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SMART CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM: Mississippi and Texas Leading Gulf South States — Continued from page 2

Unlikely advocates led the way for change in Texas, including the Austin-based Texas Public Policy Foundation (TPPF), member of a national network of libertarian, freeenterprise research and advocacy centers. Although TPPF was a proponent of “tough on crime” policies, it recently has advocated funding for alternative drug sentencing and drug treatment programs in the legislature.

The $200 million that Texas authorized in 2007 for drug treatment programs was estimated to save 10 times that amount in prison construction costs alone.4

Mississippi leads all Gulf South states in comprehensive reform. Like many other states, Mississippi saw its prison population grow over 100 percent between 1983 and 2013. Mississippi is second only to Louisiana for the highest rate of incarceration in the country.5

A bipartisan task force commissioned by the governor and Legislature found that if Mississippi did nothing, the state’s prison population would grow by 1,951 inmates at a cost of $266 million over 10 years. The data reveal that nonviolent offenders and those revoked for probation or parole violations account for a large share of the growing prison population.6

The task force found that free factors drive prison population growth in Mississippi. First, nonviolent offenders comprised 45 percent of all inmates. Second, the analysis revealed that an

Today, a vicious cycle of poverty, criminality, and incarceration traps too many Americans and weakens too many communities” said U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder in a major policy initiative presented last August. He explained that “many aspects of our criminal justice system may actually exacerbate these problems rather than alleviate them.”

Calling for a new approach to the “war on drugs,” the attorney general lamented “our system is broken” as “too many Americans go to too many prisons for far too long and for no truly good law enforcement reason.”

Seventeen states, supported by the Justice Department and leaders of both parties, have directed funding away from prison construction toward evidence-based programs and services such as drug treatment and supervision, designed to reduce recidivism.

The effort to pursue alternatives to incarceration for low-level, nonviolent crimes is one of five key principles of the U.S. Justice Department’s “Smart on Crime: Reforming the Criminal Justice System for the 21st Century” policy initiative.7

Holder praised Texas for investing in drug treatment for nonviolent offenders and changes in parole policies that reduced its prison population by more than 5,000 inmates in 2012. Similar efforts in Arkansas helped reduce its prison population by more than 1,400.

In Mississippi, nonviolent offenders account for a large share of the growing prison population. First, 45 percent of all inmates. Second, 80 percent of nonviolent offenders and those revoked for parole violations account for a large share of the growing prison population. The data reveal that nonviolent offenders comprise 45 percent of all inmates. Second, the analysis revealed that an
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March 31, 2014, the Pew Trusts expects that Mississippi will avoid all of its projected prison growth over the next 10 years. The cost is $443.2 million (2011 dollars) in corrections expenditures in 1992, it spent $757.4 million in 2011, an increase of $315 million (71 percent).

Liberian and conservative libertarians think tanks are touting the fiscal case for criminal justice reform in Louisiana, including the Reason Foundation, and the Texas Public Policy Foundation. Although Louisiana legislators have passed model evidence-based reforms in recent years, other states, including Mississippi and Texas, have gone further. 10

These conservative and libertarian think tanks argue that Louisiana spends scarce prison resources on nonviolent offenders who face little or no threat to society [and are] routinely sentenced to exceedingly long terms in prison with no opportunity for parole or suspension of sentence, in most cases because of the state’s determinate sentencing laws. 11

U.S.-born participants described in evaluations how they were affected by the stories they heard: “The first-hand reports were important. Seeing the young man [Michael] break down as he tried to tell his story broke my heart.” “...[Listening to the story of] fear and family [and] overwhelming and humbling to hear. [I made] me sad, angry—wanting to share [their] story.” ...“I experienced a little of the pain that the individuals who shared with us have experienced.” 12

Gregory Boyle, S.J., writes in Tattoos on the Heart that a new, palpable sense of solidarity among equals, a beloved community, is always the fruit of true compassion. 8 When I asked Central Americans how it felt to be listened to, their responses reflected the compassion and solidarity they experienced. A 58-year-old woman who had fled Guatemala to escape brutal beatings from her husband said, “I felt very happy and touched because I came to understand that we are not alone as immigrants, that we are a part of all Central American people.” A Nicaraguan woman who had poured her heart out about the agony she suffered having to leave her children behind felt others had put themselves in her place, and she could see they were very moved. 9

