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ABSTRACT

This case study examines how The City, Inc.’s work within North and South Minneapolis, Minnesota neighborhoods from 1987 and 1992 was framed within a compilation of articles drawn from prominent Twin Cities’ daily newspapers. Positioned within a conceptual framework based on the ethical philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas, this study explores how the idea of community, as constructed and reinforced through organizational initiatives and local print media, impacts the everyday relationships of those within and between communities. Framed within a discourse analysis, Levinasian ethics considers what aspects of community discourse restrict and oppress the relation with the other. The study concludes by suggesting how the identified aspects of conditional belonging, finding the trace, and building community can be valuable in offering an alternative to assessment-style research by considering the relationship and responsibility of the one for the other.
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CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW

1.1 Purpose

This thesis is primarily guided by questions concerning how discourses on community, as constructed and reinforced through organizational initiatives and local print media, impact the everyday relationships of those within and between communities. Using the case study of The City, Inc. (hereafter referred to as The City), an inner-city community organization in Minneapolis, Minnesota that, between the period of 1967 and 2011, provided a mixture of social, educational, and advocacy services in South and North Minneapolis neighbourhoods, I will examine how discourses of community appear in two prominent Minnesota newspapers’ (The Minneapolis Star Tribune and The St. Paul Pioneer Press) discussion of programs offered by The City.

With a view to understand how the discourse about community as offered by The City (what will be discussed as reflecting that of the non-dominant community) aligns and departs from organizational structures external to The City (i.e., funding bodies, Twin City politicians, the Minneapolis Police Department, local media—external bodies to The City that will be discussed as representing the dominant community), I look to highlight the implications that discourses of community have on the way in which we come to understand and depict communities and community members.

To help with this aim, I will be focusing on the period between 1987 and 1992, highlighting The City’s advocacy and education work established through its program, At-Risk Youth Services (ARYS), and the later partnership between The City and an offshoot group of this program, United for Peace. With funding by the U.S. Department of
Health and Human Service, ARYS, established in 1987 and led by Harry “Spike” Moss (former director of The Way from 1971 to its closing in 1985 [Cook, 1992d], and a long-time inner-city activist—hereafter referred to as Spike Moss), looked to conduct outreach work with youth involved in gangs. As James Nelson (1994), a former president of The City, explains:

ARYS is a community-wide program that reaches out to high-risk and/or gang involved young people and their families by developing caring adult relationships and linking participants to long-term education, social and spiritual services that are relevant to the problems they face. ARYS also focuses on raising public awareness of gang issues, mediating potential conflicts, preventing gang-related disorders, as well as reducing negative gang-related behaviour. (p. 134)

Developed under the growing landscape of increased gang activity in Minneapolis during the 1980s, ARYS sought to develop a relationship with those who had an intimate knowledge of the community and the issues that young people and their families faced. The City reached out to ranking members of local gangs, in conjunction with local community activists, and hired them because of their standing as community leaders. The relationships that developed through this initial effort led to the later formation of United for Peace in May 1992. United for Peace was a coalition of four prominent gangs in Minnesota (the Vice Lords, Disciples, Souls and Bloods) that partnered with the Minneapolis Police Department to help mitigate levels of street violence, and that also sought to establish employment opportunities for minority youth and young adults. United for Peace was funded by The City and had two outreach workers from The City, Spike Moss and Steve Floyd, sitting on its board of directors.

A contentious idea at times, external support for the hiring of local gang members floundered in September 1992 following the shooting death of local police officer,
Jerome (Jerry) Haaf. In commenting on the implication of the shooting in the postscript of his chapter in *Children in families at Risk*, Nelson (1995) describes the following:

In early September 1992, we were associated by affiliation with the murder of a police officer. A true tragedy. There was/is a lot of posturing, speculation, and irresponsible talk of guilt by innuendo without due process, something poor communities of color have grown used to. The relationship between the community we serve and the Minneapolis Police Department has been broken. The metaphors of Sisyphus and the roller coaster are apt here. A relational beach head established today erodes tomorrow in this ebb and flow of human successes and failures. The future is wildly fluid and the peacemakers hope for the potential of healing in conversations…. All of my relatives ….Have pity on us…. (p. 28)

The four men (Mwati “Pepi” McKenzie, Shannon Bowles, Monterey Willis, and A.C. Ford) who were later charged with and convicted of the murder were members of the Vice Lords and held connections to Samuel “Sharif” Willis (hereafter referred to as Sharif Willis), a gang leader of the Vice Lords, an employee of the City’s ARYS program, and the president of United for Peace. Of the four men, A.C. Ford was a member of United for Peace (Cook, 1992f), Monterey Willis was the nephew of Sharif Willis, and all four men were said to be “close associates of Sharif Willis” (Bonner, 1992c, p. 1A). During the initial phases of the investigation two of the later convicted men, Monterey Willis and Shannon Bowles, were originally arrested from Sharif Willis’ home (Nelson & Cook, 1992a), leading investigators to believe Sharif Willis was involved in the planning of the shooting, and thus leading to the Minneapolis Police Department to sever its relationship with United for Peace; however, Sharif Willis was never charged for being involved with the September 1992 shooting.

The case study offered by The City illustrates a continual questioning about who is seen as a viable contributor to community development. As will be expanded on in the coming chapters, while there was certainly some questioning and scepticism by members
of the dominant community about the initial contribution that hiring active gang members could have in community initiatives, the 1992 shooting overshadowed the preceding contributions by members of ARYS and United for Peace. With this in mind, I will examine the 1987-1992 period of focus through the use of a discourse analysis (outlined in Chapter 4) in order to explore the ever-negotiated depiction and questioning about what community is and who and what is seen as a valuable contributor to community development.

While this study does not prescribe how community ought to be referenced or understood, the conceptual framework (explored in Chapter 3) directed by Emmanuel Levinas’ ethical philosophy offers a perspective on community that helps unfurl the research questions guiding this study. A clear consideration of community reflective of Levinas’ ethical philosophy is offered by Jean-Luc Nancy in his book, *The Inoperative Community*. Nancy (1991) articulates an understanding of community that is based on Mitsein (being-with) over a perspective on community based on Dasein (being there). For Nancy, an understanding of community that is conceptualized as being-with or being-together offers a capacity for resistance against immanent control and power that recognizes community as something constructed and as something that can be completed. In Nancy’s (1991) view, community based on being together recognizes resistance as something that “precedes us rather than our inventing it—that precedes us from the depths of community” (p. 81).

Thus, while I suspect that there will certainly be times where community is depicted in terms of a geographical orientation that binds people on the one hand, or an idealized belief characterized through a shared sense in communality on the other (two notions
illustrative of a community depiction based on Dasein), my ultimate interest is in how these different depictions of community impact the intersubjective relation that one has with the other. Note that the reference to “the other” is meant to describe the transcendence of the relation with someone — a connection, a proximity that cannot be reduced to spatial categories or to modes of objectification and thematization. The intersubjective relation as Levinas (1961/2012) articulates is an asymmetrical relationship, whereby the face-to-face encounter maintains a separation between the I and the other. As will be elaborated in Chapter 3, this separation works to accentuate the ethical responsibility to the other, and should not be misconstrued with an “us versus them” representation of the other. Levinas’ articulation of intersubjectivity, then, does not represent a neutral coexistence, a we, as Heidegger understood. The relational perspective that I will attempt to pursue in my analysis and discussion questions how depictions of community tend to be referenced when attempting to engage with and mediate societal problems and conflicts.

1.2 Research Questions

Two central research questions will guide my examination and analysis of the selected newspaper content: (a) How is community depicted in Twin City daily newspaper articles discussing The City and what frames the understanding of this depiction? (b) How do the identified discourses about community impact how we come to know and be with the other? As will be outlined in Chapter 4 (Methodology), the former question will act as the basis for the discourse analysis in Chapter 5, while the latter question will frame the discussion in Chapter 6.
1.3 Positionality

I originally approached this work with an aim to assess five key programs that would encapsulate five core categories of gang and violence reduction strategies: prevention (opportunity provision), intervention (youth outreach/street work), suppression (deterrence), comprehensive (community specific), and legislative (anti-gang bills and injunctions). This original approach could be described as something of a descriptive or historical account about how this typology of gang and violence reduction programming developed and how the discourse and depiction of community shifted during this period. Recognizing that this original approach was perhaps a little too ambitious for current purposes, I have restructured my thesis to instead focus on a single case study that permits more of an intensive overview about how organizational and situational contexts impacted discourses about crime, community, and gangs for The City and in the city of Minneapolis during the 1980s and 1990s. This shift of focus has forced me to examine my position as a researcher and the apparent disjunctions of understanding that I hold. My position as a researcher who is outside of the community in which this case study is based and whose understanding of this topic has been established through academia, without the combined practical engagement with the communities in which this commentary has developed, risks creating a merely reductively and descriptive conceptualization about events and situations that were very much real to the people, community, and organizations involved. That is to say, I risk perpetuating and constructing an understanding of The City from a middle-class position or from the perspective of the dominant culture, which consequently negates and undermines the voice and efforts of The City. As is reflective of Levinasian ethics, the conceptual
framework for this research (see Chapter 3), violence against the other can be represented by the categorization of the other in an often benevolent effort to know and understand the other. Violence here is represented by the reductive categorization of the other, which oppresses the other via an understanding that I have created: a relationship that is representative of being over the other rather than with the other.

That is to say, there is an evident risk of misappropriation or objectification in attempting to comment on or establish a voice for communities and organizations that are notably distinct and separate from my own experiences. Both James Nelson (a former president of The City\(^1\)) and Harry “Spike” Moss (a former Vice President of The City and head of The City’s ARYS program\(^2\)) have commented at different times about the disconcerting efforts of those unacquainted with a community attempting to propose and correct the ills and issues surrounding that community. As Nelson (1994, 1995) suggests, in running an organization there can be an evident tension between serving the needs of the community while upholding the expectations of funding bodies and outside pundits. The distinction between the dominant communities and non-dominant communities (a distinction that will be discussed further in Chapter 2) is prominent, impacting both how organizations respond to issues and to whom they try to justify organizational approaches.

\(^1\) Nelson served as president of The City for fourteen years from 1979-1993, submitting his resignation in November 1992 (Applegate Nelson, 2001). Nelson became president of The City in 1979 following the merger between The City and Southside, A Community Ministry, an organization Nelson founded that was “interested in developing a comprehensive approach with ‘troubled’ teenagers and their families” (ISRT, 2015, para. 2).

\(^2\) Moss, a long-time controversial figure for his outspokenness on issues of racism and poverty in minority communities in Minneapolis, began working for The City’s ARYS program in 1987. Prior to that Moss was a founding member of The Way and was the executive director from 1971-1985. The Way, established following a series of race riots in the mid ‘60s, aimed at supporting black residents in the North Side of Minneapolis (See Maddox, 2013 for a fuller overview of the history and context of The Way).
Spike Moss (Jackson, 2014; Van Denburg, 2010), speaking in a public forum on gang intervention years after his involvement with The City, comments on the professionalization of deviancy control and community intervention, which has a tendency to validate externalized directives and undermine community efforts. For Moss, this professionalized validation restricts the capacity for community organizations to garner the necessary resources to operate without a seal of approval. Moss asserts that this is a particularly degrading requirement that delegitimizes community efforts, and mandates a tolerance for externally imposed intervention. For Moss, racism is heavily situated within these externalized directives for community control, as community efforts are being stripped of their resources and are being replaced by externally mandated programs that have already existed within these communities for decades prior to their defunding. Nelson and Moss raise concerns that racism and classism work to dictate the basis of power and knowledge: namely, to establish who has the knowledge to fix the problem and who are the leaders that can be trusted to do so.

The concerns that Nelson and Moss address speak to the capacity for the dominant-community (including the academy) to garner an authority over the language and representation of community struggles, largely negating the voice of those within the affected community. Such remarks question the capacity for an “objective” engagement in research and highlight the risk of negating community voices, while simultaneously imposing restrictive labels onto these communities that mandate outside intervention, restricting commentary to the scholarly discourses of the academy. Recognizably, I do not claim to offer or hold the intimate knowledge of the experiences and circumstances of those operating and collaborating with The City (see Applegate Nelson, 2001; Gurnoe &
Nelson, 1989; Nelson, 1994, 1995, for ethnographic accounts of the work of The City by people who have worked and been associated with its programs). As such, I will at times try to frame a contextual reality around the wider academic literature about gangs and criminology more broadly. By no means am I proposing that academic descriptions offer a clearer understanding of the circumstances shaping the lived-experiences happening in the community and the larger macro contexts of the Twin Cities at the time; quite the contrary, I am finding that the exploration of this particular case study undermines the generalized descriptions offered by academic research. To be sure, academic literature, being the reference for my understanding, does offer a starting position to raise certain questions. However, while offering a foundation about the tensions arising within the field of research, my understanding as predicated through academia is very much pushed and largely derailed when used to assess or frame this particular case study.

In my attempts at positionality I acknowledge two things. First, my analysis and presentation about the various ways that community is being depicted should by no means be presented as the truth. That is to say, my exploration of The City marks one more discursive layer added to the various truths that exist about The City. My lack of involvement or connection to Minneapolis and the work The City engaged in during its tenure creates the ever-present reality that what I discuss is not representative of the circumstances that framed the contextual realities, and thus can and, by all means, should be negated and contradicted where need be. Second, I suggest that my starting vantage point through criminological perspectives is also problematic, as mainstream criminology is largely steeped in the hegemonic confines of crime control. I will comment further on this in Chapter 2, arguing that cultural criminology offers an important vantage that shifts
the priorities of criminological understanding, and again in Chapter 3 as I suggest that a Levinasian ethical framework, aside from acting as the conceptual model to guide my discourse analysis, can be useful in my own positioning as a researcher, navigating the moral impulse implied by such a crime control orientation to criminology and community research.

1.4 Organization

Five main sections will be used to develop the research questions being explored. Chapter 2 will offer a brief overview of The City (the case study being examined), including an overview of the programs offered by The City, The City’s operational philosophy, and a description of the neighbourhoods and the demographics in which The City worked. Furthermore, Chapter 2 will explore The City’s consideration of community and consider this perspective of community alongside the broader perspectives of crime and social control. Chapter 3 will offer a conceptual framework outlining key ideas from Emmanuel Levinas’ ethical philosophy. The key ideas outlined in Chapter 3 will be incorporated into my method of analysis exploring how the depiction of community impacts the relation with the other. Chapter 4 will describe my methodology and discuss some of the strengths and limitations of my chosen approach. Chapter 5 will analyze and interpret newspaper coverage, examining the ways in which community came to be depicted. Chapter 6 will provide a discussion surrounding how the identified depictions of community impact the relation with the other. Finally, Chapter 7 will discuss the practical outcomes of my research, addressing the met and unmet goals of the research, discussing recognized limitations, and presenting possible implications of my work for future research.
CHAPTER 2: THE CITY, INC.

As The City is no longer operational (the organization closed its north Minneapolis alternative school in 2011 and filed for bankruptcy the same year), I will rely on the work of James Nelson (1994, 1995), a former president of The City, and Jo Applegate Nelson (2001), a former teacher and program director at The City School from 1977 to 1993, to offer a description about the history and philosophy of the organization. While the focus of this case study prioritizes the period between 1987 and 1992, Nelson’s more historical account of the organization during his tenure as president from 1979-1993 and Applegate Nelson’s focus on the period between 1992-1993 offer a valuable framework for understanding how The City developed, the types of programs it operated, and how the organization conceptualized community.

2.1 A Brief Overview of The City

According to its mission statement “The City is an agent of healing, growth and advocacy participating in the building of culturally pluralistic communities through target relationships with inner city young people and families” (emphasis added) (Nelson, 1994, pp. 22-23). The City began as a youth club in South Minneapolis (Mitchell, 2011, p. 03B), established in 1967 by a group of inner-city parents whose children were involved in the juvenile court system. Originally incorporated as “The Psychotic City,” a description “indicative of the times but also of the self-perception of this local community that it intended to be different” (Nelson, 1994, p. 24), The City wanted to establish a space for their young people. The City expanded its operation from South Side Minneapolis to North Side Minneapolis in 1990 after The City was awarded ownership of a dormant North Minneapolis community center that used to house The
Way (Halvorsen, 1990; for further coverage of this acquisition see “Decision set for next week,” 1990; “Under new management,” 1990). Developing a number of different programs in the coming decades, The City attempted to adapt and create spaces that the community and families required. The City began its school program in the 1960s (opening its first alternative school in the early 1970s [Mitchell, 2011]), developed family therapy programs in the 1970s, began social service and outreach initiatives in the 1980s, and began economic development efforts in the 1990s (Nelson, 1995).

Nelson (1994) describes each of the numerous programs that The City offered, as outlined above, as fitting within one of three functional categories: healing, growth, and advocacy. The healing cluster attempted to offer counselling and support services to various groups in order to address the contextually relevant systemic forms of oppression. For example, The Indian Resource Pool and Kupona Ni’Uhuru sought to be culturally relevant to the Native American and African American population that The City served, and programs like to The Family Program, The Day Treatment and Aftercare Program, and The Group Home were geared towards families, young people, and girls in the community. The growth cluster, including The City School’s Senior High Program and The City’s Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Program, provided education support and skill-based services. The advocacy cluster, including At-Risk Youth Services and The Project on Urban Poverty, attempted to stimulate discussion and mediated support to help understand and develop appropriate approaches that addressed community-wide issues like youth violence and poverty.

Recognizing that some programs would naturally devolve and be replaced by others as need be, The City prioritized sustaining the relationships and the community
engagement that it had developed – an operating philosophy that Nelson (1995) articulates as emphasizing “what we’re currently working on rather than as a recipe” (p. 9). This operating philosophy acted in stark contrast to the rather formulaic “broken window system,” CeaseFire, and Gang Resistance Education and Training (G.R.E.A.T) gang and violence reduction strategies that the city of Minneapolis would solicit for ideas about how to curb gang violence in the years following the dismantling of the partnership between The City and the Minneapolis Police Department in the early 1990s (a further assessment about the role and validation of institutionally mandated gang and violence reduction programs will be explored in Chapter 5). The perceived transferability of gang and violence reduction strategies like the broken window system, CeaseFire, and G.R.E.A.T from one urban center to another can undermine the capacity for community agency, whereby conflicts and issues are addressed using approaches devised from the resources and knowledge in the community. Articulating, in part, the concerns highlighted by Nelson and Moss in Chapter 1 (see Positionality) the imposition and implementation of gang and violence reduction strategies by the city of Minneapolis over the belief in community-directed approaches highlights part of the ongoing tension between the dominant community and the non-dominant community.

For The City, the voice and needs of those within the community was foundational to the function and direction of its programs and foundational to its capacity to build community. In highlighting the importance of including the needs and voices of those which we serve in the construction and consideration of community, Nelson suggests:

We have tended to get bogged down into debate of what is and is not community, fighting over whose experience is most righteous. What is actually meant by
community is probably less important than examples of a community in action…
(Cited in Applegate Nelson, 2001, p. 20)

Nelson’s description emphasizes that the efforts and the voices of those within the community serve to implicate the direction and understanding of community rather than contemplating an idealized framework for community as something to build towards. As Applegate Nelson (2001) reflects, “community and ‘community-building’ are cheap words. They’re tossed around a lot” (p. 20). For Applegate Nelson (2001), community has many different connotations ranging from the position of schools as “learning communities” to ethnic and cultural depictions of community (such as the “African American community”) to geographic classifications of community (such as the “Phillips community”), each offering its own distinct position about who and what community depicts and how community is achieved and sustained. As a manner of institutional reflection, The City utilized six points of assessment to guide its efforts at building community.

The first point, developing a sense of history and place, emphasizes the need to find a grounding in the past in order to establish and sustain connections in the present. Elegantly summarized, Nelson (1995) asserts that “without a sense of history and place, a community is virtually nonexistent” (p. 9). The second point, developing relationships and making relatives, highlights the importance of the connections that are made with others. Where relationships speak to a sense of mutuality and the capacity for individuals to shape and impact one another, the idea of relatives speaks to the creation of a trust that allows individuals to feel connected and included within the larger family network that The City attempted to create. The third point, the utility of culture, highlights the significance of Charles Waldergrave’s position that “culture is probably the most
influential determinant of meaning in people’s lives” (cited in Nelson, 1995, p. 10). As such, there is a need to be attuned to cultural practices and activities and to establish relationships with those who “hold and carry the culture” (Nelson, 1995, p. 10). Such a position attempts to go beyond the institutionalization of problem solving, often devoid of cultural sensitivity, by prioritizing cultural and communal practices whenever possible.

