 1: 25-47. Available: Project MUSE.

^{ix} Kramarae, Cheris. 2004. "Women as a Muted Group" Pp. 19-26 in *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*, edited by Karen A. Foss, Sonja J. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

^x *Ibid.*

^{xi} Hooks, Bell. 2004. "Feminism: A Movement to End Sexist Oppression" Pp. 47-56 and "Feminist Politicization: A Comment" Pp. 57-62 in *Readings in Feminist Rhetorical Theory*, edited by Karen A. Foss, Sonja J. Foss, and Cindy L. Griffin. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stacey U. Tucker is currently pursuing a PhD in Sociology at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Her interests are in structural causes of poverty, specifically in the effects of globalization and public policy on poverty; conceptions of democracy; and the relationship of religion to political orientation. She is also teaching a course at UT called Social Justice and Social Change, which covers topics such as stratification and social justice in historic and contemporary settings.

After receiving a Master's Degree in Planning (Urban and Regional Planning, emphasis in Economic Development Planning) from UTK in 2004, Stacey worked as a Planner for Bradley County, TN. She obtained a B.A. in Intercultural Studies and Sociology from Lee University in 2001. Email: sussery@utk.edu.

JUSTICE STUDIES ASSOCIATION 9TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY

– *June 4-7, 2008* –

Democracy, How?

Justice and Democracy in 2008

The 2008 JSA conference theme “Democracy, How?” calls for papers to explore how to come about democracy in a just way, while also grappling with the contradictions within modern democracies.

The divide between the liberal democratic ideal on the one hand and its reality on the other has created many challenges for intellectuals committed to the concept of democracy. Modern democracy has come to represent both the idea of the power of the people and the often contradictory idea of legally guaranteed individual rights and liberties. (How) Can the concept of democracy be a viable form of social organization today? What are the predicaments faced by democracy as both ideal and concrete form of social organization today? Is a just democracy possible? What kind of democracy do we need to work towards social justice?

Themed panels and individual papers could focus on exploring the conference theme of democracy and justice, with special attention to discussion inspired by, but not limited to, any of the following topics:

Grassroots Democracy: Whose Democracy Is It Anyway?
Democracy, Mass Media, and Alternative Media
Democratic Expressions and Experiments
Democracy and Peacemaking in Everyday Life
Global Governance and Democracy
Conquest, Empire, Imperialism, War, and the Globalization of Democracy
Restorative Justice and Democracy
The 2008 Presidential Election and Democracy

Other topics might address issues of democracy and youth, the environment, law or education.

*We encourage broad participation by activists, academics and mindful thinkers.
All proposals are welcome.*

**Please send your paper/panel idea, along with a 200 word abstract,
to the Programme Chairs Christina Braid and Sabine Milz at
democracyhow@gmail.com.**

Submissions must be received no later than March 31, 2008.