At one table 13-year-old Michael, from Honduras, explained how last year armed gang members started coming on to his school’s playground to intimidate boys to join their gang and that one of his best friends took his own life rather than join. His 17-year-old sister, Yarel, became so terrified after being robbed three times by armed assailants that she refused to return to school. When gangmen spread their home with bullets last September, their uncle decided to have the children taken to the U.S. where, after a long and frightful journey, they were re-united with their mother and father in New Orleans—whom the children had not seen since nine years. Michael’s mother, Maria, explained, as her son rubbed her face and hair, that, because she could not pay for her son’s many medical needs in Honduras, she had to leave him and his sister with her brother. However, she never left her children—she’s calling them without fail every morning and every evening.
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A Lesson in Compassion
Catholic Teach-In on the Child Migrant Crisis and Its Causes

BY SUE WEISHAR, PH.D.

Children and families fleeing violence and impunity in Central America this past summer evoked a wide range of responses from the American public. At one end of the spectrum, images of poor migrants clinging to trains headed to the U.S. and hundreds of Latin American children sleeping on the floors of Border Patrol processing centers struck fear and anger in the hearts of Americans with nativist tendencies, reactions stoked by fear-mongering talk show hosts and politicians. Although all children apprehended at the border are under-sized fish or annoying pests to management programs, i.e. practices used by wildlife or any other protection. This is the moment has begun to move toward transformation. Rohr warns that without the other, humans are alienating isolation. At nine tables placed throughout the auditorium, Central American immigrants, and loving, ultimately seeking God.

In Catholic thought, "authentic freedom is an exceptional sign of the divine image" within the human person.1 Created in God's image, every person has "the natural right to be recognized as a free and responsible being."2 We have a duty to respect each one’s right to exercise freedom as essential to human dignity.3 "Freedom From" or "Freedom For"? Notice the language "free and responsible being." Unlike some philosophies, Catholic thought does not consider freedom purely from an individualistic perspective "reducing it to the arbitrary and uncontrolled exercise of one’s personal autonomy."4 It is not just "freedom from." Our theology views the human person as essentially social—both sacred and social. Christian anthropology sees freedom, them, as one of four social values "inherent in the dignity of the human person, whose authentic development they foster."5 These four social values are truth, freedom, justice, and love, and they are very interdependent. Our freedom, then, is "freedom for"—for the purpose of seeking what is true and loving, ultimately seeking God.

Freedom and Social Justice This freedom is protected by social justice and the common good, which demand respect for the dignity and freedom of others and that society be organized to promote individual freedom, optimal social well-being, and proper group and individual relationships. As ethicist David Hollenbush, S.J., explains: This self-limiting concept of the common good and the role of government in protecting it shows that, for Pius XII as well as for the entire tradition, human rights cannot be understood apart from social interdependence, nor can social well-being be understood apart from personal rights.6 Freedom, then, is circumscribed by the social nature of the person and the common good, as well as our Christian understanding of love as mutuality and the Gospel’s preferential love for the least among us. For example, the "free" agreement between employer and employee to "the amount of pay to be received is not sufficient for the agreed-upon salary to qualify as a just wage," because a just wage "must not be below the level of subsistence" of the worker: natural justice precedes and is above the freedom of the contract.7 The Catholic "family wage" principle also insists that "such a wage must also allow for savings that will permit the acquisition of property as a guarantee of freedom."8
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On July 24, 2014, U.S. House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan released a discussion draft entitled Expanding Opportunity in America. That report observed, “Poverty is too high, unemployment is too high, labor-force participation is too low, and wage growth is too slow.” The report’s proposals for expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit, education reform, and criminal justice reform merit careful consideration. However, the draft’s first chapter—“reforming the safety net”—refrains ideas that will worsen poverty and erode what remains of the safety net.

At the heart of this “reform” is a pilot program in certain states called the Opportunity Grant (OG) “to coordinate aid for families in need” by allowing states and community groups “to test different ways of coordinating aid for families in need” by allowing states and community groups “to test different ways of fighting poverty that will “help people not just avoid hardship—but build a successful career.”* Supporting arguments say that the safety net discourages work and federal programs need better coordination. The answer proposed is a block grant for states and local communities to build a more accountable, individualized, and effective safety net.