The fourth point, developing comprehensive community solutions, emphasizes the importance of allowing individuals to maintain their ties to community, as the community is recognized as being a place for support and inclusivity. Furthermore, the community has a firm grasp of an individual’s experiences and the underlying societal structures that can often condemn, restrict and isolate individuals; thus, to remove an individual from the community can often emphasize individual struggles and undermine corresponding structural inequalities. The fifth point, advocacy and institutional opposition, iterates the detachment that the values, interests and solutions developed and imposed by the dominant-culture can have for families and neighbourhoods positioned within the non-dominant culture. A critical awareness about who is the beneficiary of public policy and programs needs to be developed in conjunction with advocacy surrounding the needs and issues of the communities being served. The sixth and final point, a commitment to reflection: experimentation and research, identifies the need to reflect, receive feedback, and continually adapt in order to ensure the programs and services offered are appropriate and relevant. Emphasized within these six points of assessment is an articulation that there needs to be a connection with those who are immersed within the neighborhoods. That is to say a connection which extends beyond mere acquaintanceships, embracing the wider history and contextual position of the community.
2.1.1 Neighbourhoods and Demographics

Working in neighborhoods in the near southside (Philips and Powderhorn) and near northside (Near North) of Minneapolis (Nelson, 1994), The City’s clientele shifted significantly over time. When The City was founded in 1967 a large population of the families that the agency served were, as Nelson (1994) describes, “poor white,” about another third were aboriginal, and a few were Hispanic and African American. During the period from 1981-1990, Nelson (1994) highlights a significant change in the cultural and ethnic demographics of the population that was using and helping to develop The City’s services:

The percentage of African Americans rose in our school programs from 8% in 1981 to 48% in 1990; American Indians represented 35% in 1981 and 35% in 1990; European Americans represented 60% in 1981 and 14% in 1990. The family program witnessed similar changes: African Americans 9% in 1981, 55% in 1990; American Indians 19% in 1981, 24% in 1990; European Americans 71% in 1981, 20% in 1990. (p. 37)

The cultural and ethnic demographic changes marked by The City’s services follow a transformation in inner-city neighborhoods that saw middle-class families move out and the migration of non-middle-class families into the neighborhoods (Nelson, 1994). 3 In a section entitled “A Meso Context: Minneapolis,” Nelson (1994) reviews how a number of reports produced by the city of Minneapolis and The United Way forecast the impact

---

3 The neighbourhoods of Phillips, Powderhorn, and Near North all saw notable cultural and ethnic demographic changes between 1980 and 2000. Between 1980 and 2000 the white population declined in each of these three neighborhoods (64 percent to 24 percent in Phillips; 89 percent to 42 percent in Powderhorn; and 36 percent to 12 percent in Near North). Correspondingly, these three neighbourhoods saw an increase in black (8 percent to 29 percent in Phillips; 4 percent to 22 percent in Powderhorn; and 53 percent to 58 percent in Near North), Asian (1 percent to 6 percent in Phillips; 1 percent to 6 percent in Powderhorn; and 1 percent to 14 percent in Near North), and Hispanic populations (2 percent to 22 percent in Phillips; 2 percent to 22 percent in Powderhorn; and 5 percent to 9 percent in Near North) (City of Minneapolis, 2015a, 2005c, 2015e).
of the neighborhood transformations. For Nelson (1994) these reports seemingly offer a reductively bleak overview of these neighbourhoods and further establish that “being a poor person and a person of color is a risky combination as you will likely live isolated from the rest of society in neighborhoods characterized by other attending social ills such as criminality, high school drop out rates and high mortality rates for newborn children” (p. 22).

2.1.2 Constructing Inner-City Spaces and Stigma

Noteworthy to this discussion is a consideration of how the use of at-risk discourses contribute to the specialised representation of a given space. Reflecting on David Ley’s exploration on the racialization of space in Philadelphia neighbourhoods, Nayak and Jeffrey (2011) suggest that “the ideas about community are seen to be socially constructed, while a neighbourhood and its borders tend to be defined by those inhabiting these spaces” (p. 184). The notable poverty in the target communities with which The City worked, 4 in combination with a plethora of other discernible risk factors, serves as a point of emphasis that comes to perpetuate a constructed perspective about the inner city. As Burgess (1985) found in her research, exploring how print media uses race to construct and define space, the inner city gets prescribed “as an alien place, separate and isolated, located outside white, middle-class values and environments” (p. 193). An

---

4 In 1999 poverty rates in the neighborhoods of Phillips, Powderhorn, and Near North were all above the poverty rate for Minneapolis, which stood at 17 percent of people living below the poverty line. The neighborhood of Powderhorn had the lowest percentage of people living below the line of the three neighbourhoods at 21 percent, the Phillips neighbourhood was the next lowest at 34 percent, and Near North was the highest at 38 percent (City of Minneapolis, 2015). Notably, these poverty rates, with the exception of Powderhorn which had remained steady at 21 percent, were significantly higher in 1989, with the poverty rate in the Phillips neighbourhood at 49 and the poverty rate in Near North at 46 percent (City of Minneapolis, 2015b, 2015d, 2015f).
understanding about what this inner-city space represents is contested by the externalized imposition that these neighborhoods are indicative of an at-risk environment. This external position is in contrast to the everyday mundanity for those within these communities, whereby these neighbourhoods more significantly represent their home.

Within the current case study of The City we see a burgeoning concern about gangs in the 1980s that escalates and becomes a point of emphasis throughout the Twin Cities as issues of violence are emphasized in the media and public reactions begin to escalate. While the increased social reaction works to prioritize the seemingly apparent reality of “gang violence,” the social reaction also impacts how community comes to be depicted and controlled. Common monikers such as gang, the ghetto, and the hood all fit into a popular cultural purview that undermines how inner-city spaces are presented and the level of authority those within such neighbourhoods are allotted. Using an excerpt from Lance Freeman’s There Goes the Hood, Richardson and Skott-Myhre (2012) highlight the popular connotation behind terms like “the ghetto,” “the inner-city,” and “the hood” as “places that are off-limits to outsiders, places to be avoided after sundown, and paragons of pathology” (p. 13). Richardson and Skott-Myhre contrast this popular imagery of the hood as a dangerous space with a naturalized position that recognizes the hood as neither negative or positive; rather, they see it simply as a place of residence – “where people live their lives in the most mundane of fashions: buying groceries, cooking meals, washing dishes, talking with friends, and all the other banal activities of life” (p. 15).

Nelson (1995) too speaks to the common imposition of language that is not reflective of that used within the communities being spoken of. Speaking about the
common use of the phrase “youth gangs” by the media Nelson attempts to provide a clarifying perspective:

it is instructive to learn that these organizations seldom utilize that moniker to describe themselves, preferring the terms nations, families, people, folks, associations, or sets, and have membership that not only has in some cases, spanned 40 years but has represented the entire life cycle as well. (1995, p. 21)

Again, the naturalized reality that Nelson expresses contrasts with the purposefully dichotomous orientation, which depicts this reality as being positive or negative. This orientation fails to explain the reality from those within the community, but is heavily produced and imposed from social reactions and subjective realities established from outside of these communities. Paul Feyerabend (1988) warns of such a misappropriation of language that attempts to construct a relativist framework of knowledge, a language which appeals to authority abstractions, otherwise termed “sculpted realities,” but which lacks input from those within the affected spaces:

The way in which social problems, problems of energy distribution, ecology, education, care for the old and so are ‘solved’ in our societies can be roughly described in the following way. A problem arises. Nothing is done about it. People get concerned. Politicians broadcast this concern. Experts are called in. They develop theories and plans based on them. Power-groups with experts of their own effect various modifications until a watered down version is accepted and realized. The role of experts in this process has gradually increased. We have now a situation where social and psychological theories of human thought have taken the place of this thought and action itself. Instead of asking people involved in a problematic situation, developers, educators, technologists and sociologists get their information about “what these people really want and need” from theoretical studies carried out by their esteemed colleagues in what they think are relevant fields. Not live human beings, but abstract models are consulted; not the target population decides, but the producers of models. Intellectuals all over the world take it for granted that their models will be more intelligent, make better suggestions, have a better grasp of the reality of humans than these humans themselves. (pp. 283-284)

Feyerabend’s admonishment of the professionalized accentuation of difference serves to warn against a rationalized benevolence that constructs and perceives the notion of
community from the idealized perspective based on potential—what it could be. The imposed gentrification that is likely to follow asserts the required imposition of the dominant-culture and undermines the relational consideration that is also paramount in the conceptualization of community. As Nelson (1994, 1995) describes, the contestation between the perspective of the dominant-communities and the perspective and needs of the non-dominant community become a basis for on-going organizational struggle in negotiating what a community represents.

2.2 Negotiating Community

2.2.1 Community and The City

In speaking about his time as president of The City, Nelson (1994, 1995) describes the ongoing relationship that existed between the dominant community and the non-dominant community. The dominant community during the tenure of The City was represented by the funding bodies overseeing its programs, such as the United Way. As Nelson (1994) suggests, the dominant community “is loosely defined as primarily middle to upperclass and primarily European American” (p. 1). Contrastingly, the non-dominant communities are represented by program participants and the staff of The City. For Nelson this non-dominant community was “loosely defined as primarily middle and lower class and primarily people of color” (pp. 1-2). The inclusion of both the dominant and non-dominant community in the organizational structure of The City was a point of contestation as the mandate of the dominant community and the needs of the non-dominant community could be easily misaligned. Recognizing that the mandate of the dominant community can often get prioritized over that of the non-dominant community,
Nelson (1995) offers a perspective of community as tribe to highlight the importance of acknowledging the wealth of knowledge that the non-dominant community holds.

Emphasizing the cultural and structural differences that embody different communities, Nelson (1995) asserts the following:

there is a lot of fear about regressing to tribalism, because tribalism is primitive and primitive is bad, or so the argument goes…curiosity about what other communities of people have to offer is one of the first casualties, and certainly one’s own solutions carries the day in an uneasy atmosphere of continuous and growing failures arising from the status quo. (pp. 3-4)

The constructed fear of the other and the validation of dominant structures and solutions establishes a separation between mainstream and inner-city communities, whereby the understanding and knowledge connected to inner-city communities is purposefully undermined. The other here can be recognized via an “us versus them mentality”, weary of the diversity proposed outside of dominant culture attempts at progress and development. The constructed isolation that this position provokes alters the perception about how community is perceived and subsequently impacts the relationship with those from mainstream and inner-city communities. Tribal knowledge or attempts at diversity and difference result in the imposed classification of difficulty from the dominant community onto the non-dominant community. The rise of difficulty (crime and civil disorder) alongside difference (the questioning of collectivist aims) alters the realm of social control. As Bauman (2001b) recognizes, the coexistence between the hegemonic civilian and the questionable other “no longer can be treated as a temporary irritant” (p. 138); it becomes something that must be controlled.

Jock Young (1999) perceives this social control as reflecting a bulimia of sorts. The notion of bulimia for Young is predicated on Levi-Strauss’ notion of anthropoemy,
whereby in order to protect sacred social spaces, society ejects those deemed dangerous and condemns them to temporary or permanent exclusion. The bulimic society is thus one that both devours people and spits them out. The metaphorical use of bulimia references the advanced industrial society’s calculated erraticism of normalcy. The dominant community uses service delivery systems, alongside mass media, to help project images of desire and the underlying areas of progress and development that facilitate those aspects of desire (Young, 1999). Mass media, then, as McLuhan (1967) suggests, serves to entice people into this lifestyle—something worth striving for—and is reinforced through the hyperbolic examination of problem areas of society.

Working to reconceptualise how inner-city communities are represented, Nelson (1995) counters this pejorative understanding of the tribe with a perspective that supports curiosity. This position of curiosity attempts to validate the potential knowledge that individuals hold about their culture and communities, which is otherwise undermined when the tribal perspective is used to provoke isolation and fear. To highlight this point Nelson (1995) asks the following:

What if urban tribal life and the so-called “gang phenomenon” represent a group of associations socially adapted to provide the basic building blocks of community, relationships, and culture? What if these phenomena represent a cost-effective place to begin transformation of the quality of life in our inner cities? (p. 5)

Of course, it is these very questions that guide the approach that The City used to develop its At Risk Youth Service (ARYS) program. ARYS, and the later affiliated United for Peace, established a space for those immersed within this urban tribal life to dictate and facilitate the discourses surrounding the community. As will be expanded in later chapters, the foregrounding and validation of the voices and experiences of those from
the community over the more prominent direction of the dominant-culture became a place of tension between the non-dominant community and the dominant community.

### 2.2.2 Social Control, Community, and the Criminology Narrative

The contentious relationship between what Nelson (1994, 1995) saw as the dominant community and the non-dominant community offers an important glimpse into the complexity that arises when situating community into a narrative of criminology. The criminological narrative, as I will explore in this section, is constructed and imposed by the dominant community, very much impacting the relationship between the dominant community and the non-dominant community. The major historical transformations of the criminological narrative within the United States, broadly speaking, offers a contextual framework for collaborative efforts between The City and the city of Minneapolis. As will be discussed in this section, a major shift of the criminological narrative occurred in the latter half of the twentieth century that attempted to move away from the use of institutions like asylums and prisons and instead promoted the use of community based strategies. While for some this transformation highlighted a significant change in criminological thought and systems of social control, for others it only served to strengthen institutional methods of control.

Significantly, as will be explored in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6, the criminological narrative surrounding the dominant community that at one time supported, or at the very least cooperated, with The City’s programs changed following the September 1992 shooting of police officer Jerry Haaf. While The City was able to garner support for their programs from the city of Minneapolis and the dominant community for quite some time,
Criminology raises questions about how to respond to, or control, behaviours and acts of violence, deviancy, trouble-making, and/or any general undesirable action. The label of “crime” that frames these behaviours and actions is quite ambiguous in itself, rendering meaning only “when a number of persons regard the phenomenon of crime as a problem” (Quinney, 1975, p. 3). Quite contentiously, the meaning and function of crime varies depending on who controls this narrative. Thus, an objective positioning of a criminological narrative as working to explain criminality is too reductive. The incorporation of discourses about community helps to move beyond an objective classification of criminality as it questions the very method in which criminological classifications are applied. That is to say, the division and partitioning of community highlights how criminological classifications frame and suggest methods of social control (i.e., Who is the problem? Who is to blame? Who can help to alleviate the issue?).

Broadening the intent of the criminological narrative, Quinney (1975) suggests three interrelated areas of focus that are relevant to the consideration and understanding of criminology: (1) the formulation and administration of criminal law; (2) the development of persons and behaviours that become defined as criminal; and (3) the social reactions to crime (p. 106). The first two focus areas designate what crime is and
how we come to determine criminally defined behaviour – and more specifically how a
person’s respective positioning within their societal and cultural contexts impacts their
action and behaviours – while the third area of focus offers an important intersection that
highlights the influence of social reactions on discussions of crime. This third aspect
directs what strategies should be used for crime control, prevention and intervention (i.e.,
how do we respond to crime?), but it also works to assess public attitudes towards crime
(i.e., how does the public perceive and construct crime?). For Quinney (1975), public
perception is significant in discussions of crime, as it illustrates the subjective realities
that people associate with crime, realities that become embedded within the larger social
discourse around crime. Mutually constitutive, these three focus areas shape the contours
of criminality and impact how community is understood and positioned within narratives
of deviancy and social control.

As Cohen (1985) suggests, there have been two major transformations of the
criminological narrative in North America – one occurring between the late eighteenth
century and beginning of the nineteenth century, and the second emerging during the
latter half of the twentieth century. Scull (1977) highlights three salient features that
shaped these transformations. As he explains, these features were:

(1) The substantial involvement of the state, and the emergence of a highly
rationalized and generally centrally administered and directed social control
apparatus; (2) the treatment of many types of deviance in institutions providing a
large measure of segregation from the surrounding community; and (3) the careful
differentiation of different sorts of deviance, and the subsequent consignment of
each variety to the ministrations of “experts”…the emergence of professional and
semiprofessional “helping occupations.” (p. 15)

Alongside Scull’s emphasis of state involvement, systems and areas of control, and the
professionalized oversight of deviancy control, Cohen (1985) also highlights a fourth
core aspect from Scull’s descriptive account: treatment and punishment of the offender. As Cohen describes, with these transformations came “the decline of punishment involving the public infliction of physical pain. The mind replaces the body as the object of penal repression and positivist theories emerge to justify concentrating on the individual offender and not the general offence” (pp. 13-14).

Quite notable to the change of treatment of punishment, and reflecting the first major transformation of deviancy control is the development of institutions that served to isolate the poor and the deviant from the rest of society (Scull, 1977). Prior to the first transformation (pre-eighteenth century) deviancy control was minimal as there was weak state intervention and very little infrastructure intended for criminal control; jails and imprisonment, as Scull (1977) describes, “were places of pretrial detention, receptacles for debtors, and a means of ensuring that those convicted of serious offences were still around for the infliction of sentence” (pp. 19-20). These facilities were not designed for long-term detention, but were merely temporary accommodations (e.g., the county jail in Philadelphia in 1685 was one-half of a rented farmhouse [Barnes, as cited in Scull, 1977, p. 34]). Deviancy control at this time was largely regulated by the community, often using open forums to come to terms about an issue or punishment on a case by case basis (Scull, 1977). Issues of poverty and crime were dealt with by the community in such a way as to “provide for their own while relying on settlement laws to exclude the needy outsider” (Scull, 1977, p. 19). The gradual investment in institutions like workhouses, houses of corrections, jails, hospitals, and asylums in the late eighteenth century marked a significant shift in deviancy control where the most vulnerable populations (often the poor), previously dealt with and accommodated by the community, were now
purposefully isolated from the community. Thus, as Rothman (1971) argues, institutions went from a place of last resort in the eighteenth century when dealing with poverty and deviancy to being the first choice by the nineteenth century.

The established institutional presence and the intentional isolation of certain groups of the population marked the ensuing categorization of populations of the poor and deviant as illustrative of grander social ills. As Rothman (1971) claims, eighteenth-century Americans “did not interpret the presence of the poor as symptomatic of a basic flaw in the citizen or the society, an indicator of personal or communal failing” (p. 1). Rather the notion of poor had very little differentiation to it and broadly represented widows, orphans, those with a disability, the ill, and the insane. The rapid population growth of major cities in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and New York (Rothman, 1971) and the development of the capitalist system (Scull, 1977) foregrounded the ensuing shift that provoked the need for deviancy control. Not only did the rise of the capitalist establishment negate the once held sense of social obligation that communities held towards the vulnerable other, but they also used institutions to “remove the able-bodied poor from the community in order to teach them the wholesome discipline of labour” (pp. 28-29). The syphoning of the once homogeneous grouped populations of poor into workhouses led to a setting of exacerbated conflict, proposing questions about what was to be done with those who could not work within the prescribed framework of the capitalist system. Institutions and the now accompanying expertise of professionals used to manage the various forms of deviancy served to validate capitalist categorizations, and created a system that could isolate difficult populations for long durations on the claim of benevolence. As Scull (1977) reinforces, it was this claimed commitment to the
“restorative ideal” that worked to validate the necessity and development of the institutional approach.

Embedded within this institutionalized model, and the model which was prominent within the first major transformation of deviancy control, was the Positive School. Established by Cesare Lombroso in the nineteenth century, the Positive School attempted to establish a clear distinction between the criminal and noncriminal. The Positive School overtook The Classical School as the dominant method of thinking about deviancy and addressing crime. Highlighting the difference between the two schools of thought, Jeffery (1959) explains the following:

The Classical School defined crime in legal terms; the Positive School rejected the legal definition of crime. The Classical School focused attention on crime as a legal entity; the Positive School focused attention on the act as a psychological entity. The Classical School emphasized free will; the Positive School emphasized determinism. The Classical School theorized that punishment had a deterrent effect; the Positive School said that punishment should be replaced by a scientific treatment of criminals calculated to protect society. (p. 4)

Emphasized within the positivist position is a biological and atavistic position that the criminal presupposes the crime. While Lombroso did consider environmental factors, ranging from meteorological and climatic influences to the influence of marriage customs, religion, population density, race, economy, and government, to name a few (Ellwood, 1912), he used these to rationalize the restrictive or stimulating factors that sparked individual criminality (Quinney, 1975).

