

Editorial

Hello everyone,

A very warm welcome to the first edition of the EFRJ Newsletter for 2013. You would have received notification in December of our intention to move to an electronic format and this is our first edition that has been distributed in this way. We would be keen to hear your thoughts on this, so please feel free to get in touch with me at Editor@Euforumrj.org. I would also encourage you to email me with any thoughts or responses that you might have to the articles that have been written in this edition as we would like to develop a new feature which highlights your reactions or feedback on other members' work. Furthermore, any ideas that you may have about the structure or content of the newsletter, any offers to contribute to it in the form of written articles and information about events would be very welcomed. We hope that this year will begin a greater involvement of our readership with the editorial board and other readers.

The first edition is larger than usual which has been possible due to its electronic form and contains three new features that will be present in all editions. We begin with our first new feature which targets senior academic staff to review the state of the field with a contribution that draws on their own work. Our first contributor is Professor Harry Blagg who has recently left Western Australia to take up a post at Plymouth University in England. He provides an interesting contribution which talks about the challenges to successfully implementing restorative justice. We are very

grateful to Professor Blagg for taking the time to write something for us.

Our second contribution is focused on discussing policy developments in restorative justice. This has been written for us by Virginia Domingo de la Fuente who reports on the intentions of the Ministry of Justice in Spain to develop a statute for victims of crime. Within her article, she reflects not only on the challenges of the policy-making process, but also on the resistance to restorative justice within Spain and the role that her organization — Victim-Offender Mediation Service in Castilla and Leon — has played in pushing the issue onto the national agenda. Again, we are grateful to Virginia for taking the time to provide insight on restorative justice in her country.

Our final feature is on the findings of a research project. This contribution was written by Ricarda Lummer who reflects on the diverse use of restorative justice in their cross-comparative project and the specific challenges, but also the approach to overcome them with their project partners. It appears that the project was a great success with many beneficial outcomes being reported. My sincere thanks go to Ricarda for providing such an interesting contribution.

I look forward to receiving any thoughts, advice or contributions over the next coming months.

With very best wishes,

Dr Kerry Clamp

Chair of the Editorial Board

Editor@euforumrj.org

Restorative justice in a crowded market place of ideas: challenges and opportunities for relevant practice in the coming years

Restorative justice has had a significant impact on how many people now conceive of justice in the contemporary world. It offers an important counter-weight to traditional retributive notions of justice, and opens up fresh channels for

dialogue and debate about what justice means, how it can be achieved for all parties involved in conflict, and how hitherto excluded parties (such as indirect victims and communities) can have their voices heard.

Importantly, RJ has demonstrated that justice is something that can be delivered by non-professionals in a multiplicity of contexts, not just within the formal justice system. It has also taken us beyond traditional notions of victim/offender mediation by demonstrating that responsibility for criminal events lies with offenders: victims should not be duressed into sharing responsibility for harms inflicted on them. In doing so, however, it has also challenged the dominant perception that victims are only interested in vengeance and retribution, demonstrating that many are satisfied by a sincere apology, a face-to-face explanation and/or punishments (such as community service) that translate a bad event into a public good.

Yet, there is a sense in which RJ has failed to live up to its early promise: perhaps because the promise itself was unrealistic and failed to grasp the profound hold narratives of retribution and punishment have upon the popular consciousness (and collective unconscious); or because populist law and order politics continue to create anxiety and a climate of fear. What Jonathan Simon (2001) referred to as the 'punitive turn' in correctional policies may have blunted the reforming edge typified by RJ. In this climate, RJ has had to co-exist with, and in many respects remain subordinate to, strategies designed to allay popular anxieties about becoming a victim of crime, fuelled by visceral media generated moral panics about rising rates of crime and violence, that no rational, 'evidence based' arguments to the contrary can wholly displace.