In these pilots, the federal government would “consolidate a number of means-tested programs into the OG program” to which the largest contributions would come from SNAP (the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, successor to the Food Stamp Program), TANF (the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program, successor to AFDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children), childcare, housing assistance programs, and others. * The funding would be “deficit-neutral” (costing no more or less than the total of the specific programs it replaces) and remain fixed over an unspecified number of years. The model for OG is the 1996 welfare reform law, which the proposal calls “a remarkable success” in reducing poverty among children of single mothers between 1992, when it was 55 percent, to 39 percent just before the recession of 2000. This precedent purportedly justifies turning more safety net programs over to states because “the recipe for success is more flexibility in exchange for more accountability.” Sadly, the report ignores the record since 2000. OG contains multiple problems, including its flat funding which guarantees that more and concentrated services provided to some people mean fewer dollars for a safety net for others. Moreover, we should look carefully at the entire history of 1996’s welfare reform—the rationale for OG. Proponents proudly cite outcomes attributed to the law during its first years: more low-income mothers at work, fewer children in poverty, and a reduction in the number and percentage of poor families receiving TANF benefits. But that picture fades upon a longer and closer look.

In August 2014, The Center for Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) summarized the impacts of the 1996 law:

- **Over time, TANF has provided basic cash assistance to fewer and fewer needy families, even when need has increased.**
- **During the recession and slow recovery, TANF served few families in need.**
- **The amount of cash assistance provided to families has eroded in almost every state, leaving families without sufficient funds to meet their most basic needs.**
- **TANF plays much less of a role in reducing poverty than AFDC did—and the provision of less cash assistance has contributed to an increase in deep or extreme poverty.**
- **Although a key focus of welfare reform was on increasing employment among cash assistance recipients, states spend little (only 8 percent) of their TANF funds to help improve recipients’ employability.**
- **Employment among single mothers increased in the 1990s, but welfare reform was only one of several contributing factors—and most of the early gains have been lost.”**

Several explanations for this negative assessment go to the heart of the problems of block-granting safety net programs.

First, unlike SNAP, block grants do not provide benefits to each person who is qualified. States determine who will be eligible and how much assistance they will receive, often shifting funding between programs and recipients. Thus, the percentage of families with children in poverty receiving AFDC/TANF benefits has declined from 82 percent in 1979 to 68 percent in 1996 (when the TANF block grant began) to 25 percent in 2012 (see chart on page 5).

Block grant funding also does not increase in hard times or high unemployment or increased poverty. Moreover, with block grant funding, states often use federal dollars to replace state funding of antipoverty programs, despite Congressional efforts to require state “maintenance of effort.” Ultimately, the poor lose. For example, the child poverty rate in 1996 was 20.5 percent. It declined until 2000, falling to 16.2 percent. But then, as the economy tanked and jobs vanished, the child poverty rate increased to 21.8 percent in 2012 (see last year of available data). Yet, while poverty increased, the percentage of families receiving TANF decreased. As CBPP reported:

“One of the 19th laws, the national TANF average monthly cash aid has fallen by almost twofold—from 4.7 million families in 1996 to 1.7 million families in 2013—even at poverty and deep poverty have worsened. The number of families with children in poverty hit a low of 3.2 million in 2000, but has since increased to more than 7 million. Families with children in “deep poverty” (with incomes below half of the poverty line) dropped to a low of about 3 million in 2000. Now it is about 3 million, although TANF caseloads continued to drop. With states shifting funding, individual TANF family benefits also declined. CBPP continues, “In the median state in 2013, a family of three received $428 per month; in 14 states, such a family received less than $300. TANF benefits are below 50 percent of the federal poverty line in 50 states and below 20 percent of the poverty line in 16 states.” AFDC average grants were notoriously low for decades, but, after the 1996 block grant, benefits in 48 states eroded further, so that TANF cash benefits today are at least 20 percent less than in 1996.

Chairman Ryan’s proposal would continue serious block grant flaws—devastating poor families—and expand them to the SNAP program, which currently is the one almost-universal safety net program that meets the changing needs of the eligible poor in a timely fashion and has significantly improved child and family nutrition in this country.
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ANOTHER MISLEADING PROPOSAL:  U.S. House Budget Committee Opportunity Opportunity Proposal

BY FRED KAMMER, S.J.

On July 24, 2014, the U.S. House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan released a discussion draft entitled Expanding Opportunity in America. That report observed, "Poverty is too high, unemployment is too high, labor-force participation is too low, and wage growth is too slow."

The report’s proposals for expansion of the Earned Income Tax Credit, education reform, and criminal justice reform merit careful consideration. However, the draft’s first chapter—"reforming the safety net"—rehashes ideas that will worsen poverty and erode what remains of the safety net.