Where the Positive School led the first major transformation of criminological thought, Cohen (1985) argues that the first major transformation laid the foundation for all major deviancy control systems, while the second transformation is a little more contentious in its intent, where for some it represented a reversal of these original
transformations and for others it served to strengthen and continue the patterns directed by the first. In highlighting the intended motives of the second transformation, Cohen (1985) describes a movement – most notably advocated by those working within crime control settings – that sought to reverse the ideological direction of crime control that had been established through the nineteenth century transformation. As such, this movement sought to decentralize power and reintroduce community based approaches, deprofessionalize the field so as to limit the requirement and rationalization of classification of deviancy, deinstitutionalize practices of corrective care and promote community care approaches, and reverse the positivist approach that attempted to accentuate the deviant mind (Cohen, 1985). Quite notably, this movement attempted to once again conceive of the prison, and like-minded institutions, as a place of last resort in dealing with issues of deviancy, and instead prioritized a position of reintegration into the open establishment that is the community.

Evident in the suggestion that this second transformation rather than reverse the isolating and restrictive tendencies worked to strengthen the institutional and positivist model is the belief that this second transformation is predicated on a traditional view of community that is incompatible with the social structures in which the community is now constructed. Cohen (1985) argues that to reflect on the construction of community as it existed in the traditional, pre-capitalist view, risks idealizing the notion of community and mitigating the relative conflict and disorder that was both faced and tolerated, and perhaps more significantly undermines the point that community at that time was conceived of as separate to the state. As Cohen (1985) asserts, “the most obvious and incontrovertible feature of the current correctional policies is that they are creatures of the
state: they are sponsored, financed, rationalized, staffed, and evaluated by state-employed personnel” (p. 123).

The foregoing overview of The City exemplifies Cohen’s assertion, as the programs designed and implemented by The City, though certainly derivative of this more decentralized approach, remained embedded in the more restrictive correctional approaches of the dominant culture, as it was the dominant culture that financed and, in part, evaluated The City’s “progress.” In using Abrams’ distinction of neighbourhood care as service delivery versus that of neighbourliness to emphasize the difference between modern conceptualizations of community control and traditional community control, Cohen (1985) describes the following:

The one means the efficient delivery of bureaucratically administered welfare services to neighbourhoods, a more vigorous reaching out by the welfare state to those in need; the other means, as an alternative to the welfare state, the cultivation of effective informal caring activities within neighbourhoods by local residents themselves…attempts to realize either one are likely to militate directly against the realization of the other. But in practice most projects find themselves trying both at once: using formal means (agencies, organization, professions) to promote informal relationships, neighbourliness and reciprocal care. (p. 123)

Again within this illustration it is evident that The City attempted to establish informal caring practices that were designed and facilitated by local residents, but did so using more formal methods. While it is the non-dominant community that is central to the development and functioning of the various programs that The City implemented, the use of a formalized methodology instills a requirement to rationalize and validate the chosen approaches in reference to structures and level of tolerance reflected in the dominant community. Thus, even though community-care approaches attempt to mitigate state involvement, the notion of community within this perspective still remains very much embedded in societally dominant discourses of crime and deviancy.
Beyond merely offering an introduction to The City, Inc., this chapter was a more general inquiry into how community, and The City’s approach to community, fits into a criminological narrative that exudes a requirement to question what a community represents. Also included in this chapter was a broader articulation about how crime and deviancy are constructed and how they determine how we come to engage with and understand others, and again how the perception of community can be used to position and reinforce the treatment of individuals. Looking to expand on the ideas presented throughout Chapter 2, Chapter 3 will introduce the conceptual framework that guides this inquiry of thought. More specifically, Chapter 3 will look to offer an introduction of Emmanuel Levinas and his theoretical framework, and will explore how Levinasian thought can be used to expand on insights about the criminological-community narrative.
CHAPTER 3: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In keeping with the general themes of Chapter 2, I will use this chapter as a way to introduce Emmanuel Levinas’ philosophical thought. Looking to offer some insight about how Levinas’ theoretical framework can be used as we move toward the discussion facilitated by the discourse analysis of Twin Cities’ newspapers assessment of The City, I will explore Levinas’ emphasis on the Other in relation to the discussion of community. As will be explored, Levinasian thought offers a valuable contribution to the consideration of community as represented within a criminological narrative. As was considered in the Chapter 2 discussion of crime and criminal behavior, community serves as a central reference point in considering how criminological classifications are applied and controlled. Depending on the time, the criminological narrative may be such that the community is perceived as facilitating criminal behaviour, giving validation to correctional facilities like asylums and prisons. Alternatively, and in accordance with the timeline of The City, the criminological narrative may perceive the community as central to the care of “the deviant” and correction of criminological behavior. Levinasian thought develops the positioning of community alongside criminological narrative further by questioning how the responsibility to the other is, or is not, reflected within these different criminological approaches. Levinasian thought articulates a relationship of being with and for the other, a relation which precedes any and all language that comes to understand, know, and question the other. Levinas’ understanding of the way in which we conceive of the other has implications for understanding how the depiction of community impacts the capacity for the criminological narrative to interfere with how we come to know and be with the other.
Prior to expanding on the importance of the Other in my consideration of community, I will offer an introductory account of Levinas’ relationship with Martin Heidegger. While Levinas was influenced by Heidegger during his studies at Freiburg, Heidegger’s later affiliation with the Nazi party and Levinas’ Jewish heritage served as catalysts in Levinas’ reconsideration of Heideggerian thought: a philosophical thought that Levinas now acquainted with a reductive consideration of the other that permitted the violence and hatred perpetrated during the Holocaust.

3.1 Emmanuel Levinas and Martin Heidegger

3.1.1 The Relationship of Emmanuel Levinas and Martin Heidegger

Levinas’ relationship with Heidegger began soon after obtaining his license in philosophy from Strasbourg. Levinas traveled from Strasbourg to Freiburg to study under Edmund Husserl and chose Husserl’s theory of induction as the focus of his dissertation (Levinas, 1996). After the first semester at Freiburg, it was Heidegger and his work Sein und Zeit that impressed Levinas. In an interview with Philippe Nemo in 1981, Levinas (1982/2014) still asserts Sein und Zeit to be one of the finest philosophical offerings of all time, “among four or five others…” (p. 37). Following the completion and publication of his dissertation, The Theory of Intuition in Husserl’s Phenomenology, in 1930, Levinas intended to undertake writing an introduction to Heidegger’s ontology (Bernasconi, 2001). While the book was partially completed, and was later released as a paper in 1932, Levinas ultimately abandoned the project in 1933 after Heidegger joined the Nazi party. Having been born in 1906 in Kovno (Kaunas), Lithuania, and impacted by the upheaval of the First World War and the 1917 Russian Revolution (Levinas, 1996), Levinas was
weary of the possible correlation between Heidegger’s ontology and the outright evil that awaited under the Nazi regime (Bernasconi, 2001). The atrocities that were to follow during the course of the Second World War impacted Levinas, as his family, members of the Jewish community in Lithuania, were killed, and Levinas, while working as a translator in the French military, was captured and sent to a prisoner of war camp in 1940 where he did forced labor (Bernasconi, 2001; Levinas, 1996).

The impact and the reality of the Second World War and the Holocaust remained influential in the development of Levinasian thought. In the dedication in one of his most recognized books, *Otherwise than being, or, Beyond essence*, Levinas (1981/2011b) inscribes:

> To the memory of those who were closest among the six million assassinated by the National Socialists, and of the millions on millions of all confessions and all nations, victims of the same hatred of the other man, the same anti-semitism.

It is in this mature work that we see Levinas continue to expand and develop his philosophical thought in greater detail as focused around the central thematic of *substitution*, a fundamental conception in Levinas’ interpretation of the responsibility the we hold to the other.

### 3.1.2 The Departure from Heidegger’s Ontology

While Levinas’ later works are the focus of much of his rising popularity in current times, as they offer a more detailed iteration and encompassing account of his ideas, it is his earliest works where we see Levinas grappling with the departure from Heidegger’s ontology and an introduction to key ideas that would be built upon in his later works. Levinas’ first original book, *Existence and Existentia* (the literal translation is “from existence to existents”), was written during his captivity as a prisoner of war.
Existence and Existents marks one of Levinas’ first attempts to move beyond Heidegger’s ontology, or what Levinas called Heidegger’s “thought of Being” (Levinas, 1972/2006). While Existence and Existents is not one of Levinas’ most influential pieces it still serves as an essential piece in the development of ideas presented in his later, more influential works, Totality and Infinity, and Otherwise than being.

As is to be discussed, Existence and Existents, proposes a way to know the self that is presented outside of Heidegger’s emphasis on Being; a way that Levinas contemplates as being presented and offered in the image of the other, and sustained via the intersubjective relation with the other. It is this very questioning of the relationship with the other that I find pertinent to my later analysis of the emergence of discourses of community in newspaper coverage of The City. The use of Levinasian thought allows us to ask whether identified depictions of community offer the capacity to engage the intersubjective relation with the other, or whether they place limitations on the way in which I am able to come to recognize my relationship with the other. That is to say, in a given understanding of community am I to be seen as being responsible for the other, or am I to separate myself from the other and judge them based on the moral directives of the community and society at large?

In this opening piece, Levinas uses the terms “existence” and “existents” in place of Being and beings to describe the fundamental ontological difference, that is, the difference between Being and beings (Bernasconi, 2001). In his explanation of the ontological position, Heidegger argues for an understanding of Being that is derivative of the Being of a being. From this position Heidegger argues that it is from being-in-the-world, or what he terms Dasein, that Being is revealed and thereby understood (Sheffler
Manning, 1993). In the initial framing of his counter argument, Levinas (1978/2011a) argues that “in order to describe being-in-the-world, [Heidegger] has appealed to an ontological finality, to which he subordinates objects in the world. Seeing objects as ‘materials’ he has included them in the care for existing” (p. 34). As Bernasconi (2001) highlights, Levinas interprets Heidegger to be denoting a being consumed with its own Being. While Heidegger may not agree with this interpretation, Levinas contends that Heidegger’s understanding of being is maintained through an understanding of the same, or the Being that beings share (established through Western philosophy to represent the ego or consciousness), whereby in being we reduce the other to a totality.

Levinas’ consideration of totality can be recognized in our previous discussion in Chapter 2. It is very much the attempt to classify, whether it be an area like the ghetto or the hood, or a group like a gang or the deviant. The very objectification of a place, person, or thing, Levinas’ warns, is indicative of being immersed within this idea of totality. For Levinas, totality, and the desire to know the world, comes at the cost of oppressing and restricting the other; this desire is not done in favor of the intersubjective relation with the other, but is done by and for the self.

For Levinas (1961/2012), Western thought is predicated on the pursuit of a totality, which can be understood as an attempt to reduce the complexities of the universe into a knowable and manageable sameness. Levinas (1961/2012) proposes the infinite as an alternative to the totalizing impulse of ontology which reduces the other to the same, or which reduces the other to the knowledge of the other. The infinite, in contrast, contends that the other is beyond understanding: “the other presents himself, exceeding the idea of the other in me” (Levinas, 1961/2012, p. 50). Levinas contends that
Heidegger prioritizes Being as the source of knowledge and freedom, whereas for Levinas freedom is attained precisely via the intersubjective relation with the other. For Levinas, Heideggerian Being is consumed with the self (i.e., the self understanding itself) and offers a deceptively parochial understanding with which we come to know the world around us. For Levinas, existence occurs outside of Being and can only be offered and maintained via the intersubjective relation with the other. It is this very argument surrounding how we come to know and be within the world that has implications for the way in which we construct the criminological narrative and how that narrative then influences the discourse of community. That is to say, the criminological narrative can either be considered a tool with which to question and control the behavior of the other, or one with which to acknowledge our responsibility in and for the actions and behavior of the other.

For Heidegger, it is through the surrender to Being that a person may attain freedom and knowledge within the finitude of their lives. While Levinas too emphasizes the relation of a being to Being, Levinas, unlike Heidegger, does not assume this relation to already be in place; rather, Levinas argues that there is existence without existents. That is to say, Levinas contemplates Being prior to Dasein, or prior to its comprehension via being-in-the-world. Being prior to Dasein comes to be the focus of Levinas’ argument in *Existence and Existents*, and more significantly in his depiction of the significance of the other. As Sheffler Manning (1993) clearly articulates, “it is the being’s, or the existent’s, emergence out of Being itself that is the primary concern of *Existence and Existents*” (p. 41).
Levinas (1978/2011a) argues that the relationship of beings with Being is misaligned, as “it is called a relationship only by analogy” (p. 8). As Sheffler Manning (1993) explains, Levinas contemplates a distinction between “being in general” and “the being of the self.” Using the idea of the “there is,” what he describes as “the phenomenon of impersonal being: it” (Levinas, 1982/2014, p. 48), Levinas attempts to demonstrate the existence of being in general, or the impersonal being, via what he calls “modalities of being” (Levinas, 1982/2014, p. 51) including fatigue, indolence, and effort. The there is exists, as Levinas (1982/2014) describes, “in the absolute emptiness that one can imagine before creation” (p. 48), and for Levinas (1978/2011a) the there is represents “this impersonal, anonymous, yet inextinguishable ‘consummation’ of being” (p. 52). The there is represents a sort of nothingness, a horror, a darkness that does not meld within subjective-objective classifications that can be used to overcome the silence and comprehend being. As Levinas (1978/2011a) explains about the there is, “its anonymity is essential” (p. 53). The illustration of the there is serves to emphasize being in solitude; however, as Levinas (1982/2014) explains, “it is not a matter of escaping from solitude, but rather of escaping from being” (p. 59). As will be expanded on in this section, it is the trace offered by the other that allows the escape from Being.

In the consideration of community, the very nothingness and anonymity indicative of the there is comes to be represented in the systems of control used to protect the community from lingering threats and dangers. While Levinas highlights that the intersubjective relation with the other is essential to overcoming the horror and darkness represented by the there is, the establishment of systems of control negates the potential overcoming of the there is and instead serves to extend its lingering presence. In
imparting the responsibility onto the other to contain the there is, I undermine the very responsibility that I have to being with and for the Other and instead am left consumed within the there is, ever-weary of the lingering threats that consume me.

Levinas’ (1978/2011a) use of the modality of fatigue and insomnia to explore the presence of the there is offers a vivid illustration of the very consumption of the there is. In his description of insomnia, Levinas (1978/2011a) states the following:

The impossibility of rendering the invading, inevitable, and anonymous rustling of existence manifests itself particularly in certain times when sleep evades our appeal. One watched on when there is nothing to watch and despite the absence of any reason for remaining watchful. The bare fact of presence is oppressive; one is held by being, held to be. One is detached from any object, any content, yet there is presence. This presence which arises behind nothingness is neither a being, nor consciousness functioning in a void, but the universal fact of the there is, which encompasses things and consciousness. (p. 61)

Situated alongside this evocation of insomnia, Levinas (1978/2011a) uses the description of the darkness of night to accentuate the anonymity of the there is:

when the forms of things are dissolved in the night, the darkness of the night, which is neither an object nor the quality of an object, invades like a presence…The indeterminateness constitutes its acuteness. There is no determined being, anything can count for anything else. In this ambiguity the menace of pure and simple presence, of the there is, takes form. Before this obscure invasion it is impossible to take shelter in oneself, to withdraw into one’s shell. One is exposed, the whole is open upon us. Instead of serving our means of access to being, nocturnal space delivers us over to being. (pp. 52, 54)

Within the anonymity of nightfall, the self is consumed, indifferent from the stillness and darkness of the watchful night. In insomnia, Levinas argues, the recognition of the self is anonymous, and an object of anonymity much like the night itself. What is known is that there is something, a presence.

Levinas argues that there are two parts to consider in moving beyond being in general. The first involves the idea of hypostasis to suggest a mastery over being. Levinas
describes hypostasis as the movement from “being to a something” (Levinas, 1982/2014, p. 51), or as he alternatively puts it, the movement from a verb (to be) to a noun (an existent). While hypostasis presents an existent, and thus the suspension of anonymity assumed via the there is, Levinas still warns of the threatening presence of the there is. As the light of morning can offer a reprieve from the desolation of darkness, so too can systems of control offer a reprieve from a threatening presence. However, as Levinas’ consideration of hypostasis reveals, the daylight offers but a momentary reprieve from the presence of the there is. Systems of control, like that of the daylight, cannot fully overcome the there is; freedom from the there is can only be established through the intersubjective relation with the other.

As Levinas (1978/2011a) explains, “if an existent arises through consciousness, subjectivity, which is a pre-eminence of the subject over being, is not yet freedom” (p. 84). Hypostasis grants a reprieve from the there is; however, hypostasis, an existent, is situated in a solitary instant caught in its own existence: “it is inside of itself tied to itself…in the understood universe I am alone, that is, closed up in an existent that is definitively one” (pp. 84, 85). For Levinas, it is the alterity that comes from the other that allow us to depose the solitary subject.

In Levinas’ understanding of the importance of the other, the other precedes the self; to know the world outside of the solitary self, I must first reference it through the other. For Levinas, the anteriority of the other is demonstrable by the trace, which Levinas (1972/2006) describes as the impression of the other on the world. The trace for Levinas presents itself to the subject as external to time while impressing on the self an obligation of living in a world whose past and future exclude her and surpass any
comprehension. *The face*, an embodying representation of the world to the self, reveals the other and serves as a refutation of totalizing thought and understanding. The significance of the trace offered by the face is recognized by the understanding that “all the weakness, all the morality, all the naked and disarmed morality of the other can be read from it…the face, then, is not the color of the eyes, the shape of the nose, the ruddiness of the cheeks, etc.” (Levinas, 2001, p. 208). The face-to-face encounter is powerful in demonstrating the depths of my humanity that cannot be comprehended within the confines of an ontological framework.

The ontological framework, of which Levinas is weary, interprets Being that is shared by all beings. For Levinas (1978/2011a) it is the significance of the other which accentuates that “in Being there are beings” (p. 106). As Levinas (1961/2012) puts it, “the world is offered in the language of the Other” (p. 92), and as such the self enters into a world belonging to the other, as it is only from the trace offered by the other that I am able to escape the confines of Being and the there is. In the attempt to know the other from the confines of darkness, I risk betraying the other in order to reprieve the vulnerability that I feel from the there is. The trace, then, acts as an ethical appeal highlighting the unknowability of the other and ultimately leaving me to question how I come to know.

In the consideration of community, how we come to know and frame community is significant in addressing the apparent division between the dominant community and the non-dominant community. Community that is contemplated irrespective of the other risks chasing an idealized vision for community, one which remains consumed in attempts for control from lingering threats. Community that is recognized in light of the
other offers a basis for recognizing the insecurities that consume me in the confines of solitude. Regardless of how I come to know, whether it is through the confines of solitude or through the language of the other, there is a shared implication for the self and other alike, whereby I either reduce the other to a totality of my understanding, and risk oppressing the other in the attempts at control, or emerge within a relationship that is with the other.

In the foregoing description concerning the detachment of Levinasian thought from that of Heidegger, what emerges is Levinas’ emphasis on the importance of the other in emerging beyond a being in general and recognizing an existence established in being-for-the-other. It is this very recognition of the other and what Levinas argues is the responsibility that we hold to the other that will foreground the use of Levinasian thought in my consideration of community and the broader criminological-community narrative addressed in Chapter 2.

3.2 Levinasian Ethics, Community, and the Other

3.2.1 Ethics, Morality, and the Relation with the Other

Levinas’ consideration of the other positions him in contrast to the anti-humanism of the time; however, neither does he align himself with the humanist tradition following that of Kant, which validates humanity based on the moral capacity of the self through the faculty of reason. Levinas departs from the humanism which is based on the transcendental apperception; humanism which starts with the subject remains with the subject. Levinas’ humanism is thus for Levinas a non-essentializing humanism which begins with the other. For Levinas, the significance of an ethics-first philosophy is
unfurled through the recognition of the other. As Levinas describes, “prior to the arrival
of the human, there is already vigilance with regards to the other. The transcendental I in
its nudity comes from our awakening by and for the other” (Levinas, 2001, p. 211).