A crowded marketplace

There have been other challenges to RJ too, and these have been posed, not by the ravings of the popular media, but by proponents of other radical reform agendas, either in the form of entirely new systems of adjudication, censure and redress, or through the significant reform to existing systems and networks of justice. RJ is now operating in a crowded market place and no longer enjoys a monopoly of the language of transformational change and reform. In this piece I intend to look at number of justice innovations and how they pose challenges for RJ, as well as opening up new pathways for collaboration and partnership. The areas I have chosen are: problem oriented courts and the philosophy of therapeutic jurisprudence; transitional justice, and Indigenous justice. Before doing so, a few brief words about my own position.

From transformation to co-option?

My own interest in RJ began in the early 1990s in Australia, but I was involved in research, back in the UK in the 1980s, focused on emerging forms of victim/offender mediation and reparation in both the youth and adult justice systems, as they were about to morph into restorative justice. I consider myself to

be an advocate for restorative solutions, but this advocacy is tempered by a belief that RJ cannot, on its own, claim to have the answers to the many contemporary conflicts, crimes and harms, and that it should build alliances with other movements without attempting to claim ownership over them, or assume its fundamental precepts are relevant in all instances. Furthermore, despite lofty ambitions to transform the way we do justice, in many societies RJ has tended to be employed by lower level functionaries in the police and youth justice to deal with minor juvenile crime. Promoted as a transformational paradigm, RJ has been safely co-opted onto the margins of the system it sought to transform.

Problem oriented courts and therapeutic justice

Innovations such as Problem Oriented Courts (POCs) and therapeutic jurisprudence (TJ) have restored a belief in some quarters that the courts (so often viewed as a key part of the problem for RJ enthusiasts) can act as lead agents of change, rather than as just a Plan B when RJ fails. There has been growing interest in developing what King et al. (2009) call 'non-adversarial' forms of court based justice, and exploring the potential for courts to take a lead role in resolving the underlying issues that ensure repeated contact with the justice system for particular groups. Non-adversarialism presents a radical challenge to the ways, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, we imagine the routine dispensation of justice: away from a bruising gladiatorial struggle to establish guilt or innocence, towards a collaborative enterprise concerned with healing harms and reintegrating offenders. POCs, according to Berman and Feinblatt (2001), 'employ the authority of the courts to address the underlying problems of individual litigants, the structural problems of the justice system, and the social problems of communities.' While Winick (1997, 23) describes therapeutic jurisprudence as drawing on 'the knowledge, theories, and insights of the mental health and related disciplines' on the premise that 'the law itself can be seen to function as a kind of therapists or therapeutic agent.'

There are clear points of synergy here connecting problem-oriented courts, therapeutic jurisprudence and restorative justice (Braithwaite, 2002), but they differ in crucial respects. The former retain faith in the authority of the law and courts to deliver change, while RJ adopts an essentially subversive stance in relation to existing justice institutions and seeks to dethrone judicial sovereignty: privileging, instead, the communal ownership of conflict 'stolen' by the state, in Nils Christie's (1977) well-circulated phrase.

Transitional justice

Also, on a global stage, the emergence of transitional justice — while confirming some elements of the RJ project (e.g. reconciliation between parties is possible, ordinary people can take a lead in bringing about justice) — also raises serious doubts about the appropriateness of RJ philosophy, with its focus on forgiveness and victim-offender reconciliation, in situations of extreme conflict, because the seriousness, longevity and intensity of the crimes may lead victims to seek retribution and significant forms of reparation. Furthermore, solutions to state-sponsored crime may involve structural and systemic change, the creation of a new civil society, the generation of new legal and civil norms, democratization, and new economic structures and opportunities, processes which have tended to lie outside the sphere of RJ.