At the heart of this “reform” is a pilot program in certain states called the Opportunity Grant (OG) "to coordinate aid for families in need" by allowing states and community groups "to test different ways of fighting poverty that will “help people not just avoid hardship—but build a successful career.”" Supporting arguments say that the safety net discourages work and federal programs need better coordination. The answer proposed is a block grant for states and local communities to build a more accountable, individualized, and effective safety net.

In those pilots the federal government would "consolidate a number of means-tested programs into the OG program" to which the largest contributions would come from SNAP (the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, successor to the Food Stamp Program), TANF (the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program, successor to AFDC—Aid to Families with Dependent Children), childcare, housing assistance programs, and others. The funding would be "deficit-neutral" (costing no more or less than the total of the specific programs it replaces) and remain fixed over an unspecified number of years.

The model for OG is the 1996 welfare reform law, which the proposal calls "a remarkable success" in reducing poverty among children of single mothers between 1992, when it was 55 percent, to 39 percent just before the recession of 2000. This precedent purportedly justifies turning more safety net programs over to states because "the recipe for success is more flexibility in exchange for more accountability." Sadly, the report ignores the record since 2000.

OG contains multiple problems, including its flat funding which guarantees that more and concentrated funding which guarantees that more and concentrated federal dollars to replace state funding of antipoverty programs, despite Congressional efforts to require state "maintenance of effort." Ultimately, the poor lose. For example, the child poverty rate in 1996 was 20.5 percent. It declined until 2000, falling to 16.2 percent. But then, as the economy tanked and jobs vanished, the child poverty rate increased to 21.8 percent in 2012 (the last year of available data). Yet, while poverty increased, the percentage of families receiving TANF decreased.

Several explanations for this negative assessment go to the heart of the problems of block-granting safety net programs. First, unlike SNAP, block grants do not provide benefits to each person who is qualified. States determine who will be eligible and how much assistance they will receive, often shifting funding between programs and recipients. Thus, the percentage of families with children in poverty receiving AFDC/TANF benefits has declined from 82 percent in 1979 to 68 percent in 1996 (when the TANF block grant began) to 25 percent in 2012 (see chart on page 10).

Block grant funding also does not increase in hard times with high unemployment or increased poverty. Moreover, with block grant funding, states often use federal dollars to replace state funding of antipoverty programs, despite Congressional efforts to require state “maintenance of effort.” Ultimately, the poor lose.

With states shifting funding, individual TANF family benefits also declined. CBPP continues, “In the median state in 2013, a family of three received $428 per month; in 14 states, such a family received less than $300. TANF benefits are below 50 percent of the federal poverty line in 50 states. In 16 states, AFDC average grants were notoriously low for decades, but, after the 1996 block grant, benefits in 48 states eroded further, so that TANF cash benefits today are at least 20 percent less than in 1996.”

Chairman Ryan’s proposal would continue serious block grant flaws—devastating poor families—and expand them to the SNAP program, which currently is the one almost-universal safety net program that meets the changing needs of the eligible poor in a timely fashion and has significantly improved child and family nutrition in this country.
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Number of families receiving AFDC/TANF benefits for every 100 families with children in poverty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AFDC/TANF</th>
<th>TANF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Catholic Social Thought and Freedom

BY FRED KAMMER, S.J.

In Catholic thought, "authentic freedom is an exceptional sign of the divine image" within the human person.1 Created in God’s image, every person has “the natural right to be recognized as a free and responsible being.”2 We have a duty to respect each one’s right to exercise freedom as essential to human dignity.3

“Freedom From” or “Freedom For”? Notice the language “free and responsible being.” Unlike some philosophies, Catholic thought does not consider freedom purely from an individualistic perspective “reducing it to the arbitrary and uncontrollable exercise of one’s personal autonomy.”4 It is not just “freedom from.” Our theology views the human person as essentially social—both sacred and social. Catholic anthropology sees freedom, then, as one of four social values “inherent in the dignity of the human person, whose authentic development they foster.”5 These four social values are truth, freedom, justice, and love, and they are very interdependent. Our freedom, then, is “freedom for”—for the purpose of seeking what is true and loving, ultimately seeking God.