Critical to Levinas’ (2001) conception of ethics is the recognition that “all thinking is
subordinated to the ethical relation” (p. 211), which is presented upon the awakening of
the I by the other. Significantly, Levinas (2001) emphasizes that the intersubjective
relation with the other is asymmetrical: “the other is infinitely other, the infinitely other
for whom I have nostalgia” (p. 211).

The very asymmetry of the ethical relation is imperative in Levinas’ attempt to
contemplate morality based on that of an obligation for the other over that consumed by a
relation of desire. In conceiving of the creation of morality as responding to the
obligation for the other as represented through the ethical relation, Levinas (1961/2012)
provides the following explanation:

morality comes to birth not in equality, but in the fact that infinite exigencies, that
of serving the poor, the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, converge at one
point of the universe. Thus through morality alone are I and the others produced
in the universe. (p. 245)

As Levinas describes, the onset of morality is motivated by the ethical relation with the
other and takes the form of discourse mediated through a desire to know the self and the
other. Levinas is weary of the suspension of the ethical relation in favor of the morally
driven desire to know the other. The totalizing structure subsumed in desire risks an
oppressive relationship over the other, rather than a relation recognized by the
responsibility to the other.
Within this same line of inquiry, one could question whether the other is as indebted to me as I am to the other — a sort of reciprocity of being. Conceiving of this relation with the other in a reciprocal fashion, Martin Buber (1970), in his book, *I and Thou*, suggests that the emergence of the I from the other implicates the I in an action of reciprocity toward the other. For Buber, the I-Thou relation is illustrative of a relationship of general symmetry and reciprocity: “when I say ‘Thou,’ I know that I am saying ‘Thou’ to someone who is an I, and that he says ‘Thou’ to me” (Levinas, 2001, p. 213). For Levinas, the equitable reciprocity that Buber suggests in the logically contemplated I-Thou relation focuses too heavily on an idealized understanding on the relationship between the I and the other. Levinasian thought emphasizes the very asymmetry that is the basis of the relationship and obligation to the other. Questioning the benefit that is presented in a relationship based on reciprocity, Levinas (2001) denotes:

once one is generous in the hope of reciprocity, that relation no longer arises from generosity but from the commercial relation, from the exchange of proper procedures. In the relation to the other, the other appears to me as him to whom I owe something and in regard to whom I have a responsibility. (p. 213)

Reciprocity here is reflective of a view of community based upon Robert Putnam’s understanding of social capital, whereby social capital is central to community understanding and development. For Taylor (2011), social capital describes how social life enfolds with networks, norms, and trust that facilitate mutual growth – an idea immersed within the communitarian philosophies of the 1990s that perceived moral reciprocity as a valid means to overcome perspectives of individualism. Levinas’ insistence on an asymmetrical understanding of the relation between the I and the other beyond the terms of reciprocity, discerned instead via a responsibility to the other, is central to the exploration of community and The City discussed in Chapter 5.
For Levinas, responsibility should not be based on indebtedness to the other, for that risks an oppressive stance whereby I become a showcase of my own humanity. Further arguing beyond an understanding of Levinasian ethics as reduced to an understanding of reciprocity or Westernized liberal quest for equity, Tahmasebi-Birgani (2014) argues that such a reduction of Levinasian ethics implicates the relationship and responsibility that I have to the other into an inconspicuously harmful benevolence that ultimately reinforces converting the unjustly treated other into an equally oppressive totality. For Tahmasebi-Birgani (2014) Levinas’ notion of substitution adequately addresses this limitation as substitution represents “the event of suffering for the other’s suffering – despite one’s inability to create meaning out of that suffering” (p. 77).

The very responsibility that Levinas prioritizes in the relationship with the other becomes a point of contention when subsumed with the notion of the third. The third simply represents, as Levinas (1979/2011c) describes, “the third person emerging next to the other; the third person is himself also a neighbor, and the responsibility of the ego also devolves onto him” (p. 106). However, the third presents a quandary, as the inclusion of the third alters my understanding with the other and the relation and sense of responsibility that I hold to them. In the moment with the other and the third, I am left to choose how I come to know the other. It is the idea of the third, alternatively positioned as the political, that frames the basis for understanding justice and the criminological narrative (as discussed in Chapter 2) and that complicates Levinas’ understanding of the responsibility that the I has to the other.
3.2.2 Levinas, Justice and the Criminological Narrative

As explored in Chapter 2, the criminological narrative influences not only how we view crime and justice (criminal law), but also how we consider the other (criminal behaviors) and how we respond to the other (social reactions to crime). Crime and justice as formulated and administrated through criminal law impacts the ethical relation with the other. The ever changing construction of crime, embodied within criminal law, establishes a framework in which to view the other.

Problematically for Levinas’ ethical relation, criminal law comes to represent the third or a morally compositional other established through the political - a totalizing body established outside of the ethical relation with the other. Morally contemplated justice asks that I compare incomparable others. Seemingly toiling with the complication of the third, Levinas (2001) explains the following:

Between the second and third men, there can be relations in which one is guilty toward the other. I pass from the relation in which I am obligated and responsible to a relation where I ask myself who is the first. I pose the question of justice: within this plurality, which one is the other par excellence? (p. 214)

For Levinas the inclusion of the third and the forced reconceptualization of the relation to the other represents a core issue with fundamental justice. Within Levinas’ conception of the ethical relation with the other, it is Levinas’ understanding of substitution, as tied to the responsibility that I hold to the other, that is central in dealing with the “delinquent” other. Elaborating on this point Levinas (2001) describes that “I pass from the order of responsibility, from mercy, where even that which should not concern me concerns me, to justice which limits that initial precedence of the other from which we started” (p. 214). In his explanation of the importance of maintaining the ethical relation, Levinas
suggests that so long as *mercy*, alternatively termed *charity*, persists in conjunction with justice, there remains an understanding of being-for-the-other, the capacity of putting the other’s existence before one’s own. In describing the importance of considering justice alongside mercy, Levinas (2001) adds the following:

the state in which justice is not separate from mercy is a society where there remains the possibility, upon the return of the verdict, for the manifestation in public opinion and in the elite of a consideration in favor of the person judged guilty. (p. 231)

A contemplation of justice within the ethical structure of being-for-the-other, and which presupposes mercy, is very much tied and structured around the obligation and responsibility to the other. Thus, in being responsible for the other “if the other does something, it is I who am responsible” (Levinas, 2001, p. 216), for in the ethical relation I am also responsible for the actions of the other. As Levinas (1981/2011b) elaborates elsewhere, “the more I discover myself to be responsible, the more just I am, the more guilty I am. I am myself through the others” (p. 112). The responsibility to the other is stripped of its significance when justice and mercy are discontinuous.

Using the concept of *the verdict* to describe the discontinuity of justice and mercy, Levinas argues that the way we view the other is different before and after the verdict. In the course of reaching a verdict *I* am asked to judge the other through the confines of justice alone, thereby suspending the ethical responsibility that *I* hold to the other. After the verdict is reached *I* am left to resume the ethical relation with the other. Thus, the way in which *I* am told to encounter the other is significantly different before and after the verdict. Before the verdict, *I* am to judge an action and behavior, presumably to be judged criminal or not, and ignore the face of the other, that is, the very trace that asserts the connection and responsibility that *I* have to the other. The moment after the verdict,
ethics acts as a reminder about the “famous debt I have never contracted” (Levinas, 2001, p. 208).

Arguably it is the insertion of criminal law and the questioning of what is criminal behavior that provokes the choice to condemn the other in order to sever any obligation that I feel towards the other. Such a dismissal of obligation comes at great risk of favoring the moral, the conceptualization of the other as reflected within the jurisdiction of the criminal code, over the ethical, which implicates me via responsibility in the actions of the other. Taking a phrase from Dostoyevsky to make this point, Levinas (1982/2014) remarks that “we are all guilty of all and for all men before all, and I more than the others” (p. 98). From the moral, I dismiss the call to the other that permeates from the trace found in the face of the other, and instead I judge the other within the moral frameworks that have been deemed necessary.

Levinas does not wish to undermine the detriment caused by violent or criminal acts; however, he recognizes that in judging others I not only perpetuate a dialogue of violence and separation, but I accept and engage in oppression – limiting and condemning the humanity of the other in favor of my own. Thus, in attempting to separate ourselves from the very acts that we find morally inappropriate we opt to engage in behavior that Levinas would argue is far more dangerous and detrimental to our relationship and understanding of the other. To negate the face of the other is to deny them a humanity that they themselves have bestowed upon us.

The intent of Chapter 3 has been to offer an introductory account of Emmanuel Levinas, and the core aspects of Levinasian thought that will guide the analysis and
discussion that will be offered around community and the relation with the other in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. In the next chapter, Chapter 4, I will offer an overview of my chosen methodology, and provide a fuller account about how I will integrate Levinasian thought into my assessment of the selected print media commenting on The City.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Looking to expand on how the use of Levinasian ethics can be helpful in my assessment of community and the relation with the other, I will offer an overview of my chosen methodology – a discourse analysis. To begin I will describe discourse analysis and provide some consideration about how it will be useful in my assessment of Twin City newspaper articles concerning The City. I will then offer a description of the chosen sources of analysis followed by an overview of how I will use and structure the discourse analysis in this study.

4.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis itself is a relatively broad approach with a number of general variations. In its broadest conceptualization discourse analysis attempts to unfurl aspects of a given text which feed into particular micro and macro narratives (Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori, 2011, p. 530). I suggest that the current study is positioned within a practice of critical discourse analysis (CDA). As van Dijk (2001) describes it, CDA “studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context” (p. 352). As van Dijk’s definition suggests, CDA examines not only the top-down dynamics in which power and dominance are provoked, but it simultaneously explores the bottom-up relations that feed into discourses of resistance and compliance (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2004). The concurrency of the top-down and bottom-up discourses is an essential feature of the current study as I actively attempt to interrupt top-down considerations of power and control with the very vigorous bottom-up discourses of resistance offered by members of
The City. The permitted dynamism that CDA offers moves us away from understandings of complacency that can minimize proactive and reactive engagements within and between communities—i.e., CDA insists that researchers engage with the underlying complexities that shape relational dynamics. Given the contextually broad and complex features which facilitate the top-down and bottom-up features of discourse, van Dijk (1993) and Wodak (2004) argue that CDA necessitates a transdisciplinary consideration of the text and context under analysis. As Wodak (2004) explains, CDA is abductive in its approach as it works back and forth between theory and empirical data. Such an abductive approach does not limit discursive practices as fitting neatly within a given theoretical base; rather, CDA is more emergent in its efforts as it attempts to provoke the different theoretical undertones that exist through the top-down and bottom-up contributions of a text. The acknowledged necessity of a transdisciplinary approach fits well with this study, as my examination of The City is entangled within a discursive matrix that speaks to elements of criminology, geography, child and youth studies, critical race studies and social justice.

The abductive efforts that Wodak (2004) includes within her description of core CDA principles were largely developed from Norman Fairclough’s (1992, 1995) efforts to establish CDA as a sound methodological approach. Understanding the specific theoretical undertones that direct a given discourse analysis is essential because employing a generalized approach risks depicting discourse analysis, as Macleod (2002) warns, as an “uncontested methodology that can be applied in an uncontested manner” (p. 17). While there is certainly a level of flexibility surrounding how a discourse analysis may be conceived and implemented, it is not without some form of structure. As Parker...
(2013) notes, “each approach is governed by a series of conceptual and methodological terms, which themselves orient the researcher to attend to specific delimited aspects of language” (p. 254). From Fairclough’s position, CDA should not only establish an analytic framework that guides how social theory can be implemented in discursive practices, but it should also attempt to illustrate practical contributions (Macleod, 2002; Wodak, 2004). Thus, as Parker (1992a) suggests, “discourse analysis itself poses a choice for researchers who use it to describe or change the world, a choice that hinges on the idea that we always either reproduce or transform phenomena when we describe them” (p. 254). I see Parker’s position above as highly resonant as I approach this current study, for I see The City as an organization that stood out in its efforts and had a very active role in the voice and shaping of Minneapolis then and now. For the legacy of The City to be restricted to the prominent moments of violence that are showcased within the newspapers’ documentation of The City would be misleading and would be a demonstration of Parker’s concern to not reproduce that which has already been said.

Thus, for Parker and other prominent discourse analysts alike (see Fairclough, 1992, 1995; van Dijk, 1993, 2001; Wodak, 2004), researchers hold a very active role in the way discourses emerge. The way researchers come to represent and engage with discursive practices largely reflects how we position ourselves within analytic efforts. From this perspective Parker (1992a) offers a basic working definition of discourse as “a system of statements which constructs an object” (p. 5), keeping in mind that the construction of that object is very much embedded in what stands out for the researcher. As such, for Parker (1992a) reflexivity is a core part of discourse research as it leads the researcher to question the language used to construct a given discourse. In the more
modernist conceptualizations of reflexivity, the subject of analysis represents, as Pillow (2003) describes, “a subject that is singular, knowable, and fixable” (p. 180). My very use of Levinas’ ethical philosophy as a theoretical framework for this research serves to question the validity of such a reflexive method, as it is argued that not only is the other unknowable, but to totalize or attempt to know the other risks an act of oppression. The concerns of Nelson and Moss (as discussed in the Chapter 1 section on Positionality) surrounding the misrepresentation of the non-dominant community and disarticulation of organizational efforts, speak to this notion of oppression as they reflect what Pillow (2003) presents as the challenge offered by those “who have typically been on the ‘other’ side of representation” (p. 184).

I would suggest that the present method (as expanded in section 4.3) attempts to keep with Levinasian thought, as my use of a discourse analysis not only seeks to highlight language concerning the ethical relation with the other as consumed within the discourse surrounding community, but also insists that I be conscious about how I position my own understanding of the groups and individuals which I will later describe. As such, in looking to explore the ethical relation I will attend to how the discursively constituted conceptualization of community impacts the relation with the other, and consider what aspects of community discourse restrict and oppress the relation with the other. Oppression here refers to the urge to engage in language that attempts to reduce and totalize the other, so as to make the other knowable. For the purposes of this study, this translates to questioning how labels and descriptions about a program, a place or about those within a given program and place impact how community comes to be depicted and envisioned.
In moving forward, I look to Levinas’ consideration of the *saying* and the *said*, which he uses to question the problematic nature of language as it can work to arrest the ethical moment in order to establish a framework for knowing the other. For Levinas (1981/2011b), language, or the labels and descriptions that are used to know or totalize the other, risks placing the other within the confines of the said, what he describes as a “historically constituted vocabulary” (p. 37). Levinas argues for an understanding of language that can both be said and unsaid: an understanding that mitigates the desire to know the other, but remains committed to a relationship that prioritizes being with and for the other. Thus, in assessing discourses about community, Levinasian thought questions whether or not community is conceived of in idealized terms that restrict the ethical relation with the other, or whether community has the potential to be reconceptualised as need be.

In contemplating the construction of the said, the final construction and composition of thought, Levinas wishes to acknowledge the pre-original thought composed via the saying from whence a choice is offered: withdrawal from the ethical or the continued immersion within it. The saying, thus, represents a momentary potential of betrayal for Levinas (1981/2011b), the moment where language is either conceived as a “system of nouns” (the said) or as a verb and “modes of temporalization” (the saying) (p. 40). Rather than risk the potential betrayal and restrict the relation with the other, Levinas (1981/2011b) contemplates “saying saying saying itself” (p. 143). The “saying saying saying” proposes an engagement with language that is embedded within the ethical and remains with a course “for-the-other” as opposed to “being for-oneself”, as is derived through the said.
There is a profound significance in Levinas’ consideration of language, as both the saying and the said impact how we come to know and/or to be with and for the other. Levinasian thought offers a valuable framework in which to consider how aspects of knowledge and power are implicated in the language and conception of discourse about community. As such, I would argue that the way in which the discourse of community is conceived in the series of newspaper articles discussing The City largely impacts the way in which the relation with the other is conceived and constructed.

4.2 Sources and Sampling

In considering the importance of community discourses, I will use two Twin City newspapers as the source for articles to question how community comes to be depicted in the assessment of The City and its ARYS program. The articles used for my analysis are drawn predominantly from the two daily newspapers in the Twin City area: The Minneapolis Star Tribune and The St Paul Pioneer Press. The choice to draw from The Star Tribune and the Pioneer Press was made primarily out of convenience. While three other major print sources in the Twin City area, including the Twin Cities Reader, City Pages, and the Minnesota Spokesman Recorder, were identified via searches on the Minnesota Historical Society and the Hennepin County Library websites as having articles covering The City during the select 1987-1992 focus period, issues of accessibility and availability impeded their inclusion in this study. With the Twin Cities Reader no longer operational there was no archive with which to access relevant content. While City Pages and the Minnesota Spokesman Recorder are still active print media sources in the Twin Cities area their online archives did not allow for searches within the 1987-1992 focus period. As such, I have relied upon print sources that are notably
positioned within the dominant community and which target a middle class audience. With that said, my established methodology (as presented in section 4.3) will attempt to speak to concerns of using sources from the dominant community to direct an understanding of knowledge.

In looking to draw on articles from the Star Tribune and the Pioneer Press archives that covered the period between the start and the relative decline of The City’s ARYS program, I conducted a search between the period of January 1987 and December 1992. While there is a certain level of ambiguity surrounding the timeline of ARYS, 1987 represents the year that ARYS was established, and 1992 represents the year that the city of Minneapolis Police Department cut ties with The City following the shooting of a local police officer. The shooting would later connect back to members of United for Peace, an organization and membership that developed out of ARYS and that held the support of The City.

The searches, conducted through the online archives of both newspapers, were done using the search term “the city inc.” I was able to search the desired 1987-1992 period in the online archive for the Star Tribune, which allowed searches as far back as 1986; however, I was only able to conduct searches as far back as 1988 for the Pioneer Press. Accompanying searches using the search terms “At Risk Youth Service,” “ARYS,” “United for Peace,” “James Nelson,” and “David Dobrotka” were conducted afterwards to ensure that all of the available articles, as best as possible, were accounted for. An additional 2 articles were collected from the Chicago Tribune and will be included in the compilation of articles for the discourse analysis as they provide a detailed description of The City and the positioning of ARYS within the broader gang
and violence reduction efforts that were occurring at the time in the United States. In total, 191 articles were collected through the online newspaper archives: 125 of the articles came from the archives of the *Star Tribune* (see Appendix A), 64 articles came from the archives of the *Pioneer Press* (see Appendix B), and 2 articles came from the archives of the *Chicago Tribune*.

In the compilation of 191 articles, 25 of the articles are presumed to be editorials or opinion pieces (18 from the *Star Tribune* and 7 from the *Pioneer Press*) based on their location within the newspaper or the ambiguity of authorship. While it is often common to exclude editorials and opinion pieces from discourse analyses upon the contention of bias, I have opted to include them in the forthcoming analysis for two main reasons. First, they provide a more detailed account in many cases than the respective staff columns and thereby are invaluable to an awareness of some of the accompanying contextual aspects that framed the discourse around community and The City. Second, while it cannot be presumed that these articles are objective and unbiased, I still situate them as being embedded within and contributing to the middle-class readership that these newspapers target.

The latter point highlighted above is of notable mention as the intended middle class audience establishes a notable disjunction between the middle class discourse presented and the non-middle class experiences and environments that are being commented on in the case of commentary focusing on The City and its programs. As Nelson (1994) reflects on his own experiences of dealing with the newspapers’ presentation of The City, “the middle class institutions to which the Star Tribune clings to for hope, however – the corporations, the schools, the government – have opened
themselves up to middle class African Americans but remain as closed as ever to the non-middle class” (pp. 57-58). In drawing from cultural criminology, Ferrell (2013) argues that meaning, then, comes to reflect “the contested social and cultural process by which situations are defined, individuals and groups are categorized, and human consequences are understood” (p. 258). Thus, while the selected newspapers may target a middle class audience, their commentary and the embedded constructions of meaning certainly have implications for the middle class and the non-middle class alike.