RJ has emerged in societies where criminal events occur against a backdrop of (relative) normality, while transitional justice usually operates in contexts shaped by massive human rights violations, war and genocide. Participants in RJ ceremonies (the family conference, the face to face meeting between victim and offender) may return to a world normalized by the encounter — they may look forward to getting on with their lives. Post-conflict societies are often typified by large-scale destruction, social upheaval and anomie: a world ‘out of joint,’ unlikely to be set right without significant investment. Some of these tensions emerged during South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission, where Archbishop Desmond Tutu succeeded in placing restorative justice at the heart of the proceedings. However, for every voice like Desmond Tutu, preaching forgiveness and reconciliation, there were many others who could not forgive those who had perpetrated serious crimes, and who challenged requests for amnesty. South African social movements such as Khulumani,¹ with the support of global NGO the International Centre for Transitional Justice,² are challenging many of the outcomes of the TRC on the basis that the, so called, restorative outcomes allowed murderers and torturers to walk free, with the complicity of a post-apartheid government intent on burying the past as soon as possible.

Transitional justice recognizes the profound trauma created by state crimes, ethnic cleansing and state sanctioned rape. Recent critical writing on TJ (see Green and Ward, 2004; Stanley and McCulloch, 2013) suggests that transitioning towards stable democracy demands long-term nation building, complemented by a vibrant civil society, and may require bringing powerful state actors to account, and might involve significant elements of retributive justice (Uprimny and Saffon, 2007). It is ironic, but in a number of respects very telling, that in South Africa and many other parts of

Africa, South America and Asia, the victims of crimes of the powerful (usually the poor and oppressed) are being asked, with the support of western powers, to forgive and forget in the name of justice, while the retributive justice systems of these societies (western, African etc.) continue to incarcerate and grind down the poor and marginalised in the name of victims of crime.

Indigenous justice

In a book about Australia’s Indigenous people and justice (Blagg, 2008), I wrote a chapter called ‘Restorative Justice: A Good Idea Whose Time has Gone?’ in which I suggested that, in relation to Indigenous people at least, RJ should not claim to have some privileged status, in terms of either being able to articulate Indigenous grievances, or providing a vehicle for resolving them. Indeed, I maintained that, in a number of crucial respects, Australian models of RJ (re-packaged and de-radicalized versions of the models being developed in New Zealand at that time) furthered white interests and entrenched white privilege, because they reinforced police powers over Indigenous people (the police being the principal gate-keepers and custodians of RJ) and deflected attention away from matters of grave interest to Aboriginal Australians, particularly the recognition of their own law and culture. Offering RJ to Indigenous people was no alternative to land rights and acknowledging that Australia was home to two systems of law, not one.

RJ could not deal satisfactorily with Indigenous concerns about Aboriginal deaths in custody or the historical role played by the police and the justice system in dispossessing them: the justice system has not been a neutral arena, but a highly contested and politicized realm, that has historically supported white annexation of Indigenous lands and legitimated the destruction of Indigenous culture. The complex arena of Indigenous justice needs to be approached by RJ practitioners cautiously and with a degree of humility — it cannot be assumed a priori that RJ has the answers, although, through dialogue with Indigenous people, we may begin to generate the right questions.

The complex arena of Indigenous justice needs to be approached by RJ practitioners cautiously and with a degree of humility — it cannot be assumed a priori that RJ has the answers, although, through dialogue with Indigenous people, we may begin to generate the right questions. Critics such as Daly (2002) and Cunneen (1997) have done much to challenge the notion that RJ (at least as it is practiced by white justice agencies) is not an Indigenous practice: it arrives in Indigenous communities as part of the familiar wagon train of white laws, policies and practices, in a top down fashion. Furthermore, it operates with a highly re-

¹<http://www.khulumani.net/>

²<http://www.ictj.org/our-work/regions-and-countries/south-africa>

stricted notion of victims and offenders, often refusing to acknowledge the extent to which Indigenous young offenders are themselves amongst the most victimised section of society, with histories of abuse and neglect, from within their own communities and from western structures of power and control. Indigenous people in Australia have tended, in any case, to miss out on access to restorative justice conferencing because they are more likely to be arrested, remanded in custody, and placed before the courts than Non-Indigenous people, which excludes them from diversionary processes. Similar problems beset the creation of restorative justice programs in the European context. Those most at risk of becoming enmeshed in the justice system are usually the most marginalised communities, with little stake in conformity. What is required in these instances is that RJ work in collaboration with initiatives designed to build social and cultural capital, increase social participation, reduce social exclusion and build bridges between cultures, as well as create pressure for reform to the justice system that reduces its tendency to label and oppress minority groups. This would make RJ appear less like an instrument of what many outsiders see as an oppressive and distant justice.