Freedom and Social Justice

This freedom is protected by social justice and the common good, which demand respect for the dignity and freedom of others and that society be organized to promote individual freedoms, optimal social well-being, and proper group and individual relationships. As ethicist David Hollenbush, S.J., explains: This self-limiting concept of the common good and the role of government in protecting it shows that, for Pius XII as well as for the entire tradition, human rights cannot be understood apart from social interdependence, nor can social well-being be understood apart from personal rights.6

Freedom, then, is circumscribed by the social nature of the person and the common good, as well as our Christian understanding of love as mutuality and the Gospel’s preferential love for the least among us. For example, the “free” agreement between employer and employee to “the amount of pay to be received is not sufficient for the agreed-upon salary to qualify as a just wage,” because a just wage “must not be below the level of subsistence” of the worker: natural justice precedes and is above the freedom of the contract.7 The Catholic “family wage” principle also insists that “such a wage must also allow for savings that will permit the acquisition of property as a guarantee of freedom.”8

Wages are only one example of how certain economic, social, political, and cultural conditions “are needed for a just exercise of freedom.”9 These may include private property and other private ownership of goods that “assure a person a highly necessary sphere for the exercise of his personal and family autonomy and ought to be considered as an extension of human freedom.”10 It also means that, facing growing income and wealth inequality, “The fundamental task of the State in economic matters is that of determining an appropriate juridical framework for regulating economic affairs, in order to safeguard the prerequisites of a free economy, which presumes a certain equality between the parties, such that one party would not be so powerful as practically to reduce the other to subservience.”11

Ultimately, contemporary Catholic thought positions freedom in the context of the doctrine of solidarity—recognizing the human, practical, and spiritual ties uniting people and social groups and calling for “a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good” because “we are all really responsible for all.”12
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Understanding CST
March 31, 2014, the Pew Trusts expects that Mississippi will avoid all of its projected prison growth over the next 10 years and save $51 million a year with this new law.6 H.B. 585 was supported by the Catholic Dioceses of Mississippi and signed by Governor Phil Bryant in the February 19, 2014, Catholic Day at the Capitol in Jackson.7 The law is consistent with Catholic social teaching about restorative justice.8

The challenges that Louisiana faces are similar to Mississippi’s, only more daunting. Louisiana leads the nation in the rate that it operates its juvenile facilities. Fourth, it focuses prison beds on violent and career offenders. Parole and probation, the task force included enforcement officials, and civil rights advocates. The project included extensive teaching about restorative justice.8

Libertarian and conservative think-tanks are consternating the fiscal case for sentencing reform. Louisiana’s prison population increased from 31,007 in 1992 to 39,709 in 2011. Whereas the state spent a $443.3 million (2011 dollars) in corrections expenditures in 1992, it spent $757.4 million in 2011, an increase of $315 million (71 percent).

In Louisiana, Mississippi, and Florida should study Mississippi’s bipartisan, comprehensive, evidence-based study that developed 19 specific policy changes.9 Chaired by the commission of correctional reform, the task force included legislators, judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officials, and civil rights advocates. The project included extensive testimony of various advocates and a public safety summit convened by Governor Bryant in November 2013. Mississippi partnered with the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice. This assistance represents a private-public partnership between Pew and the Justice Reinvestment Initiative of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mississippi’s reform is structured around six primary goals. First, it ensures certainty and clarity in sentencing to reduce uncertainty in early release and overall time served. Second, it increases access to alternatives to prison, including specialty drug courts to impose alternative sentences to reduce recidivism. Third, it focuses prison beds on violent and career offenders. Fourth, it strengthens supervision and intervention. Fifth, it implements evidence-based re-entry planning to assist all offenders. Finally, it implements comprehensive re-entry planning to assist all offenders to re-enter into the community of their families to flee their homes—Central American causes were to explain the reasons for the recent border crisis from the point of view of the persons most impacted by the violence and impunity forcing so many children and families to flee to the United States.9

Causes were to explain the reasons for the recent border crisis from the point of view of the persons most impacted by the violence and impunity forcing so many children and families to flee to the United States.9

U.S.-born participants described in evaluations how they were affected by the stories they heard: “The firsthand reports were important. Seeing the young man [Michael] break down as he tried to tell his story broke my heart.”10 “Listening to the story of family and family headway and humbling to hear. [I’d made me sad, angry—wanting to share their story].”11 “I experienced a little of the pain that the individuals who shared with us have experienced.”12

Gregory Boyle, S.J., writes in Tattoos on the Heart that a new, palpable sense of solidarity among equals, a beloved community, is always the fruit of true compassion.12 When I asked Central Americans how it felt to be listened to, their responses reflected the compassion and solidarity they experienced. A Nicaraguan woman who had fled Guatemala to escape brutal beatings from her husband said, “I felt very happy and touched because I came to understand that we are not alone as immigrants, that we are part of all Catholic people.”12 A Nicaraguan woman who had fled Guatemala to escape brutal beatings from her husband said, “I felt very happy and touched because I came to understand that we are not alone as immigrants, that we are part of all Catholic people.”12


The event was organized by JSRI, Catholic Charities Archdioceses of New Orleans, and the Archdiocesan Office of Racial Harmony.