4.3 Method

My analysis will be composed of two core parts. The first, as explored within Chapter 5, looks to analyse how Twin City newspapers depict community in their assessment of The City. It is within this initial phase that I will look to employ the use of The City’s six points of assessment for building community (introduced in Chapter 2) as a framework in which to conduct an open coding of the selected 191 newspaper articles. These six points of assessment – developing a sense of history and place, developing relationships and making relatives, the utility of culture, developing comprehensive community solutions, advocacy and institutional opposition, and a commitment to reflection: experimentation and research—help to portray the divergence of understanding between what Nelson (1994, 1995) describes as the dominant community and the non-dominant community, and represent key strategies that The City used to build community and to ensure the inclusion and representation of those within the communities with which it was working. As is represented in some of the newspapers’ accounts of The City, the major themes emerging from these six points of assessment
also represented a place of critique for The City’s strategies, and offer a clear framework in which to unfurl the depiction of community.

In being both a place for understanding and critique, these six points of assessment illustrate some key areas that serve to question: How is community framed and represented? What are the roles of individuals within a community? How is knowledge constructed and implemented within community? How does community restrict or isolate individuals? What are the interests and values of the community? How is community maintained? As will be expanded in the Chapter 5 analysis, some of the key areas that are focused on using the six points of assessment as an organizational structure are context, relationships, knowledge, programs and program goals, representation, and reflexivity. While some of these areas are more representative than others in the selected newspaper articles account of The City, each area of assessment is still central in the consideration of the divergence between dominant community and non-dominant community depictions of community.

In this initial phase, the total 191 article sample was examined and coded using The City’s six points of assessment. The use of the full sample in my initial examination was quite essential, as my positioning as a researcher both outside of the community in which this case study focused and outside of the contextual positioning of the organization more broadly left me with significant gaps of understanding surrounding The City’s positioning within the communities which it served and the relational dynamics between the dominant and non-dominant community. Something of a contextual awareness was essential in order to move beyond the reductive considerations of The City that were commonly portrayed in single newspaper articles providing only a
fragmented illustration of the broader contextual realities. Thus, a partial or randomized sample selection would have impeded my capacity to present a fuller understanding of the focused 1987-1992 examination period. While only 143 of the 191 articles are directly cited in the analysis to come—a judgmental sample of articles that speaks more directly to the emergent discourses of community flowing from within the six points of assessment—I would argue that all 191 were valuable in establishing a contextual framework in which my later analysis and interpretation develop.

The second core part of my analysis, and the basis for Chapter 6, concerns how the discourse about community as offered by Twin City newspaper articles impacts the consideration of the relation with the other. In offering a clearer method to consider how the depiction of community impacts the relation with the other, I turn to my overview of Levinasian thought outlined in Chapter 3 as a place to draw my set method of analysis. In working with the terms outlined in my account of Levinasian thought, I suggest three areas of assessment that will help in the consideration of how the depiction of community impacts the capacity for an ethical relation with the other. The three areas of assessment can be described as follows:

*Area 1: The trace and the face.* In this area of assessment, I examine how we come to know and be with the other. Central to Levinas’ consideration of the other is the prolonged capacity to sustain the ethical relation with the other. In part Levinas suggests that the sustained ethical relation is granted by the capacity to say and unsay; that is, to recognize that the other is unknowable and to not attempt to reduce the other to a knowable entity. In examining the depictions of community broadly, I will explore whether or not the language used to explain community allows for reconceptualization or
whether the depiction of community appeals for a progression and development towards an idealized (totalized) conception of community. Thus, through the use of each area of focus, I look to see how the depiction of community impacts the capacity for the sustainment of the ethical relation.

Area 2: Mercy, charity, and the verdict. In this area of assessment, I explore the moments in which we are made to question the ethical relation with the other. While for Levinas charity or mercy allows for a continued acknowledgement of the face of the other, it is often expressed within the confines of the verdict, as established through the moral questioning of the other and/or the other’s behaviours, which ultimately leads us to question the other outside of an understanding of charity and mercy. As such, I will explore key events within the designated period of focus that shaped how community is understood and which lead us to question the responsibility that we have to the other.

Area 3: The third and substitution. In this area of assessment, I analyse how the forced inclusion of the third, or the political, impacts the way in which we come to know and be with the other. Focusing on the coverage of The City following the 1992 shooting of a Minneapolis police officer, I look to assess how the reaction presented in the coverage of the shooting impacted the way in which the criminological narrative was considered within and outside of the respective communities. The 1992 shooting dramatically altered the relationship and trust between the dominant community and the non-dominant community, severing the ties between The City and United for Peace’s collaboration with the Minneapolis Police Department and the city of Minneapolis. As such, I will explore how this resultant fallout impacted the relationship between the
dominant community and the non-dominant community, and further explore how the city of Minneapolis reconsidered its approaches to combatting violence.
CHAPTER 5: PRINT MEDIA, COMMUNITY, AND THE CITY

In her consideration of the six points of assessment of The City, what she alternatively frames as its “six community building values” (p. 20), Applegate Nelson (2001) describes them as “a collective orientation to the work of the agency whether that be education or therapy or advocacy” (p. 20). Applegate Nelson’s description acknowledges the embedded position of these values in The City’s approach. As such, this initial basis for analysis explores how and if these collective values appear and are acknowledged in the newspapers’ assessment of The City. The apparent acknowledgement or dismissal of The City’s six community building values will be central to the Chapter 6 discussion as they serve to highlight how the other is acknowledged, at what times the relation with the other is questioned, and how the responsibility to the other is complicated by the imposition of the third, which forces us to at times compare incomparable others.

This chapter uses The City’s six points of assessment as an organizational tool, using each point as a key section for exploring the depiction of community in the newspapers’ assessment of The City. Each of these six points offers a different basis for understanding community and represents key areas that The City prioritized in its understanding and reflection about building community. I will begin each main section using the perspectives of Nelson (1994, 1995) and Applegate Nelson (2001) in order to offer a brief overview about the key point of assessment in focus before moving on to explore the depiction of each point in the newspapers’ assessment of The City.
The incorporation of Nelson and Applegate Nelson’s works at the beginning of each section is in part an acknowledgment of the critique by Applegate Nelson (2001) that the print media can at times undermine the voice of the non-dominant community in their coverage of events. In highlighting the potential bias of the print media, Applegate Nelson draws on an article by Philip Kretsedemas in his coverage of the fatal shooting of officer Jerry Haaf, in which he concludes:

In spite of their vast economic resources and airs of authority, The Star Tribune and the St. Paul Pioneer press are the distributors of the stories of only part of the American populace. At no point should they be allowed to usurp the credibility of our own shared knowledge and our own lived experience. We too can tell stories. (Cited in Applegate Nelson, 2001, pp. 55-56)

Kretsedemas’ conclusion demonstrates the capacity for print media to direct a course of understanding within their selected purview. As such, the brief overview at the beginning of each section serves in part to further frame the significance of each of these key points of assessment as members of The City acknowledged them. It also is in part to ensure that The City’s voice precedes that of the print media in order to help draw out the voice of the non-dominant community in the print media’s coverage.

5.1 Developing a Sense of History and Place

A key component of The City’s conceptualization of building community acknowledges the need to reflect how community is representative of the people and the place that it embodies. The history of The City, and the way in which community is represented, is based, as Nelson (1995) reflects, on “an emphasis on inner-city Minneapolis, young people and their families, the criminal justice system, culture, and pluralism” (p. 9). Recognizably, these core aspects that Nelson notes emerge within the more surface level descriptions of The City in the selected newspaper articles.
In the *Minneapolis Star Tribune*, the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, and the *Chicago Tribune* articles, The City is commonly framed as: “a south Minneapolis youth agency” (Tai, 1990a, p. 01B), “a youth agency in north and south Minneapolis” (Tai, 1990b, p. 03B), “a social service agency” (Cook, 1992a, p. 1B), “a social welfare agency” (Worthington, 1993), a “community development agency” (Worthington, 1991, p. 29), “an alternative school during the day and a drop-in center in the evenings” (Diaz, 1988a, p. 01A; Gonzalez, 1988, p. 05B), “a Minneapolis agency that works with at-risk youth and gang members” (Brunswick & Kaszuba, 1990, p. 01A), “a non-profit community agency” (Cook & Porter, 1990, p. 1A), “a non-profit community organization that aids inner-city youth and families” (Furst, 1992a, p. 01A; Leyden, 1992b, p. 01A), “a non-profit agency with family counseling and day-care facilities, as well as an alternative school and a youth outreach program” (Worthington, 1991, p. 29), “an outreach agency for troubled youth” (Bonner, 1992a, p. 1A), and “an agency for troubled youths, activists, and residents” (Cook, 1992e, p. 1A).

Beyond being merely descriptive key terms about The City, the outlined aspects of inner-city Minneapolis, young people and their families, the criminal justice system, and culture, highlighted in the quote by Nelson above, represent key areas of The City’s history that were important to its understanding and building of community; they each contributed to the identity of The City, what it did and where it came from. Thus, the history of The City is a shared one; not merely a depiction of individuals within a given time and place, but a reflection of the collective investment by individuals that impacts how a place comes to be known and serves as a signifier of their daily lives.
In speaking to the shared understanding of The City’s history, Applegate Nelson (2001) offers the following description:

The City’s history was a familiar litany quoted by veteran staff. ‘In 1967, parents opened a drop-in center as an alternative to their kids hanging out on the streets. The kids who came to hang out were not going to school, so…’ ‘The mother’s club began when City staff called together a group of mother’s whose kids were raising hell in the neighborhood…’ ‘The junior league started the Group Home…’ ‘The kids named the place the ‘Psychotic City’…’ New staff, new students and their parents, potential funders heard the litany and were oriented. Myths were created and perpetuated. (p. 22)

The embedded meaning reflected within the litany that Applegate Nelson shares is not just a series of events about how The City came to be, but reflects a rich history of conversations and partnerships that helped to establish an understanding of place and a shared sense of belonging. Being oriented to such a history offers a chance to engage within the conversations that shaped The City. Being outside of that conversation leaves one to know The City through its myths: an attempt to construct an understanding from the facts and figures of the neighbourhoods and events which impact The City, but which are removed from the very relational entity that brings meaning to The City’s history.

As is presented within several Star Tribune and Pioneer Press articles, the positional understanding of The City’s history is noticeably different depending on whether the comments came from members and supporters of The City or from someone unaffiliated with The City. Comments that came from those unaffiliated with The City were not only reminiscent of the surface level descriptions noted above, but they often portrayed The City as being a controversial organization: an organization “under the suspicious eye of the community that thought they were part of the problem” (Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). Part of this controversy reflects criticism about The City’s methods (Cook, 1991; “Deputy Chief Offers Apology,” 1988; Diaz, 1988a), their employees (Benidt,

Amid this skepticism about The City were the surrounding myths that The City was a hub for criminal activity. Such myths appear in some articles as the distrust between The City staffers and the police. As some staff members at The City shared, “some officers had long suspected the agency of stockpiling guns…the City Inc. also has had to battle rumours that it is using money from Los Angeles gangs in an attempts to acquire the Way’s boarded-up building” (Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). In another quote highlighting the distrust between the Minneapolis police and The City, “Jim Nelson, remembers one police captain remarking that ‘a lot of our guys think you people make bombs down here’” (Parker, 1992b, p. 1A).

Alongside those more critical positions of The City were those that acknowledged their “unorthodox methods” and thought they should be given a chance “as Minneapolis’ growing social problems defy orthodox solution” (Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). This was a commonly shared sentiment from community members, politicians, and Minneapolis police officers who, though skeptical at times, were conflicted by the evident benefit that The City’s methods demonstrated. In one such instance, Precinct Commander Steve Strehlow, commenting on the effectiveness of The City staff to help quell disturbances by youth in the City Center, acknowledged that “I guess I’ve been impressed by some aspects of the organization. The idea to provide some place for at-risk kids is a good idea,’ said Strehlow, who opted for using the City Inc. after seeing that using police only worsened the tensions” (Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). Such an ambivalent position of The
City was commonly framed using the statistical picture of Minneapolis’ current problems and the projections of what was to come.

The *Star Tribune* and the *Pioneer Press* articles prior to 1990 presented an urge to address the needs of those most “at-risk.” The selected newspapers present being at-risk as “having a statistically higher probability of dropping out of school and into pregnancy or crime” (Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM), as illustrated by indicators such as truancy, dropout rates, homelessness, low-income housing, single parent households, and unemployment.

Several articles attempted to capture this at-risk landscape of Minneapolis:

In Minneapolis alone 20,000 kids live in poverty, mostly in 12,000 single-parent households…More kids, particularly minority, single-parent youths, will be on their own in Minneapolis. (Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM)

At The City in Minneapolis, four-fifths of the 218 students last year lived in single-parent households or independently; four-fifths have had criminal-justice involvement; all were at high risk of not completing high school. (Inskip, 1989, p. 15A)

Embedded within the depiction of Minneapolis’ situation was an uneasy reassurance that the situation in Minneapolis was not as bad as other large urban centers (Diaz, 1990; Parker, 1992b). However, there is also a presented uneasiness about the reduction in funding and the potential carry-over effects that could impact the capacity to serve youths most at-risk:

…There’s been a marked increase in delinquency cases coming into the courts—a major influx of drugs with adolescents. About 9,000 students attended summer school last year, but this year the $1.5 million program was cut. The U.S. Department of Labor and the state ‘have dramatically reduced the financial support of the (city) summer youth program,’ … so only 475 jobs will be offered compared with 675 last year. (Furst, 1989, p. 01B)

As a reaction to Minneapolis’ then current and projected situation there was a desire to do something before things got worse. Projections offered at the turn of the decade (1990) emphasized an urgency to act, as signs indicated that things would only get worse:
The Twin Cities are beset with problems of gangs, drugs and violent death hardly imagined 10 years ago... The factors that contribute to those problems, chiefly racism, social exclusion and poverty, only show signs of getting worse in the 1990s... Felony convictions, a major indicator of crime, have been projected to increase by 7 percent statewide during the 1990s... That projection is based on a 1986 State Planning Agency study. It reflects the continuation of two major demographic trends: a population boom in the crime-prone ages of 15-25, and a doubling of the minority population in Minneapolis. Other social indicators also seem to portend bad things. In Minneapolis, which has experienced a steady drop in the number of middle-class families since the 1950s, the number of babies born to unwed mothers and the number of children living with single parents are up. (Diaz, 1990, p. 01A)

Amid the presented landscape of Minneapolis and its at-risk populations was an awareness that The City represented a well-funded organization—many articles (Clark, 1992; Franklin, 1988, 1990; Furst, 1992a; Inskip, 1989, 1990, 1991; Leyden, 1992a; “Minneapolis/United Way,” 1989; Porter, 1992) highlight The City’s funding grants from major organizations like the United Way of Minneapolis, The McKnight Foundation, Pillsbury Co., Honeywell Inc., The Minneapolis Foundation, The Bush Foundation, and the State Planning Agency—that offered services geared towards the most at-risk populations. Thus, The City’s image as “the unofficial headquarters of the city’s young street toughs” (Parker, 1992b, p. 1A) represented a tangible effort to mitigate lingering threats of crime, gangs, poverty, and unemployment.

The position of those unaffiliated with The City often comes across as somewhat mixed; uneasy about The City’s methods, but also appreciative at times of some of The City’s efforts. In commenting on the sharper criticisms and concerns about The City, Jim Nelson is quoted as saying “I would suggest that, generally, people who have problems with (us) aren’t educated as to the need” (quoted in Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). Both the

---

5 By 1992 The City held an annual budget exceeding $3 million USD and employed nearly 100 staff members between their North and South locations (Clark, 1992).
history of and the context for The City and its methods is often lost in the more surface level assessments of its methods and programs. As will be expanded in section 5.2, affiliates of The City—staff, youth, families, and funders alike—often present a deeper description of The City’s efforts and provide notably unwavering support even amid community tensions arising from the shooting of Minneapolis police officer Jerry Haaf in 1992. It is this latter point of unwavering support that speaks to the City’s efforts to build community and establish a sense of belonging.

The contextual position of the neighborhoods The City served largely include a history of racism and poverty. In an attempt to acknowledge grander systemic problems and to minimize the emphasis placed on the people and the communities it served, The City used an alternate to the position of “at-risk.” The City began using the term “underclass” in 1987 to “give context to the organization’s rising experience with young people involved in so-called gang activity” (Nelson, 1994, p. 9). Underclass as defined more broadly represents:

…poor people who live in a neighborhood or census tract with high rates of unemployment, crime, and welfare dependency…the Underclass is (further) defined by social isolation, spatial concentration, and dysfunctional behavior, the Underclass population turns out to be predominantly minority and primarily urban. (Joint Center, as cited in Nelson, 1994, p. 10)

Underclass as defined more specifically for the work of The City represents:

…individuals who lack training and skills and either experience long-term unemployment or are not members of the labor force, individuals who are engaged in street crimes and other forms of aberrant behavior, and families that experience long-term spells of poverty and/or welfare dependency. (Wilson, as cited in Nelson, 1994, pp. 10-11)

The use of the term underclass attempts to offer a broader consideration of the contexts that frame individual positions. That is to say, Nelson (1994) argues that positions, such as at-risk, merely emphasizing individual deficiencies and family dysfunction, which
often target young people and families in poor communities, are incomplete; further consideration about “the contributing role of economic, social, spiritual, and political factors” (p. 29) must also be acknowledged. It is this position of the underclass, an acknowledgment of the individuals and areas that The City had a long history of serving, which correlates with its efforts at developing a sense of belonging. In his description about how The City viewed establishing such a sense of belonging, Nelson (1994) writes:

A place where young people can belong and know others who are like them is an important anchor point for those who have not had many positive relationships with adults, institutions or authorities and who often come from families saddled with various pejorative labels. (p. 24)

Thus, in the midst of the at-risk discourse framed in the newspapers surrounding the current and projected state of Minneapolis and the accentuated problem areas and individuals, The City offered a position of the underclass. The use of underclass intended not to ostracize individuals and neighbourhoods as the focal problem, but sought to acknowledge a general sense of shared experience and belonging. As one employee at The City is quoted as saying, “this is a center of healing and growth” (Spike Moss, as quoted in Gelfand, 1990, p. 29A).

Problematically, the disconnection between those from the dominant community commenting about problem areas versus those immersed within those very communities emphasized the divergence between the at-risk position and the underclass position. That is to say, there is a clear separation between constructed discourse from the dominant community and the embodied reality of those from the non-dominant community. Jim Nelson highlights this as a notable problem with the Minneapolis police department, whose officers largely live outside and are unrepresentative of the communities in which
they work (Hodges, 1991b). As one article states, having so many officers living outside of the communities they serve impacts the type of relationships they attempt to develop:

only 20 percent of Minneapolis’s sworn officers live in the city. Of the city’s 831 cops, all but 168 commute to a dangerous job far from home. And some of them—far too many of them—strap on the mindset of warrior in an urban jungle when they leave their quiet suburbs and strap on their holsters. No one envies a cop’s life. As events proved last Friday, it’s a risky job that can make officers the target of killers. But the citizens of Minneapolis have as high a stake in what happens on the streets as the police. And the citizens do not want war; they want security and they want peace. (Coleman, 1992, p. 1b)

Such detachment between members of the non-dominant community and the dominant community created an antagonism at times that emphasized issues of racism and undermined potential collaborative efforts. This was a notable issue within some of the selected articles, as many conflicts that arose stemmed from tensions between members of the non-dominant community and the police. On a number of occasions, employees from The City served as mediating figures during possible instances of unrest (Brunswick, 1989; Cook, 1991; Furst, 1991, 1992a; Hodges, 1992; Jeter & Sweeney, George, Chin, & Cook, 1992; “Unrest was Quelled,” 1992); instances in which the standing tension with the police was seen to undermine their capacity to intervene without further aggravating the situation. The City’s efforts to mitigate violence not only occurred between the dominant and non-dominant community, but also within its own communities (commonly through attending house parties and other gatherings where confrontations were frequent [as noted in Furst, 1992a; Hodges, 1992; Rosario, 1992]). From the time it was founded, The City remained committed and attuned to the relational dynamics within the communities it served and more broadly to the dynamics between the dominant and the non-dominant communities, in its ongoing efforts to develop programs positioned within the broader history and place that shaped the community.
5.2 Developing Relationships and Making Relatives

Central to each of The City’s six points for building community is the need to create meaningful relationships with those in the neighborhoods in which it was working. As Applegate Nelson (2001) highlights, “authentic relationships are the basis of community” (p. 27). The development of authentic relationships reflects “making relatives.” As Applegate Nelson (2001) explains:

in addition to those relatives we inherit at birth, relationships which we “make” are also our “relatives.” At the City, we believed, as do most if not all cultural communities that we need all the relatives we can get. Having relatives sustains us when times are hard. (p. 28)

The City presents relationships under a framework of mutuality, acknowledging that “we will have an effect on each other” (Nelson, 1994, p. 25). Thus, the development of relationships based on mutuality was an attempt to depart from the formal and professionalized approaches that those within these focused neighborhoods took as being “extensions of the law or the public welfare systems” (Nelson, 1994, p. 25). The City did not propose an organizational method looking to impose a solution to correct the issues and ills of the neighborhoods, but attempted to offer a space to mitigate isolation and promote social interaction as guided and facilitated by those within the neighborhoods.