A relevant practice in the coming years

The future of restorative justice remains a topic of robust discussion. A recent debate between Chris Cunneen and Carolyn Hoyle (Cunneen and Hoyle, 2010), for example, illustrates the divergence of opinion, with Cunneen maintaining that, as currently practised, RJ reinforces existing structural inequalities and injustices, while Hoyle asserts, to the contrary, that RJ retains capacity to give a voice to victims, reintegrate offenders and restore community cohesion. Both would agree that, for RJ to be relevant in contemporary Europe, as we drift further into austerity and the politics of blame and cruelty (hate crimes against perceived ‘outsiders’; the demonisation of immigrants, the young, people on welfare, and ethnic minorities), it must develop a philosophy and practice capable of connecting RJ with social justice. To be relevant on the global stage it needs to articulate a set of practices that position RJ alongside those growing demands for post-colonial justice, capable of dealing with the multi-faceted nature of crimes against humanity and, at the same time, resist pressures to be simply a cog in an unreformed punishment machine.

Professor Harry Blagg

Plymouth University

harry.blagg@plymouth.ac.uk

References

- Berman, G. and J. Feinblatt (2001, April). Problem solving courts: a brief primer. *Law and Policy* 23(2), 125–140.
- Blagg, H. (2008). *Crime, aboriginality and the decolonisation of justice*. Annandale NSW: Hawkins Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2002). Restorative justice and therapeutic jurisprudence. *Criminal Law Bulletin* 38(2), 244–262.
- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology* 17(1), 1–15.
- Cunneen, C. (1997, December). Community conferencing and the fiction of indigenous control. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 30(3), 292–311.
- Cunneen, C. and C. Hoyle (2010). *Debating restorative justice*. Oxford: Hart.
- Daly, K. (2002, January). Restorative justice: the real story. *Punishment & Society* 4(1), 55–79.
- Green, P. and T. Ward (2004). *State crime: governments, violence and corruption*. London: Pluto.
- King, M., A. Freiberg, B. Batagol, and R. Hyams (2009). *Non-adversarial justice*. Annandale, NSW: The Federation Press.
- Simon, J. (2001). Entitlement to cruelty: neo-liberalism and the punitive mentality in the United States. In K. Stenson and R. R. Sullivan (Eds.), *Crime, risk and justice: the politics of crime control in liberal democracies*, pp. 125–143. Cullompton: Willan.
- Stanley, E. and J. McCulloch (Eds.) (2013). *State crime and resistance*. London: Routledge.
- Uprimny, R. and M. P. Saffon (2007). Transitional justice, restorative justice and reconciliation. Some insights from the Colombian case. ‘[Coming to Terms with Reconciliation](#)’ — [Working Paper Library](#).
- Winick, B. J. (1997). The jurisprudence of therapeutic jurisprudence. *Psychology, Public Policy and Law* 3, 184–187.

Implementing the New Directive and Restorative Justice in Spain

Restorative justice has been largely undeveloped in Spain until recently. There is very little regulation on the subject; only the juvenile jurisdiction explicitly contains a reference to victim-offender mediation.

There are some victim-offender mediation pilot projects for adults in different parts of Spain, in cooperation with the General Council of the Judiciary and/or the Prosecutors Office but with different economic and legal support and with a different approach, creating insecurity among those who work in this area and also for citizens. This insecurity is the result of misconceptions about what restorative justice is (most assume that it is the same as criminal mediation) and how it should be used (speeding up justice as the main objective of restorative justice).

However, while victim offender mediation is a tool of restorative justice it is not considered the most restorative one, because it does not include indirect victims such as the community.