Evaluations of Catholic Teach-Ins on Child Migrant Crisis and Immigration, August 3, 2014, on file with author.


From written responses to questionnaires administered August 17, 2014, on file with author.

Phone interview with author, August 22, 2014.

84 percent of offenders sent to prison in 2012 was due to a revocation of parole or probation. Parole and probation revocations exceeded all new sentences in 2012. Seventy-five percent of probation revocations were due to failure to comply with supervision terms, such as missing meetings with a supervisor or failing a drug test. Third, uncertainty in length of sentences resulted in increased time served. Fourth, few alternatives to sentencing resulted in increased time served.13

The project included extensive teaching about restorative justice.8

Policy-makers in Louisiana, Alabama, and Florida should study Mississippi’s bipartisan, comprehensive, evidence-based study that developed 19 specific policy changes.9 Chaired by the commission of correctional reform, the task force included legislators, judges, prosecutors, law enforcement officials, and civil rights advocates. The project included extensive testimony of various advocates and a public safety summit convened by Governor Bryant in November 2013. Mississippi partnered with the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Crime and Justice Institute at Community Resources for Justice. This assistance represents a private-public partnership between Pew and the Justice Reinvestment Initiative of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Mississippi’s reform is structured around six primary goals. First, it ensures certainty and clarity in sentencing to reduce uncertainty in early release and overall time served. Second, it increases access to alternatives to prison, including specialty drug courts to impose alternative sentences to reduce recidivism. Third, it focuses prison beds on violent and career offenders. Fourth, it strengthens supervision and intervention. Fifth, it implements evidence-based re-entry planning to assist all offenders. Finally, it implements comprehensive re-entry planning to assist all offenders to re-enter into the community of their families to flee their homes—Central American.Comments about the Teach-Ins was an extraordinary event: a safe space was created where suffering people opened their hearts to strangers, who in an act of true compassion, listened intently and respectfully, allowing themselves to enter into the experience of others and he changed in the process. At one table I had Michael, the first migrant who was part of a war zone—San Pedro Sula, Honduras—tearfully explained how last year armed gang members started starting fights and throwing rocks at his school’s playground to intimidate boys to join their gang and that one of his best friends took his own life rather than join. His 17-year-old sister, Yerlin, became so terrified after being robbed three times by armed assailants that she refused to return to school. When gunmen sprayed their home with bullets last September, their uncle decided to have the children taken to the U.S. where, after a long and frightful journey, they were re-united with their mother and father in New Orleans—whom the children had not seen since the nine years. Michael’s mother, Maria, explained, as her son rubbed her face and hair, that, because she could not pay for his emergency medical needs in Honduras, she had to leave him and his sister with her brother. However, she never left her children—calling them without fail every morning and every evening.
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The project included extensive teaching about restorative justice.8
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Mississippi and Texas Leading Gulf South States

By ALEX MIKULICH, PH.D.

“Today, a vicious cycle of poverty, criminality, and incarceration traps too many Americans and weakens too many communities,” said U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder in a major policy initiative presented last August. He explained that “many aspects of our criminal justice system may actually exacerbate these problems rather than alleviate them.”

Calling for a new approach to the “war on drugs,” the attorney general lamented “our system is broken” as “too many Americans go to too many prisons for far too long and for no truly good law enforcement reason.”

Seventeen states, supported by the Justice Department and leaders of both parties, have directed funding away from prison construction toward evidence-based programs and services such as drug treatment and supervision, designed to reduce recidivism. The effort to pursue alternatives to incarceration for low-level, nonviolent offenders is one of five key principles of the U.S. Justice Department’s “Smart on Crime: Reforming the Criminal Justice System for the 21st Century” policy initiative.1

Holder praised Texas for investing in drug treatment for nonviolent offenders and changes in parole policies that reduced its prison population by more than 5,000 inmates in 2012. Similar efforts in Arkansas helped reduce its prison population by more than 1,400.

The effort to pursue alternatives to incarceration for low-level, nonviolent offenders and changes in parole policies that reduced its prison population by more than 1,951 inmates at a cost of $266 million over 10 years. The data reveal that nonviolent offenders and those sentenced for first-time, low-level drug crimes represented 45 percent of all inmates. Second, the analysis revealed that an
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