Significant to the practical realization of such a relational philosophy were efforts by The City to establish relationships with those who were isolated because of its involvement within the justice and welfare systems. Framing the importance of establishing relationships with those who may be isolated because of the restrictions imposed by the justice and/or welfare system, Applegate Nelson (2001) offers the following observations:
What is true of many young people living in the inner-city, particularly those kids involved in the juvenile justice system, is that they are lacking in relatives, individuals who are present, involved and have their best interests at heart.

There are a number of contributing factors to a person having few relatives or not enough relatives. Losing relatives has huge consequences—whether through death, violent or otherwise, moving away, divorce or separation or other forms of domestic strife. Sometimes relatives are unavailable due to incarceration. Sometimes, because of their own personal struggles, relatives have not much left over to give. (p. 28)

The difficulty that Applegate Nelson presents about the ability to establish and maintain relatives is often a core feature within *Star Tribune*, *Pioneer Press*, and *Chicago Tribune* articles about youth. The loss of relatives or the difficulty in sustaining relationships is commonly illustrated in many of the selected articles that cover incidents of violence, and is also emphasized within a number of human interest pieces about gang members by the *Star Tribune* and the *Pioneer Press*. In the very first of such features, Diaz (1987) begins the article with a showcase about the limited support for Munchie, the piece’s focal figure:

He never knew his father, and after his mother died in a car crash when he was 7, his only guidance came from his grandmother, a large round woman who, although she cares very much for him, had enough troubles of her own keeping her seven remaining children out of trouble while fighting a debilitating case of high blood pressure.

Two of his uncles spent time together at Stillwater Prison, and even now a snapshot of the two in the prison yard rests atop the color television console in grandmother Leola White’s sitting room. ‘There was nobody to tell me to go to school, to say it’s good for you,’ Munchie said. (p. 06SM)

The article moves on to discuss how Munchie at one time befriended “the wrong people,” a group of kids connected with a local gang, but is now on “the right track,” has a strong support system, and is working towards his ticket “out of the ghetto.” As the article concludes:

His grandmother joked that Munchie probably has more advice from people than he needs. But something’s changed. “A lot of people were always talking to
Munchie, but now he’s listening more,” Leola White [Munchie’s grandmother] said. “With a lot of these kids, their parents don’t care what they do. But everybody needs somebody to care about them, to greet them at the door and feed them and put shoes on their feet. Munchie’s on the right track now, and whatever he has in mind, we’re going to see that he meets his goals.”(Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM)

Emphasized within this piece, and similarly within the others (see Benidt, 1988; Bonner, 1988; Cook, 1992a, 1992d; Diaz, 1991a, 1991b; Kelly, 1992) is the position that “more kids, particularly minority, single-parent youths, will be on their own in Minneapolis” (Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM), and the corresponding emphasis on a choice between a good path and a bad path. While Munchie opts to choose the good path, there is much disjunction within *Star Tribune, Pioneer Press,* and *Chicago Tribune* articles about what the good path looks like and who are viable leadership figures within communities.

In its development of relationships, The City attempted to position itself outside of institutionalized approaches led by the justice and welfare systems by acknowledging the potential benefit that individuals had to offer for their community, rather than relying on an understanding reflective of the labels imposed through the systems of the dominant culture. In outlining the atmosphere at The City, Nelson (1994) offers the following description:

The facilities are informal and are operated in such a fashion that young people and families feel comfortable, safe and at home here, others may not. While there are rules, they are minimal and allow this community to feel somewhat in control of their surroundings. The result is an atmosphere, a place that feels safe, not an extension of the police, the courts or the welfare system. (p. 25)

As is emphasized within the selected newspaper articles, there is an evident distrust of legal and welfare systems from those within the non-dominant community, often articulated as “the system failing” or a tendency to be entrapped within the system (Benidt, 1988; Bonner, 1992b; Cook, 1990b; Cook & Porter, 1990; Diaz, 1991b; Hodges,
1990a; Kelly, 1992; Tai, 1989). As such, The City’s centers attempt to afford a level of control to those who use them and to acknowledge those who are largely left isolated by things like the legal and welfare system. Representative of such efforts, The City is commonly acknowledged as attempting to accommodate “youths who haven’t worked out anywhere else” (Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM; similar references appear in Bonner, 1988; Inskip, 1990; Tai, 1988, 1990a;).

While the newspaper articles often portray The City’s efforts as being controversial, members of The City position its work around an attempt to “care for each other.” As Jim Nelson is quoted as saying, “I think it comes down to individual people caring for each other...We can have all sorts of neat policies—get tough on crime, build more prisons—but if you don’t see people working together, we’ll still be a violent nation” (quoted in Hopfensperger, 1992, p. 01B). The relational efforts that The City attempted to provide are often captured in statements offered by those who are in some way affiliated with The City. Some such statements include: “they treat you like family and they really care about you. It keeps the kids off the street” (Suzie Dean, as quoted in Diaz, 1988a, p. 01A; similar descriptions highlighting The City’s relational efforts can be found in Benidt, 1988; Bonner, 1988; Cook, 1992a; Diaz, 1987; Furst, 1992a; Inskip, 1990; Kaszuba, 1989; Kelly, 1992).

Where The City and its staff present a desire to work with those with whom no one else is willing to work, the articles present the dominant community as offering reservations about validating such efforts. That is to say, the articles present the dominant community as being hesitant about acknowledging current and former gang members as valuable leadership figures for youth and the community. Perhaps the most consistent
skepticism comes from the police who largely oppose The City hiring gang members (Benidt, 1988; Cook, 1991, 1992a; “Deputy Chief Offers Apology,” 1988; Diaz, 1988a; Furst, 1992a; Gonzalez, 1988; Grow, 1992a; Hodges, 1991b; Kaszuba, 1989; Leyden, 1992c). The articles present the hiring of current and former gang members as being antithetical to efforts to get youth to choose the correct path. What is commonly emphasized within the selected articles is the need for former gang members to demonstrate “a conversion” or a rehabilitation of sorts: “given time, training and a proven track record he [reference to a former gang member and employee at The City] could be part of the solution. But to go from gang member to social-service worker overnight I think is neither appropriate nor workable” (Minneapolis Deputy Police Chief in 1988, Bob Lutz, as quoted in Benidt, 1988, p. 01B).

Questions of appropriateness and demonstrated rehabilitation appear alongside a conditional acceptance, whereby the dominant community skeptically surveyed The City’s efforts and quickly condemned such efforts at the sign of conflict. Following the shooting of an employee at The City, the Deputy Police Chief at the time Bob Lutz commented that “I have no time for the City, Inc. I’m not impressed by them. These are some of the people who have done everything they can for 20 years to bilk the community” (“Deputy Chief Offers Apology,” 1988, p. 03B). While Lutz’s comments were later retracted at the insistence of The City, the insinuation that The City’s efforts “bilk the community” reflected an evident distrust of the unconventional; such admonishments, though regularly presented in the selected articles following incidents of violence, were exasperated following the death of Jerry Haaf in 1992, particularly by the police union and politicians. In one example, Steve Cramer, a city councillor in
Minneapolis, presented a position of naivety about the dominant community’s allowance of United for Peace and The City’s efforts:

A lot of people, myself included, were naïve…In some respects, it’s been worse than if we’d done nothing…It is fuzzy thinking to believe adults who have been—and chose to stay—on the wrong side of the law can show young people to the right side of society…our commitment to creating positive alternatives…must be absolute. But we can’t do that and at the same time confuse young men and women about what constitutes acceptable conduct in an orderly world. (Minneapolis City Councillor and 1992 mayoral candidate, Steve Cramer, as quoted in Baden, 1992c, p. 01B)

Notably, Cramer’s remarks came shortly before he entered the mayoral race for Minneapolis, and for members of The City represented an attempt to politically position himself and build support within the dominant community (Baden, 1992c). Cramer’s remarks, along with others presented from the dominant community, depict a level of authority about what takes place within both the dominant and non-dominant communities. Such authority seems to impact the effort allotted to developing relationships and collaboration within and between communities. Where The City demonstrates strong attempts to establish viable relationships, some of the relationships that existed between The City and members of the dominant community were associative. Associative relationships, as illustrated within some of the selected newspaper articles, reflect those with which members of the dominant community do not attempt to establish a fuller understanding of The City’s efforts, but merely offer a tolerance so long as no issues arise. Associative relationships are often broken after incidents of violence or conflict and are followed by efforts to bolster support for individual organizational initiatives. The Minneapolis Police Federation offers a prominent example of efforts to bolster support following an incident of violence.
Recognizably, the Police Federation and its president at the time, Al Berryman, never appear open to The City’s efforts and United for Peace, but were tolerant up until the shooting of Jerry Haaf. Following the shooting, the Federation attempted to strengthen the commitment shown by the Police Chief John Laux and the city of Minneapolis to Minneapolis police officers. In one proposal offered in October, 1992, Berryman asked Police Chief Laux for the following items:

increase funding and support for drug enforcement activities by returning drug seizure funds to the department under the police chief’s control. Increase the narcotics enforcement units to deal with the city’s drug problem and provide the unit with sufficient funds… “Cease dealing with known or suspected criminals as representative of the community and establish relationships with people and organizations with honorable reputations in the community.”…Admit that there is a ‘real and serious gang problem in this city’ and establish a task force to handle the increasing gang activity…Name a critical incident team of primarily minority officers to be available in any emergency situation involving the police and the minority community. (Brunswick & Furst, 1992, p. 01B [emphasis added]; further commentary on these proposed changes can be found in Baden, 1992b; Brunswick, 1992b; Furst, 1992b; Parker, 1992d)

Further, the Federation attempted to strengthen support within the dominant community by holding a T-shirt sale using the slogan “United for Police” (a play on United for Peace) and releasing a series of radio ads presented as garnering support for the police and for “peace and public safety” (Furst & Smith, 1992, p. 01B; commentary for and against the Police Federation’s methods at rallying police support can be seen in Brandt, 1992; “For cops, and for Minneapolis too,” 1992; Furst & Leyden, 1992b; Klobuchar, 1992a, 1992b; “Letters from readers,” 1992a, 1992b; “Sending a message to the police union,” 1992). Controversial, the ad states:

They stalked him, waited until he was alone, snuck up behind him, fired their illegal guns into his back. Thirty-year Minneapolis police veteran Jerry Haaf found the strength to call for help and died.

What will Jerry Haaf’s death mean? It’s up to us. People are afraid in Minneapolis. If the police aren’t safe, who is?
Your police, members of the Minneapolis Federation, are asking for your help. With your help we’ll catch the killers. But the violence must stop or the jobs will continue to leave, your neighbors will keep moving. Call us at 788-8444. That’s 788-8444. Jerry Haaf will have died for nothing unless we all work together to make this city safe again. Politicians have never solved a crime. Your police and you the citizens of Minneapolis can if we work together. Paid for by the Minneapolis Police Officers Federation. (Quoted in Furst & Smith, 1992, p. 01B)

Notably, the Federation’s ad is relatively calm in comparison to the memorial piece for Jerry Haaf presented on the Police Federation’s website honoring officers killed in the line of duty, which concludes (as they have written and emphasized): “For their deed they should be HUNG, but that will not happen in Minnesota. Hopefully they will die in prison. Whatever happens to them, one thing is for sure—they will rot in hell for eternity” (MPD Federation, 2015).

Where The City’s position on relationships and making relatives reflects an understanding of mutuality that acknowledges the impact that individuals have on one another, the attempts by the Police Federation to garner support for its officers and its efforts are counterintuitive to a mutual connection as it undermines the value of relational bonds it does not direct. The conditional selection of relationships and the presented desire for peace and public safety artificializes the depiction of community as something malleable and controllable. As The City’s effortful desire to build community indicates, it is hard to control that which you do not fully understand.

5.3 The Utility of Culture

The recognition of the utility of culture strongly reflects Nelson’s (1995) description of community as tribe. As introduced in Chapter 2 (see 2.2.1 Community and The City), Nelson reflects how tribalism, as framed within the dominant community,
often constitutes a regression to a form of primitive knowledge; primitive knowledge here represents that which is evidently divergent from ideas constructed and supported within the dominant culture. Such connotations surrounding “primitive knowledge” dismiss the importance that other perspectives of culture offer in understandings of knowledge and healing that help towards building community. In The City’s position within the non-dominant community, such alternative understandings have been paramount to the development of relationships:

Because of long term historical relationships with American Indian and African American communities, we have developed culturally-specific approaches that respect, recognize and utilize the cultural and tribal orientations of families. Without the experiences of these historical relationships, there would be no context to either appreciate or appropriate the perspectives, world views and traditions of these non-dominant cultures. The opportunity to tap into the richness of traditional and native healers and teachers is too often missed. (Nelson, 1994, pp. 26-27)

The City worked to support and advocate for the use of such alternative understandings of culture, looking to local leadership to guide and facilitate the development of services. As Nelson (1994) highlights, The City was largely composed of those from the communities it was a part of: “over 85% of The City’s staff represent the cultural orientation of the community we serve and over 80% of staff are either former program participants and/or have been long term residents of the community” (p. 28). The City’s methods place a value on culturally-specific approaches developed by those within the communities rather than relying on and imposing institutionally constructed methods.

The definition and understanding of knowledge, as it appears within Star Tribune, Pioneer Press, and Chicago Tribune articles, often highlights the divergent perspectives between the dominant and non-dominant community; however, the articles allot much more emphasis to unfurling the meaning and definitions behind perspectives from the
dominant community. This is especially true surrounding conversations about gangs and the contrast between The City’s efforts to work with gang members and the efforts from the dominant community to do something about gangs.

Members of the non-dominant community at times refuted and reframed the newspapers’ repeatedly criminalized depiction of gangs. Following incidents of violence often portrayed as being “gang-related,” families of those involved attempted to refute the label of gang member, often insisting that their relative was not associated with a gang (see Benidt, 1988; Bonner, 1988; Brunswick & Kaszuba, 1990; Diaz, 1987, 1988a, 1988b). On most occasions, the articles continue to allude to possible gang affiliations, looking for symbolic representations to illustrate such connections. For example, following the much publicized death of Tycel Nelson, in an attempt at symbolic association one article highlights the color of the flowers being placed on the coffin to illustrate a possible gang affiliation: “at the gravesite, some of the youths placed carnations tinged in blue on the coffin. Blue is the color of the Disciples” (Leyden & Short, 1990, p. 01A). Throughout the coverage of Tycel’s death his family denied gang affiliation, while the police did presume a connection (Brunswick & Kaszuba, 1990).

At other times articles demonstrate an attempt by those from The City and those identifying with gangs to reframe the understanding of gangs away from the merely criminalized connotations highlighted within the newspapers and towards an understanding emphasizing the meaning of gangs as they are positioned within the community. The use of the term “gang” is often questioned by members of The City, who note that “the youths…use such terms as families and nations rather than gangs” (Inskip, 1990, p. 23A; similar reframing of the use of the term gang appears in Cook, 1992a;
Leyden, 1992b). Highlighted within the attempted reframing of gangs is an acknowledgment that there are at times negative aspects, but there is also an emphasis on positive aspects that are often negated within criminalized connotations: “they [gangs] can be a place to be nurtured, supported, challenged—things communities where you and I came from” (Jim Nelson, as quoted in Inskip, 1990, p. 23A). As appears in the articles, staff from The City often attempted to acknowledge the benefit of such positive aspects, clarifying that its programmatic efforts neither are an attempt to remove kids from gangs or a condoning of gangs, but an attempt to mitigate the negative behaviors (Cook, 1992a; Inskip, 1990; Worthington, 1991).

While the dominant community often questions such reframing, Nelson (1994) highlights the importance of considering an understanding of gangs from the non-dominant community:

the dominant community tends to be unsympathetic to non-dominant cultural approaches often considering them to be amateurish, soft, and romantic. Such condescension ignores the fact that members of racial and cultural minorities have supported themselves over the years by developing indigenous healing and supporting systems: churches, extended families, tribes, fraternal associations and gangs. (p. 27)

Within *Star Tribune, Pioneer Press,* and *Chicago Tribune* articles, non-dominant community positions are often questioned through the use of authority figures from the dominant community, including academics, police, politicians, and the media. Gangs and gang members as understood through the lenses of these authority figures within the dominant community are often associated with an understanding of criminality. Recognizably, both the term gang and gang member are positioned as ambiguous terms that vary in definition depending on the particular agency, the city, the region of a country, race, ethnicity, age, group function, type of activities, degree of criminality, and
level of organization (Spergel, 1995). However, in an attempt to establish a uniform description about what a gang is, Klein’s (1971) definition has been influential and popular in the academic community and other areas of the dominant community, including the police. Klein’s definition describes a gang as

any identifiable group of youngsters who (a) are generally perceived as a distinct aggregation by others in their neighborhood, (b) recognize themselves as a denotable group (almost invariably with a group name), and (c) have been involved in a sufficient number of delinquent incidents to call forth a consistent negative response from neighborhood residents and/or law enforcement agencies. (p. 13)

While Klein’s definition frames a gang somewhat broadly, Bursik Jr. and Gramsick (2006) suggest that the inclusion of the third condition in Klein’s definition disqualifies the majority of groups from this “gang” classification, and remains flexible enough to be applicable to the range of gang types. In a panel discussion convened by the Star Tribune, it is acknowledged that “there is little agreement in the community about what gangs are, who is in them and how serious the problem is” (Diaz & Peterson, 1991a, p. 12A). The panel included “a judge, two police officers, a prosecutor, two psychologists, two community activists, a former police chief, a reform-school chaplain, two gang outreach workers, and an official with the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People]” (Diaz & Peterson, 1991a, p. 12A; see also “Gang violence,” 1991). Notably, the determined definition of a gang highlighted by Diaz and Peterson (1992) within the article was “the continuing organization of youngsters in a given neighborhood controlling its turf, engaging in antisocial behavior, wearing identifiable insignia, enforcing membership criteria, engaging in conflict, and committing
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6 For a broader overview of classical and modern gang typologies, and their distinction from common stereotypes about gangs, see Klein and Maxson (2006).
crimes” (p. 12A). As was acknowledged, the chosen definition largely coincided with “the nationwide literature of gangs” (Diaz & Peterson, 1991a, p. 12A) that is noted above and is largely representative of an understanding from the dominant community.

The appeal to authority within *Star Tribune*, *Pioneer Press*, and *Chicago Tribune* articles also directs the understanding of the “gang member.” From an academic position, Spergel (1995), too, offers a broad definition of a *gang member* that is flexible enough to accommodate the different positions and roles of gang membership:

> Various types of members who engage in a range of legitimate, illegitimate, criminal, and/or violent behaviors. Leaders and core members of youth street-gangs are often (but not always) more serious and frequent offenders than are other kinds of gang members. Arrested gang members are more likely to become career criminals than arrested non-gang delinquents. (p. 327)

Spergel’s authority and definition is of note as he is often called upon within *Star Tribune*, *Pioneer Press*, and *Chicago Tribune* articles to comment on The City’s approaches along with other academics, including Malcom Klein, whose definition of a gang is highlighted above (references to gang researchers can be found in “Conference to Explore Violence,” 1992; Diaz, 1990; Diaz & Peterson, 1991b; Peterson, 1991b; Rosario, 1992; Worthington, 1991, 1993). The newspapers’ use of authority figures like Spergel and Klein often raised doubts about The City’s methods. In one *Chicago Tribune* article, Spergel is noted as commenting that he “is less enthusiastic about hiring them as outreach workers with other gang members. ‘The few studies that have been done say that the street worker approach does not work’” (Worthington, 1991, p. 29).