Restorative justice is not a process itself but rather a set of guiding principles and values, a framework for identifying and addressing harms and obligations. As Howard Zehr explains, it is more encompassing than specific encounter models. Furthermore, in talking about 'speeding up' justice, the primary purpose of restorative justice in improving the attention to the needs of victims and promoting the reparation of the damage as a way to rehabilitate offenders is overlooked.

The priority of the Ministry of Justice, before the adoption of the new Directive, was to develop a statute of victims' rights. The purpose of this approach was to create formal recognition of victims' rights and needs, regardless of the offence suffered, and to provide them with a more central role within the criminal justice process. Although at first restorative justice was not mentioned, it could be argued that the creation of this statute for victims is restorative because it seeks to address the needs of victims, ensure that these needs are heard and informed, and embraces the principal that victims should have a stake in the resolution of their own offences. While the statute has not yet been finalised, these benefits of restorative justice are the objectives to be mentioned as essential in the statute of victims.

Following the adoption of the Directive 2012/29/UE of the Parliament and the Council of 25 October 2012 laying down minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, the desire of the Ministry of justice is that it can be incorporated into our law as soon as possible specifically in the statute of victims. Also although this Directive does not explicitly require the regulation of restorative justice, the Ministry has wisely seen the need and the importance of including this as a way to help and take care

for people who suffer crime and their families, if they require it. After a meeting with the Secretary of State for Justice, the victim-offender mediation service I coordinate has made various reports in which in addition to thanking the ministry for its commitment, we try to establish the minimum content which should be included in the statute of victims about this restorative justice.

We consider very important (and we have said this to the Ministry of Justice) that the statute of victims should include a broad definition of restorative justice and of victims. While victim-offender mediation, by tradition, is the best known and used tool, we argue that other restorative justice processes should be included. It is interesting that we can speak about restorative processes such as mediation, circles and conferencing, but we also need to ensure that the legal rules, such as this statute of victims and the future code of criminal procedure, will be built and adopted with a restorative approach so as to be close to more humane legal standards, which can take into account the 'voice' of the victims, providing care for the needs of the victims and rehabilitation of the offender to avoid recidivism. We want for Spain a criminal justice with a really restorative approach.

Adopting a broad definition of victims is thought to be important because by only recognising direct victims, secondary and indirect victims will be excluded which limits the amount of assistance that can be provided to them. It is also important to include in this law rights for victims, minimum requirements to access to these restorative processes, and some essential features such as: free and informed consent of the victim, the assumption of responsibility by the offender and that these services will provide restorative justice free of charge for any victim of any crime regardless of where they have suffered the crime. These services will be public, provided by Government of Spain or the voluntary sector free for citizens and with economic support of the government. This is a very similar approach that currently takes place in the several services throughout Spain, such as the one I coordinate in Castilla and Leon. We urged the Ministry of Justice to accept that restorative justice is not so dangerous as to need extreme caution. On the contrary this justice prevents secondary victimization and promotes the rights of the victims (that this Directive contemplates and that will be translated in Spain in the statute of victims) and take care of those who suffer the crimes directly or indirectly in a more effective and satisfactory way.

Spain has an obsolete code of criminal procedure from the 19th century and now finally a new one is going to be adopted. It should of course be adapted to the needs and realities of the new century, with in-

interesting innovations such as the incorporation of the principle of opportunity (discretionary prosecution) in certain cases. Taking advantage of this innovation in criminal justice in Spain is the only way in which this new code of criminal procedure can include other important aspects of restorative justice such as the process itself, what agreements should contain, who these restorative justice services will depend on, what crimes would be eligible and procedural time of application in addition to the legal consequences for the offender who takes part in these processes. So as not to cause social alarm and to enable society, which very often asks for tougher penalties, to understand restorative justice, the ideal is that it is made clear that the offender's participation in restorative justice processes involves no legal benefits except where the law provides for mitigating the reparation of the damage.