Spergel’s comments were often a shared view by other prominent figures within the dominant community, including police officers and politicians who similarly questioned the capacity for gang leaders to serve as positive community figures. The use
of authority figures, like Spergel, served to position and judge The City’s programmatic efforts under the commonly used gang and violence reduction programmatic classifications of an intervention, prevention, and suppression approach. Spergel and Klein stand out as notable figures within academic gang literature as they both attempted to develop the use of comprehensive gang and violence reduction strategies, which is the most prominently used strategy in more recent times. As will be expanded further in Chapter 6, the newspapers’ incorporation of commentary from authority figures served to question the validity of The City’s approaches by narrowly orienting its programs within an understanding of either prevention, intervention, or suppression. Such orientations provide a reductive consideration of The City’s efforts and its position within the non-dominant community, as the experts who were commenting on The City did so without an understanding of its methods, its intentions, its integral knowledge, and its goals.

At other times the dominant community questioned The City’s knowledge and familiarity with gangs when its figures and summarization of gangs within the Twin Cities did not meld with figures and representation from the dominant community (see Furst, 1992b; “Gang violence,” 1991). Members of The City were not shy or hesitant in their acknowledgment of gangs. In highlighting the presence of gangs, Spike Moss, director of ARYS, explains that “when we first talked about this problem 4 ½ or 5 years ago, there was one group with something like 16 members. Now there are 23 to 24 groups” (Gonzalez, 1988, p. 05B). Moss’ insistence on the presence of gangs came at a time around the start of ARYS when the then police chief of Minneapolis, Tony Bouza, perceived the negative aspects of gangs to be associated with “a youth problem” (Diaz & Peterson, 1991a; Gonzalez, 1988). A similar divergence of opinion was highlighted upon
the release of a contentious report issued by The City outlining gangs in St. Paul in October 1992 (the controversy surrounding this report is highlighted in Collins, 1992; Davis, 1992a, 1992b; Lonetree, 1992a; Smith, 1992; “Study by the city,” 1992). While the St. Paul city council commissioned The City to conduct the report, The City’s findings offered far higher estimates of active gangs and gang members in St. Paul than had been estimated by the St. Paul police department.

The tension presented over the acknowledgment and understanding of gangs between the dominant community and the non-dominant community highlights an attempt to reposition what gangs represent. Where the dominant community largely portrayed gangs within a criminological understanding, The City seemed to acknowledge gangs from the understanding that though they did present some negative aspect, they were also much more than that: so-called gangs had positive features that could be used to mitigate negative behaviors, which were in part a reaction to larger systemic issues of racism and poverty that framed their communities, and were connected to the culture within the community. Such an expanded position demonstrates that gangs will not simply go away: “when one reporter asked, ‘Why not dissolve the gangs?’ an angry (Spike) Moss responded: ‘This is part of our culture…this is not a question to ask us.’ (Cook, 1992b, p. 1A). As The City and United for Peace’s efforts demonstrate, an acknowledgement of the experiences and contextual position of gangs is essential to develop relationships that can impact the representation of gangs and gang members. The understanding that gangs and gang members have a part to play in the development of community is often overlooked when gangs are positioned solely within a criminological viewpoint.
5.4 Developing Comprehensive Community Solutions

While it is one thing to respect and value the place for culturally attuned methods in building community, The City also advocated for patience in allowing such methods to emerge. As Nelson (1994) describes, “too often institutions working in inner city communities begin with the imposition of a favourite solution or methodology rather than just ‘being in’ the community” (p. 28). In speaking about the issue of more specialized approaches, Richard Mammen, the director of the Minneapolis Youth Coordinating Board in 1987, notes: “We have a lot of different programs, but the problem is they’re fragmented. They deal with specific needs and issues. But kids’ lives aren’t neatly compartmentalized into specific needs and issues” (quoted in Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM). The City’s emphasis on patience and understanding addresses Mammen’s concern about ascertaining resources attuned to the various complexities that surround individuals’ daily lives. Highlighted in the same newspaper article, Spike Moss, director of ARYS, comments that “too many youth services are set up for the people who work inside rather than for the clientele they serve. ‘The industry is 9-to-5…But in the wee hours of the night we got kids all dressed up with nowhere to go from one end of Plymouth Av. to the other’” (quoted in Diaz, 1987, p. 06SM). As Moss highlights, a collaborative effort by both those for whom the services are geared and those by whom resources are allocated is required in order to determine what is valuable and helpful.

The City recognized the need to be acquainted with those whom the organization was serving in order to be prepared with services that they required. In explaining The City’s organizational approach, Applegate Nelson (2001) borrows the term “octopoidal” from Weick to describe the need to have a strong central priority supported by extending
complimentary efforts, or “extended arms.” Applegate Nelson (2001) demonstrates the alignment between Weick’s position of the octopoidal organization and the history of The City:

The City developed from a central theme or priority—the needs of neighbourhood juvenile delinquents. From the initial drop-in program, efforts expanded to court advocacy, a group home, a junior/senior alternative high school, individual and family counseling, and gang outreach. (p. 37)

Applegate Nelson’s description highlights that ARYS and the later affiliated United for Peace, though being programs attracting the largest emphasis within the 1987-1992 newspaper coverage of The City, were parts of a much larger organizational structure that The City had created to fit within the needs of the communities and individuals of which it was a part. Notably, The City’s extended efforts were not imposed rashly, but were established from conversations with those immersed within and attuned to the daily occurrences within the neighbourhoods of which The City was a part.

The City’s patience is also captured in the growth and eventual formation of United for Peace in May 1992—a coalition of four Minneapolis based gangs: the Vice Lords, Disciples, Souls, and Bloods. As is emphasized by those who were closest with its formation, United for Peace was not established overnight. In an attempt to validate the intent of the union, in the Star Tribune and Pioneer Press articles it is explained that “Leaders [of the four gangs] have been meeting regularly for almost two years to settle differences through negotiations and to try to find common ground for their members” (Rosario, 1992, p. 1B; see also “United for Peace,” 1992b). Significant to The City’s belief in patience is not only an effort to develop programs and services that fit with the needs of those within the neighborhoods The City served, but it also acts as a method to ensure the involvement of those who are being impacted by these efforts.
The City’s emphasis on patience, and the accompanying involvement, was often at odds with the sense of urgency presented by politicians and members of the dominant community (such a sense of urgency is commonly represented in articles that feature attempts to find gang and violence reduction solutions; see Diaz, 1992a; “Gang violence,” 1991; Peterson, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c). A prominent example, as drawn from *Star Tribune’s* coverage between 1989 and 1990, highlights a concern about managing “youth unrest” and “loitering youths” in the City Center of Minneapolis, an issue that had reportedly “plagued City Center for at least several months” in the early part of 1989 (Draper, Furst, & Jeter, 1989, p. 01A). In an extreme proposal, one city councillor suggested “giving shop owners broad new powers to order people out of their stores…if it is approved, youths who have been ordered out of a store by a merchant will face a misdemeanor charge if they return within 90 days” (Draper, Furst, & Jeter, 1989, p. 01A). While other city councillors and community members largely admonished this proposal, the immediate solutions presented by the business owners in City Center was a push to hire more police and security to patrol City Center and also to install warning signs across the City Center. In a description of these signs, Brandt (1990) notes, “at City Center, signs now warn what behavior will be tolerated. Responsible conduct. Suitable language. No verbal abuse, harassment or shouting. No fighting. No horseplay. No loud radios” (p. 01A).

Accompanying the business association’s attempts, the Minneapolis City Council is presented as “scrambling to assemble programs” (Furst, 1989, p. 01B) to help quell concerns from those within the dominant and non-dominant community about the impending potential for a “hot summer” (i.e., a period of unrest; this and related
references to growing unrest appear in Bonner, 1992b; Brunswick 1991a; Cook, 1992c; Diaz, 1990; Diaz & Peterson, 1991b; Draper, Leyden, & Hodges, 1990; Furst, 1989). This reflects a common illustration by the dominant community to try to assemble programs that would see transient youth return to their own neighbourhoods (Brandt, 1990; Hodges, 1990b): “police and some business people are more likely to urge that facilities be constructed in neighborhoods to draw kids there. ‘Young people are best controlled in their own neighborhoods,’ said police Capt. Carl Johnson” (Brandt, 1990, p. 01A). Presented alongside both the dominant community’s efforts to create programs for youth and existing programs’ attempts to accommodate youths in their neighborhoods, are collective attempts within the non-dominant community to establish antiviolence initiatives (Hodges, 1990b; Tai, 1990b). Such antiviolence initiatives also acknowledge a concern for a “hot summer” and social unrest. However, they reflect a detachment between dominant and non-dominant communities, decrying a failed system (see Benidt, 1988; Cook & Porter, 1990; Diaz, 1988c; Draper, Leyden, & Hodges, 1990; Hodges, 1990b, 1990c; Tai, 1990b) and an attempt to mitigate violence within their own communities, commonly presented within selected articles emphasizing a racialized non-dominant community in relation to violence (Brunswick, 1991b; Cook, 1992b; Gustafson, 1989; Hodges, 1990b, 1990c; Leyden, 1992b; Rosario, 1992; Tai, 1990b).

The reactive efforts presented above combine with a sense of urgency to re-establish control. Where The City’s emphasis on patience and involvement attempt to create a sense of belonging in its efforts to build community, the reactive measures from the dominant community serve to create a level of conditional belonging. In attempts to develop programs and garner resources quickly, such conditional belonging impeded the
capacity for collaborative discussions, as considerations about “effectiveness” and “success” were positioned within the restrictive discourse of the dominant community. As is illustrated in the selected articles, it is commonly the police, politicians or other members of the dominant community who are depicted as the ones who sever ties with seemingly failed experiments and/or ineffective organizations (such illustrations are presented in Baden, 1992c; Bonner, 1992d; Bonner & Cook, 1992; Hodges, 1991b; Smith, 1992; Smith & Furst, 1992).

Efforts for control are also illustrated within the non-dominant community as there is a general uneasiness about sharing information with the dominant community, as exemplified by limited witness accounts following incidents of violence in the community (Bonner, 1992b; Bonner & Cook, 1992; Hodges, 1991a; Leyden & Short, 1990; Wangstad, 1992; Wangstad & Bonner, 1991), and also by a general skepticism and disapproval about organizations that were seen as being associated with the dominant community. In an illustration of the latter point, there was some disapproval from members of the African-American community after a vacant community center was granted to The City following a court determined transfer of ownership: “The ownership of the building was transferred out of the African-American community…I don’t think that’s a victory for anyone (Verlena Matey-Keke, president of The Way board of directors at the time in 1990, as quoted in Halvorsen, 1990, p. 01B). Further illustration is seen in a quote by Mathew Ramadan, an executive director of the Northside Residents Redevelopment Council, critical of community efforts attempting to confront issues within the non-dominant community:

If we’ve been trying for 20 years to get something and it hasn’t worked, then maybe we should do something different. I’m tired of asking white folks to solve
Quite notably, the newspapers’ depiction of the uneasiness of members of the non-dominant community about The City’s expansion into its eventual North Side location seems to be rooted in the area’s broader contextual history, a history that traces back to the Civil Rights and Black Power Movements, and the 1966 and 1967 riots that happened in the North Side of Minneapolis. Following the riots, The Way Opportunities Unlimited, Inc. (more informally know as The Way\(^7\)) was established to “meet the needs of blacks on the North Side...[listening] to the political, social, and economic complaints made by the black community” (Maddox, 2013). Upon its founding The Way was located in the building that The City was set to take over in mid-1990, until it was closed in the mid-1980s after the United Way withdrew its funding (Kaszuba, 1989). The Way’s former director, Spike Moss, would later become an employee of The City, helping to coordinate and run ARYS and facilitate the development of United for Peace (see Cook, 1992d, for a fuller account of Moss’ transition from The Way to The City).

The attempts by both the dominant and the non-dominant communities to control what happened to and within the non-dominant community provoked a level of animosity, as both the dominant and the non-dominant communities felt that the best method for intervention would be directed by their own respective communities. In The City’s efforts to “reach the population that the rest of the agencies and the society have excluded” (Tai, 1990a, p. 01B), there is a presented level of skepticism within both the
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dominant and non-dominant communities, and largely by those who were unaffiliated with its efforts, about the effectiveness of The City’s efforts.

The conditional belonging and attempts for control portrayed at times within both the dominant and non-dominant community was something that had to be navigated as The City attempted to attain and retain funding from the dominant community that allowed The City to create collaborative initiatives directed by members of the non-dominant community. Furthermore, The City had to provide services and resources that fit within the general observation from the dominant community, while maintaining its organizational desire not to impose services onto communities. That is to say, while the dominant community often directed funding towards certain types of initiatives, The City wanted to develop services that remained attuned to the needs of the community and that fit the lives of those which it served. The emphasis on developing comprehensive community solutions acknowledges that services and resources are only as valuable as the efforts made to reflect the needs and complexities of the individuals and the community they inhabit.

5.5 Advocacy and Institutional Opposition

The strategy toward building community through advocacy and institutional opposition reflects an attempt to extend, and at times, oppose the positions of the dominant culture. While it is one thing to structure and create programs and strategies reflecting the needs and culture of those within given neighborhoods, it is another thing to reinforce and advocate on behalf of those programs within the broader and more dominant cultural discourse. As Nelson (1994) suggests, it is important to provide space
that allows those from the non-dominant community to advocate for themselves and to combat the mainstream discourse about their communities:

   somebody needs to advocate from the perspective of the local neighborhood, from the perspective of a non-dominant culture, from the perspective of those outside the economic mainstream, from the perspective of families alienated from the traditional educational and social service organizations. (p. 31)

   The City, as Nelson (1994) and Applegate Nelson (2001) both emphasize, advocated from both the individual level and the community level to provide support for those with whom it worked. In speaking about her experience of advocacy within The City school, Applegate Nelson (2001) describes how individual advocacy consisted of “going with families and students to court, to the welfare office, etc.,” (p. 38) and advocacy from the broader community level consisted of “addressing issues in the media, with politicians and with businesses” (p. 38). In conjunction with Applegate Nelson’s consideration of both individual and community advocacy, Nelson (1994) describes the importance of the advocacy offered by ARYS staff: “At-Risk Youth Services staff…are powerful advocates for individual young people as well as strong public advocates on issues surrounding young African-Americans and American Indians organized in groups the popular media calls gangs” (p. 31). While much of the individual advocacy and support that happened behind the scenes is largely absent from the media depictions of The City, there are powerful representations of how The City staff and supporters managed to create space for advocacy and attempted to address negative representations of The City and the individuals and the communities it served.

   In the attempt to provide a space for advocacy, The City’s south and north locations were depicted in Star Tribune and Pioneer Press articles as being established spaces in which members and affiliates of The City could come and speak out about
concerns of racism, poverty and representation. On a number of occasions members of 
The City are presented as being vocal advocates, using press conferences and media 
statements not only to address larger systemic issues of racism and poverty within the 
community, but also to address concerns about the coverage of events and representation 
of the community members and neighbourhoods by the media and members of the 
dominant community (Bonner, 1992e; Cook, 1990a, 1992c; Gonzalez, 1988; Gustafson, 
1989; Lerner, 1991; Soucheray, 1992b; Wangstad, 1992). At other times, The City’s 
north and south locations were central in demonstrating support and raising awareness 
about The City’s programs and other community led initiatives (Hodges, 1992), including 
a press conference announcing the formation of United for Peace in May 1992 (Cook, 
1992b; Diaz, 1992b).

In one major example highlighting the importance and utility of such space, The 
City held a press conference following the shooting death of Tycel Nelson by a 
Minneapolis police officer in order to allow local youths who were with Tycel on the 
evening he was shot to refute claims being made by the police and media (Cook, 1990b; 
Inskip, 1990). The youth refuted the popularized claims that Tycel had a gun, as well as 
claims about how he was shot. In the majority of the articles covering the story prior to 
the press conference, Tycel was said to have been shot in the chest after he was seen 
raising a gun at officer Dan May (Brunswick & Kaszuba, 1990; Cook, 1990b; Leyden & 
Short, 1990; McCarthy, 1990). However, at the press conference the youth revealed that 
Tycel was shot in the back as he ran away from officer May. While there was still
ambiguity in the details surrounding the gun found at the scene, following the press conference the police did acknowledge the claim that Tycel was shot in the back to be true. This was significant, as many articles highlighted the concern within the black community about the portrayal of that evening’s events by police and within the media (Brunswick, 1991a; Hodges, 1990c; Leyden & Short, 1990). Following the press conference there was a notable shift in the portrayal of that evening’s events in later police statements and media representations (Brunswick, 1991a; Cook & Porter, 1990; Hodges, 1991a).

In more routinized demonstrations of advocacy Star Tribune, Pioneer Press, and Chicago Tribune articles commonly present members and supporters of The City not only correcting media representations of its organizational efforts, but also advocating on behalf of the individuals with whom it worked. Commonly presented within the newspaper articles is the perception that The City is attempting to get kids out of gangs (Worthington, 1991) or condones gangs (Cook, 1992a; Inskip, 1990). In one such instance of correcting media portrayals Jim Nelson is quoted as clarifying that “getting kids out of gangs wouldn’t be something that we claim…What we try to do is to get young adults to quit their negative behavior, to stop crime and violence” (quoted in Worthington, 1991, p. 29).

The often narrow depiction about what programs and services The City offered—usually emphasizing its work with gang members and the alternative schools it ran—was another common area that was challenged within the selected newspaper articles.
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8 In regards to the gun that had was being connected to Tycel: “While a gun was found on the ground nearby, no recognizable fingerprints were found on it, and no tests were performed to determine if Nelson had fired it” (Brunswick, 1991a, p. 01A).
Employees at The City commonly attempt to emphasize that The City not only offers programs geared toward youth and gangs, but offers a far more extensive array of programs to families and the community than is often acknowledged within the media: “Nelson is quick to note that gang outreach is only about 10 percent of what The City does. The group offers an array of programs and runs two alternative schools at centers in North Minneapolis and South Minneapolis” (Leyden, 1992g, p. 01B).

Recognizably, the more critical and skeptical perceptions offered by figureheads within the dominant community about the choice to employ current and former gang members in part provoked the media’s focus on The City’s work with gangs. In one such example, illustrating an attempt to undermine the legitimacy of one of The City’s workers, Benidt (1988) writes:

Bob Lutz, deputy police chief, said he’s heard reports that Cotton is still up to gang activities, but has no firm evidence. Still, he’s skeptical of Cotton’s conversion and doesn’t think he’s a good example to kids at risk of going bad. Those kids, especially young men, too often “do not have a positive role model”… “Therefore the role models they tend to emulate are drug peddlers and pimps and other people who seem to live by their wits...What are we telling those young people then when these same people become their counselors?” (p. 01B)

Lutz’s view, commonly depicted in the selected newspaper articles (Baden, 1992c; Benidt, 1988; Cook, 1992d; Diaz & Peterson, 1991a; Rosario, 1992), portrays the dominant community questioning who may be considered valid community leaders, often presenting assumed knowledge about the circumstances of the communities and families to which the individuals were connected. Such remarks question the capacity for current and former gang members to cut ties with negatively perceived groups such as gangs and to serve as positive role-models within the community. Notably, these remarks validate discourses that emerge from the dominant community and largely negate the alternative
understandings of community leadership nurtured by The City. The more critical and skeptical discourse that is presented from the dominant community also seems to direct the basis for understanding in the media’s perception of gangs. Many articles often pursue an unwavering attempt to illustrate gang affiliation—taking note of tattoos, perceived gang colors, or any other identifiable markers—in order to illustrate assumed affiliations with negative activity.

In reaction to the more dominant portrayals of gangs and gang members, many of the demonstrations of advocacy and support presented within some of the selected newspaper articles surround members and supporters of The City attempting to respond to the more negative depictions of those with whom it worked. In many instances, such efforts by members of The City attempt to acknowledge the valuable understandings that they have about their communities and about the very populations that The City served (“Mayoral candidate’s rush to judgment,” 1992; Benidt, 1988; Cook, 1990a; Diaz, 1988a; Gonzalez, 1988; Grow, 1992d). Such responses attempt to reconceptualise perceptions about The City and those with whom it worked. Some articles capture the more forceful admonishment of dominant perceptions and misrepresentation about The City and City staff; such admonishments were often positioned alongside an apology (“Deputy Chief Offers Apology,” 1988) or clarification (Cook, 1990a; Gelfand, 1990, 1991; Lerner, 1991) about statements made about The City.