To start it is logical, without excluding or banning them, not to use restorative processes in more serious crimes, although it is not advisable to limit them to only the slightest infractions, which in Spain, we call fouts. This is because restorative justice is more effective in more serious crimes and we really would undermine the principle of equality in our Constitution, if we say that a victim of a very serious crime cannot take part in this restorative justice process. This can also

potentially lead to secondary victimization. In this respect, we are sure that the legislature will not include restorative justice only for minor offences. The new Penal Code, which has already been presented and will take effect in a short time, has rightly removed some less serious offences out of the criminal law, some will become crimes and others will cease to be in the criminal sphere.

It is a time of optimism because of the commitment of the Ministry of Justice to revolutionize the criminal justice with pioneering reforms including the interest in restorative justice and the recognition of the rights of the victims, in addition to the new Directive that will give further impetus to these good intentions. We have high expectations because the Ministry of Justice are taking into account the recommendations of the experts in Restorative Justice, to achieve a more effective law (statute) regarding for victims, their rights and restorative justice.

Virginia Domingo de la Fuente

Coordinator of the Victim-Offender Mediation Service in Castilla and Leon,
President of the Scientific Society of Restorative Justice
International Consultant on Restorative Justice
Email: virsunday@terra.es

Improving Knowledge and Practice of Restorative Justice

This two-year European Union funded project³ began in October 2010 and sought to

- a) improve knowledge of restorative justice,
- b) identify effective methods and procedures, and
- c) improve their implementation through an action research approach.

The project was promoted by the Schleswig-Holstein Association for Social Responsibility in Criminal Justice, Victim and Offender Treatment. Alongside Kiel University of Applied Sciences and the Ministry of Justice in Schleswig-Holstein, the project was supported by partners in the UK (Thames Valley Probation), Estonia (Baltic Institute of Crime Prevention and Rehabilitation) and Hungary (Justice Service of Ministry of Public Administration and Justice). The European Forum and the Centre Européen de Probation (CEP) provided their expertise and supported the dissemination process as associate partners.

To achieve these objectives, three international conferences were held in Kiel, Tallinn and Oxford. The first conference in Kiel helped to summarise the *status quo* of restorative justice in the partner countries and initiated a great collaborative two year process. Whereas the second conference in Tallinn concentrated on victims in restorative justice only, the third conference in Oxford concluded with a rather general focus on best practices and cooperation. In terms of the project's action research approach, study visits were carried out and organised around the three conferences in order to inform practitioner exchange. The observations made as part of the study visits were helpful in learning about how other jurisdictions approached restorative justice which further encouraged reflection on the procedures and techniques applied in one's own country. As a result of study visits to Germany, Emerson (cited in Lummer et al., 2012, 168) reflected:

The UK observers were extremely impressed with the Schleswig-Holstein victim compensation fund. This fund, which enabled the offender to borrow money

³JUST/2009/JPEN/AG/0641-30-CE-0369593/00-47 — With the financial support from JUST/JPEN/2009 Programme of the European Union.

from the state to compensate the victim, provides a solution to a problem in the UK, whereby courts order offenders to pay compensation to victims and the offender fails to pay, or does so over a very long period of time. This can leave the victim angry with the criminal justice system and out of pocket. UK participants have proposed this approach to the UK Government via consultation processes.

Apart from the positive effects that these observations had on the motivation and knowledge of individual practitioners, it allowed for better comparison of best practice amongst the participating countries. Here, however, the different use of terminology was increasingly problematic. Identical terms used for different RJ-methods and procedures in the partner countries and similar methods being given different names created difficulties in terms of communicating with each other and conducting subsequent analysis. We therefore developed a heuristic model which proposed a set of terms so that we could speak in one agreed language. According to this model, mediation is a method which implies a constructive, voluntary process to work on problematic situations (Christie, 1977) and resolve conflicts, which not only enables people to participate, but also gives them the possibility of making decisions on their own (ownership principle) and reaching an agreement. Within this methodology, procedures such as victim-offender-mediation (VOM), restorative conferencing or peacemaking circles are included. Often, such procedures cannot be strictly differentiated, as there can be VOMs involving supporters and professionals as well as conferences with only three participants (victim, offender and mediator). VOM may be carried out using a script and a conference with a mediator getting more involved and so forth; thus techniques can be applied independently. Hence, strict differentiation between procedures is not always possible and useful in practice. Rather we felt that procedures should be ranged along a continuum from which a practitioner chooses the most suitable procedure according to the individual case. To some extent this is already applied in practice, for example when participants choose whether or not to bring supporters, as Hopkins (2012, 188) states:

Restorative facilitators are often renowned for their creativity and flexibility. It is important that they do not feel hidebound by a single model of practice or a “script”. Every single situation is different and every participant is different. The key is to identify the needs of each participant and then be creative in adapting the restorative process to address those needs. RJ facilitators need to know about the full range of options, the decision must not be based on

the fact that only one model is offered because it is the only one the available staff can facilitate.

Overall, the project activities have had a great impact on the partner countries. In Schleswig-Holstein, a steering group was initiated by the Ministry of Justice in order to provide a platform for discussion on the further development of RJ, the dissemination of RJ-principles and creating support for this practice. Also, the Third Victim Protection Report for Schleswig-Holstein was published by the Ministry of Justice in October 2011, explicitly mentioning RJ for the first time in an official document in Schleswig-Holstein as well as the EU-project itself. The Coalition contract 2012–2017 between the Social Democratic Party, the Green Party and the South Schleswig Voter Federation says that mediation, particularly for juveniles, shall be supported. Case numbers have also risen significantly in the adult field since 2012, which may be the result of an instruction of the general prosecutor to annotate documents indicating why a case is not being referred to RJ.

In the UK, Thames Valley Probation (TVP) reported that over two hundred people in the UK have been directly involved in learning about the processes of RJ delivery within criminal justice across Europe as a result of this project. The insight into other countries’ practice has led to initiatives towards a greater use of RJ at the pre-sentencing stage. Overwhelming feedback after the Oxford conference indicated that better use should be made of satisfied participants who have undertaken RJ conferences in order to promote RJ. The presence of a UK Government Minister to open the Oxford conference was of great importance to the UK participants. It not only demonstrated support for RJ from a senior level, but also mapped out a way forward for RJ within the criminal justice system. TVP has participated enthusiastically in a government consultation process and advocated a victim fund from which offenders can borrow to compensate victims.

In Hungary, the greatest impact was achieved through strengthened international and national co-operation. At an international level, this project was the first one focusing directly on RJ in which the Justice Service of Ministry of Public Administration and Justice participated. At a national level, the co-operation between two different fields — RJ and Victim Support — has been strengthened by giving common presentations and by summarising the contact points between RJ and Victim Support in Hungary. Based on the positive experiences in the project, the Justice Service of Ministry of Public Administration and Justice made several statements to promote the extension of RJ. The case numbers of VOM are continuously rising with the greatest increase since 2010.

Estonia has also largely profited from the international cooperation. The conference in Tallinn was a

great opportunity to initiate a political debate on RJ. The presence of the Minister of Interior of Estonia gave an opportunity to RJ-advocates and put some pressure on policy-makers to further consider how to implement RJ.

Two visions were central to the project. Firstly, the increase of RJ-case numbers and secondly, the more widely applied variety of restorative justice methods, procedures and techniques. In the final scientific project report, a total of twenty recommendations were formulated, reflecting these visions. For the recommendations, further information on the project results and the project publications, please visit <http://www.rjustice.eu/en/home.html>.

Ricarda Lummer

Research Assistant
Kiel University of Applied Sciences
Sokratesplatz 2

24149 Kiel

Ricarda.lummer@fh-kiel.de

References

- Christie, N. (1977). Conflicts as property. *British Journal of Criminology* 17(1), 1–15.
- Hopkins, B. (2012). Restorative justice and problem-solving. In R. Lummer, M. Nahrwold, and B. Süß (Eds.), *Restorative justice — a victim perspective and issues of co-operation*, Volume 2 of *Soziale Strafrechtspflege*, pp. 170–190. Kiel: Schleswig-Holsteinischer Verband für soziale Strafrechtspflege, Straffälligen und Opferhilfe e.V.
- Lummer, R., O. Hagemann, and M. Nahrwold (Eds.) (2012). *Improving knowledge and practice of restorative justice: scientific report*. Kiel: Kiel University of Applied Sciences.

The Northern Ireland Association of Restorative Practitioners

Thursday 7th February 2013 saw the launch of the Northern Ireland Association of Restorative Practitioners at the Law Department, Queen's University of Belfast.



The aim of the NIARP is to support the personal, vocational and professional development of restorative practitioners by:

- Providing opportunities for practitioners to share and reflect on restorative practices;
- Promote the development of restorative practices in Northern Ireland.

The principles principles of the Association are:

- To enable restorative practitioners to network, share experiences and evidence of effective RP,

reflect and learn in order to provide a high quality and effective service to individuals, families and communities

- To enable people most affected by harmful incidents and conflict to be included and participate in processes which address their needs, resolve conflict and restore relationships.

There was larger-than-anticipated turn out at the launch and attendees were representative of a wide range of backgrounds including:

- Criminal justice — prisons and community
- Community
- Education
- Children and families and
- Training.

The launch was hosted by Shaad Maruna, Professor of Human Development and Justice Studies at Queen's University Belfast Law School. We were honoured to have had contributions from those whom we consider world leaders in this field. These include Martin Wright (Skype, when it worked!), videos from Terry O'Connell and Howard Zehr and written messages from John Braithwaite and Russ Kelly. Their stories and sentiments were thoughtful and inspiring.

Contributions were then also sought from the audience regarding the direction of the NIARP.

Responses included:

- Promotion of Restorative practices in every context
- Victim contributions
- Showcasing the vast amount of restorative practices already existing in communities, education, criminal justice system (community and prisons) and the care system
- NIARP response to government policies
- NIARP acting as a conduit for sharing best practice

The NIARP aims to meet 2/3 times annually and meetings will be held outside normal working hours to facilitate attendees. An annual fee of £10 was unanimously agreed so that guest speakers may be facilitated at the meetings to guide and enhance the direction of the Association.

Members of the Executive Committee are:

Tim Chapman — Chair

Martina Jordan — Secretary

Denise O'Neill — Treasurer

Linda Lamb

John Robinson

Harry Maguire

Billy Drummond

Tyrone Best

Gerri McCorry

Billy McKeown

Martin McAnallen

For further information and/or application for membership forms, please contact Martina Jordan on mm-jordan.mj@gmail.com.

Calendar

EFRJ Summer School 29 July to 2 August 2013 — registration deadline is 31 May

13th Annual Conference of European Society of Criminology 4—7 September, 2013 in Budapest, Hungary

Call for submissions

Book reviews

We very much welcome reviews of books and articles from our membership. If you have published a book and would like to submit it for review, please send it to the Secretariat.

Articles

Each edition we will feature a review of the field of restorative justice, reflections on policy developments and research findings/project outcomes. Please consider sharing your perspective with colleagues.

Events

Please let us know about upcoming restorative justice related conferences and events. We are happy to share this information via the Newsletter or Newsflash.

Contact Kerry Clamp for more information:
Editor@euforumrj.org.

Not an EFRJ member yet?

Join forces with other RJ professionals throughout Europe and beyond and sign up via our website: www.euforumrj.org. The process only takes 5 minutes. You can also contact the Secretariat at info@euforumrj.org or at the address below.

Editorial board:

Publisher: Edit Törzs (Belgium), E-mail: edit@euforumrj.org

Editor: Kerry Clamp (UK), E-mail: Editor@euforumrj.org

Members: Martin Wright, Robert Shaw, Christa Pelikan, Karin Sten Madsen, Branka Peuraca, Lenka Ouředníčková and Sónia Sousa Pereira

The views presented in this Newsletter are the views of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the EFRJ.

Secretariat of the European Forum for Restorative Justice Hooverplein 10 • 3000 Leuven • Belgium • T +32 16 32 54 29 www.euforumrj.org

With the financial support of the European Commission.