Notably, displays of advocacy and support are commonplace within the Star Tribune, the Pioneer Press and the Chicago Tribune articles. While much of the outspokenness is linked to members of The City and the non-dominant community, there appear occasionally very active displays of support from members of the dominant
community, including business figures (Russ Ewald, a former member of the McKnight Foundation), politicians (state representatives Richard Jefferson and Karen Clark; Rip Rapson, deputy to Minneapolis Mayor Don Fraser) and police (most notably Deputy Chief David Dobrotka, who helped establish a collaboration between the Minneapolis Police Department and United for Peace; see Parker, 1992b for a feature piece on Dobrotka’s involvement in United for Peace). However, during periods of tension and unrest these voices of support from the dominant community fall silent, perhaps in part as a result of pressures to conform to the opinions of the dominant community and perhaps also in part to show support for members of their own community. A prominent example reflects the silencing, following the shooting of police officer Jerry Haaf, of Deputy Police Chief, David Dobrotka who had been very active in his support for The City and United for Peace. In commenting on his choice to move into the background Dobrotka explains:

> It’s…imperative that this entire community rally behind the Minneapolis Police Department and demonstrate their support in word and deed. The cops need it, and that’s the reason right now why I am choosing to be silent because of 820 police officers who need me to just shut up and look at them to grieve and let the wounds heal. (Quoted in Furst & Leyden, 1992a, p. 01A)

While it is certainly valuable to have advocates positioned within both the dominant and non-dominant community, the presented division at times between the dominant and non-dominant communities does not allow for a consistent demonstration of support from those outside of a respective community. As such, the importance of offering safe spaces in which people can advocate for themselves is that much more important during times when outside supporters are silent. The City’s efforts to provide a space to support and advocate on behalf of those it served ensured that the representation of individuals and communities is not solely a reflection of discourses from the dominant culture.
5.6 A Commitment to Reflection

The final strategy in The City’s position on building community emphasizes the need not to remain static in the understanding of the people and the neighborhoods in which it served, or of the methods and resources employed. For Nelson (1994), to remain static in one’s methods and to fail to reflect “impairs not only the ability to solve problems but impairs the impact of the collective resources of the group” (p. 31). In her description of this final strategy, Applegate Nelson (2001) highlights the difference between reflection and evaluation and offers a series of corresponding questions that help guide this process:

Reflection typically connotes an individual pursuit, taking personal time to think seriously and consider carefully. Evaluation, on the other hand, implies a group process which examines or judges the value of something. Clearly, the two are related. Pausing, regularly, individually and collectively to ask and answer such questions as “How are we doing?” “Did we do what we promised?” “What more could we be doing?” “How far have we come?” “Where do we want to be?” “How will we get there?”—makes success more likely. (p. 40)

Both Nelson (1994) and Applegate Nelson (2001) emphasize the importance of continued reflection and evaluation in both the larger picture and the day-to-day. In-line with the more evaluative processes that Applegate Nelson described, The City held quarter and annual performance reviews and annual strategic planning meetings in combination with more formal and informal reflective conversations that were on-going (Nelson, 1994). Nelson (1994) emphasizes the significance of this strategy in the early days of The City’s history, describing how “no one was really sure what they were doing, challenges were everywhere and the staff and families needed to sit down and talk often—or else!” (pp. 31-32).
Nelson’s description of the importance of reflective and evaluative process in the early days of The City acknowledges the need to face challenges and work through them together, showing support for one another along the way. Much of the reflective and evaluative commentary presented in the earlier Star Tribune and Pioneer Press articles highlight the police’s opposition to the hiring of gang members (as emphasized in earlier sections). Such opposition was prominent in earlier articles following the wake of an incident at The City in February 1988, at which time one of The City’s employees, Farley Cotton (a former gang member), was shot. In reply to the incident, and in support of Farley and their decision to hire gang members, Nelson was quoted as saying “We’ve got 21 years of history where we’ve made some mistakes, but Farley is not one of them” (quoted in Gonzalez, 1988, p. 05B).

While the police are positioned in many Star Tribune and Pioneer Press articles as holding a general uneasiness about the hiring of gang members, there is also a reflective and evaluative shift within the Minneapolis police force that emerges at the onset of 1990, which offers a bit more leniency to The City’s efforts and acknowledges them as a community rich resource. The evaluative shift of police services demonstrates an attempt to move from serving a reactive role in the community to offering more proactive services to the community (Diaz, 1990). This shift occurred because “specific proposals call for police to become more community-centered and racially sensitive, through training, recruitment and in the assignments they are given” (Diaz, 1990, p. 01A), brought forward by projected concerns about rising crime. A similar reflection about the need for a more comprehensive approach from the police and community is also presented within a Chicago Tribune article where a member of the Chicago Police’s
gang and crimes unit notes that “I’m a master at supressing gangs…But I don’t think any single agency or single approach can address gangs and succeed” (quoted in Worthington, 1991, p. 29).

Reflected within more comprehensive methods is an understanding that the police and the community need to collaborate in their efforts to mitigate crime and unwanted behavior, which are often reflections of much larger systemic issues. Some articles capture more general reflections from community and organization leaders about the need to collaborate:

We can’t do this alone, the police can’t do it alone. We need 100 percent support from the community. (Gary Sudduth of the Urban League, as quoted in Hodges, 1990b, p. 03B)

Enough of this divided stuff…If we’re going to do anything on a large scale, we’ve got to do it together. (Jerry McAfee, pastor of New Salem Baptist Church, as quoted in Hodges, 1990b, p. 03B)

We need to have a broader support from citizens of this city if something’s going to work. (Sharon Sayles Belton, a city council member at the time and elected mayor of Minneapolis in 1994, as quoted in Hodges, 1990c, p. 01A)

Other articles capture more focused reflections from community and organization leaders about the importance of including those whom these changing policies impact:

If we’re going to come to a solution…we’re going to have to involve the people that we say are causing the problem. You can’t do that by not talking with members of the gangs (Richard Jefferson, a member of the state legislator in 1990, as quoted in McGrath, 1991, p. 01A)

Presented within other reflections about such collaborative efforts was the necessary development of trust between groups from the dominant community, like the police, and the non-dominant community, of which organizations like The City and United for Peace were a part.
A prominent impediment to establishing trust was the presentation in Star Tribune and Pioneer Press coverage about the police initiating and controlling the terms and discourse around such collaborative efforts. In speaking about the impact that increased community involvement had on crime in Minneapolis, the Minneapolis Police Chief at the time, John Laux, is quoted as saying: “members of the community have become more proactive in the last several years…now it’s not ‘Fix it for me,’ it’s ‘How do I work with you?’” (quoted in Hopfensperger, 1992, p. 01B). Laux’s comment indicates a seemingly growing willingness by the community to work with the police toward shared goals; however, it also positions the police as being in control of the methods used to achieve those shared goals. As will be developed in Chapter 6, depending on how those shared goals are framed, there is a risk that these goals can be used to further isolate and exclude individuals rather than serve to include and establish a sense of belonging. Such authority by the police and the dominant community was presented when the police (Hodges, 1991b; Howe, 1992; Parker, 1992c; Smith & Furst, 1992) and dominant community representatives (Bonner, 1992d; “United for Peace,” 1992a) withdrew their involvement from and support for certain collaborative efforts with The City, on one occasion, and United for Peace, on another. In reaction to the dispute with The City over the allowance of certain City employees to carry IDs that would identify them as workers (mediators) in tense situations, Jim Nelson commented that:

The Minneapolis Police Department very obviously has got a community relations problem and part of their problem is with the very community we serve…The reality is that the Minneapolis Police Department has to work with us and we have to work with them. (Quoted in Hodges, 1991b, p. 01B)

Further demonstration of the police department’s impact on the stability of such collaborative efforts can be seen through the evaluative use of crime statistics, which the
police used as a marker to assess the relative success of given efforts. At different times within *Star Tribune* and *Pioneer Press* articles (from 1992 more notably) crime statistics were used as an evaluative tool to measure the success of some collaborative initiatives and at times to contemplate the implementation of more aggressive policing tactics (the use of crime statistics is seen in Brunswick, 1992c; Brunswick & Furst, 1992; Davis, 1992; Diaz, 1990; Furst, 1992a; Furst & Smith, 1992). In one example highlighting the subjective variance in the employment of crime statistics, the Police Federation counters statistics issued by the Police Department that showed a decrease in serious crimes in favor of statistics demonstrating an overall increase over a longer period:

> The Police Department issued statistics showing that serious crimes in the city dropped 7 percent in the first eight months of 1992, compared with the same period a year ago. Serious crimes include homicide, rape, aggravated assault, robbery, burglary, theft, motor vehicle theft and arson…The police federation countered at a news conference that FBI data shows that the city’s violent crime has soared in the past decade, citing figures that homicides, rape, aggravated assault and robbery increased 10 percent from 1989 to 1991…However, the figures fluctuate dramatically from year to year. This year has been marked by about a 3 percent overall increase in violent crimes, according to Police Department crime analysis reports. (Furst & Smith, 1992, p. 01B)

The purposeful countering of the Police Department's display of crime statistics by the Police Federation happened shortly after the shooting of Jerry Haaf, and aligned with the Federation’s attempts to garner support for more aggressive policing tactics and increased funding for gang related policing.

At other times, most notably in the aftermath of the September 1992 shooting of Jerry Haaf and the severing of ties between the police and United for Peace, articles within the *Star Tribune* (Brunswick, 1992e), *Pioneer Press* (Bonner, 1992a), and *Chicago Tribune* (Worthington, 1993) offer hindsight reflections about The City and United for Peace’s efforts. Such reflections position The City and United for Peace’s
efforts in comparison with other seemingly “failed” experiments that took place at
different times in different parts of the country. Such positions assign a naivety to the
capacity to form collaborative relationships with those deemed “criminal,” or who have
held criminal pasts. Thus, the dominant community seems to be uneasy about supporting
collaborative initiatives that the non-dominant community directs and initiates. With the
articles also illustrating the intent by United for Peace to continue (Furst & Leyden,
1992a; Leyden, 1992f; Grow, 1992d), such hindsight reflections lower the level of
support for the viable continuation of United for Peace’s initiative and instead serves to
validate commentary from the dominant community about ways to move forward.

Many articles from the Star Tribune, the Pioneer Press, and the Chicago Tribune
certainly highlight pieces of reflective and evaluative commentary—much of this
surrounding collaborative efforts between the dominant community and non-dominant
community to mitigate crime and other social issues. However, the way in which such
reflective and evaluative measures were used often did not serve to strengthen
collaborative efforts, as was set forward in The City’s understanding, but rather acted as
measures to undermine collaborative efforts and validate positions and evaluative
methods of the dominant community.

5.7 Conclusion

Chapter 5 has been used to unpack some of the key aspects that framed the
operation of The City during its 1987-1992 period, and to illustrate how some of these
aspects impacted its capacity to build community and foster the necessary relationships
that it felt essential to its organizational practice. What has been illustrated above is but a
brief reflection of further complexities that certainly require more detailed analysis.

While I cannot presume to have offered a clear or even accurate description of The City’s operation during this period, I would like to work with what I have presented and develop it further in Chapter 6. Where Chapter 5 has offered a glimpse of the contexts, events, and relationships that impacted The City from 1987-1992, I would like to use Chapter 6 as an opportunity to consider how the presentation of The City by the selected newspaper articles during this period impacts the ways in which we perceive and collaborate with the other. Accordingly, through the lens of Levinasian ethics, Chapter 6 asks how does the presentation of The City impact the relationships within and between the communities of which it was a part.
CHAPTER 6: THE POSITIONING OF THE OTHER

With Chapter 5 using The City’s six methods of assessment for building community, Chapter 6 incorporates core aspects of Levinasian thought, as presented in Chapter 3, to help develop and reorganize how the relational presentation and connection with the other impacts the understanding of community. To help guide this discussion, my use of Levinasian ethics looks to continue developing how relationships were formed and interpreted, how events impacted established and unestablished relationships, and how the parting of relationships and shifting of relational goals impacted the way in which individuals were acknowledged and understood.

6.1 The Trace and the Face

Levinasian thought, similar to The City’s six points of assessment for building community, emphasizes the relational engagement with the other. Emphasized within Levinas’ consideration of the ethical relation is the capacity to sustain the relationship with the other; again, a shared aim with the efforts of The City as reflected through the understanding of “making relatives” (see section 5.2). As a reminder, the other, as presented within Levinasian ethics, is not meant as a stand in to describe those positioned outside of the dominant community, as it is often connoted within the selected newspapers; rather it is used to represent anyone who can be recognized in an ethical relation or who can be labelled or oppressed. For Levinas, the ethical relation with the other is significant, as it is the insistent anteriority of the other, as presented through the trace, that allows us to experience the world outside of the confines and isolation of the there is: “essence stretching on indefinitely, without any possible halt or
interruption…the rumbling of the *there is* is the nonsense in which essence turns, and in which thus turns the justice issued out of signification” (Levinas, 1981/2011b, p. 163). The there is, as it is alluded to within the selected newspaper articles, is very much composed and directed by the circumstances of the dominant community; that is to say, one’s positioning within either the dominant community or the non-dominant community impacts the direction of the fear and isolation which subsumes one within the confines of the there is.

For members of the dominant community the fear and the sense of isolation that the there is represents can be engulfed within the speculative projections of worsening crime and violence for the city of Minneapolis. Such innate fears are further projected by the Police Federation’s rally that “if the police aren’t safe, who is?” (Furst & Smith, 1992, p. 01B) and still further through the illustration of the “white flight” to the suburbs and the “shrinking group of people left to pay for an increasingly expensive social service apparatus” (Diaz, 1990, p. 01A). In recognizing the implications of such fear, Donkis reflects that “before our eyes, the culture of fear manufactures the politics of fear” (Bauman & Donkis, 2013, p. 96). It is very much this politics of fear that impacts how members of the non-dominant community come to be positioned within the terror of the ambiguous there is.

Where for members of the dominant community, the terror of the there is seems to be found in the uncontrollability of the projected future, for members of the non-dominant community the terror of the there is is held within the reality of the uncontrollability brought on by a politics of fear; a system tied to elements of racism and poverty through which the non-dominant community comes to be interpreted through the
discourses of the dominant community. As Levinas accentuates, the there is consumes us as we exist as a solitary subject; we are left to try to understand and defend ourselves against that which exists in the confines of the darkness. Thus, for both members of the dominant and non-dominant community, the restrictiveness of the there is represents a level of uncontrollability about what is happening around them. However, the circumstances around such uncontrollability are notably divergent, as are the roles and significance of the relationships that the other provides in helping to mitigate the isolation and fear provoked by the there is. For Levinas it is the other who provokes an understanding that is outside of the solitary subject and who allows one to depose of the solitary subject from the confines of darkness.

The recognition of the other is presented via the trace. In Levinas’ (1972/2006) description the trace is much more than a mere sign, but a disturbance that demonstrates the other, he notes:

Everything lines up in order in a world where each thing reveals the other or is revealed with regard to it. But the trace thus taken as a sign still has something exceptional compared to other signs: it signifies outside of all intention of making a sign and outside of any project that would sight it...Their presence still belongs to the present of my life. All that constitutes my life, with its past and future, is collected in the present where things come to me. But the face glows in the trace of the Other: that which is presented there is absolving itself from my life and visits me as already ab-solute. Some already passed. His trace does not signify his past, as it does not signify his labor, or his enjoyment in the world, it is disturbance itself, imprinting (one is tempted to say engraving) with irrefutable gravity. (pp. 41, 44)

The trace resonates with The City’s first point of assessment for building community that emphasizes the need to develop a sense of history and place (see section 5.1). The City’s understanding of history and place is reflected in the traces of inner-city Minneapolis, young people and their families, the criminal justice system and culture; aspects built into
the conversations and partnerships that are beyond knowing in and of themselves, but which provoke the ethical relation with the other.

Within the signification of the trace, Levinas (1972/2006) describes that “only a being transcending the world—an absolute being—can leave a trace. The trace is the presence of that which, strictly speaking, has never been there, that which is always past” (p. 43). The past, as a demonstration of the other, then, is not that which is discernable in a moment in time nor is it that which is used in our knowing of the other; rather it reflects the impression of the other outside of the self and as external to time. This consideration of the trace of the other, as Levinas explains it, may be hard to locate within the selected newspaper coverage of The City where the past becomes a means to compare and define The City. Thus, the meaning of The City, as it appears in the selected newspaper articles, is reflective of its North and South locations, the depictions of those in which it served, the events that defined its time as an organization, and as another failed experiment in a long list of others working within inner-city neighborhoods—each aspect representing a basis for meaning and understanding subsumed within the discourse of the dominant community.

For Levinas, it is the other, as demonstrated through the trace, which allows one to depose of the fear and isolation of the there is. The trace as reflective of a sign of sorts serves to convoke the other, not as a means to know the other. Where the former creates the terms for the ethical relation, as acknowledged within the face, the latter creates an understanding consumed within the totalizing efforts of the self, whereby the face, and all that it represents, is used to control the other. Thus, for Levinas, where the trace represents the anteriority of the other, that which is exterior to the self and all
comprehension, the face reveals the other and further accentuates an understanding of the world outside of the totalizing confines of the solitary subject. In Levinas’ (1961/2012) description of the presentation of the face, he writes:

The way in which the other presents himself, exceeding the idea of the other in me, we here name face... [The face] signifies the philosophical priority of the existent over Being, an exteriority that does not call for power or possession, an exteriority that is not reducible, as with Plato, to the interiority of memory, and yet maintains the I who welcomes it. (pp. 50-51)

In Levinas’ description, the face signifies the responsibility that I have to the other. Such a responsibility is prior to a collective representation of Being and also offers broader implications for the consideration of community. A community that is reflective of Levinas’ ethics-first philosophy begins with the responsibility to the other; this is contrary to an idealized, or what Bauman (2001a) calls an imagined, view of community. For Bauman (2001a) the ideal community portrays an objective of security; however, such an objective is an elusive aim that risks prioritizing security, or rather a sense of security, in place of freedom. The demise of the ideal objective results in a reality of insecurity, projected through a hostility towards the unfamiliar. Recognizably, the points of contention that Bauman has with the imagined community reflect the isolating concerns that Levinas presents in his consideration of the there is. Instead Bauman proposes community that is centered on sharing and mutual care; that which emphasizes the pursuit of a community based in the ethical. That is to say, a community led not by the pursuit of security, but prioritized by the ethical relation with the other.

The position of the other within the consideration of community implicates the use and understanding of the relationship with the other. In describing this relationship with the other, as presented through the face, Levinas (1961/2012) writes:
The relation with the Other, or Conversation, is a non-allergic relation, an ethical relation; but inasmuch as it is welcomed this conversation is a teaching. Teaching is not reducible to maieutics; it comes from the exterior and brings me more than I contain. In its non-violent transitivity the very epiphany of the face is produced. (p. 51)

In Levinas’ position, the face is extremely valuable in its demonstration of the unknowability of the other and the very responsibility that I have to the other. An attempt to know the other through a process of question and answer undermines the ethical relation recognized by the other’s exteriority and unknowability. For Levinas, the relationship with the other begins via the trace and ends through the attempt to know the other. As Levinas (1961/2012) writes, “to be in relationship while absolving oneself from this relation is to speak” (p. 215). The attempt to know the other, then, risks creating the domains for power and control over the other. Community, contemplative of this latter attempt to know the other, betrays an effort to control the conception of community rather than an ethical positioning in relation with the other.

The City’s consideration of building community acknowledges the other in a position of mutuality. Mutuality here can be seen as an effort to develop a sense of belonging. As affiliates of The City often acknowledged within the selected newspaper articles, The City’s relational efforts were largely unrestrictive as it attempted to develop relationships with those who were isolated or embedded within systems from the dominant community that limited their capacity to belong. The City attempted to undermine the labels and restrictions that the people that it worked with were subjected to, as they appeared within many of the selected articles, and which fed into the skepticism about the value that certain relationships could offer.
The newspaper articles used labels such as gang, gang member, at-risk youth, and inner-city strategically as a way to position how we come to know the other. Some articles position such labels alongside other associating claims, for instance about an individual’s criminal record or the statistical assessment of a neighborhood. Take for example the following description presented within different articles about members of the non-dominant community:

Willis, 41, has been a staff member of the City Inc., a non-profit agency that works with youth, since being released from Stillwater Prison last spring on a murder conviction…Willis shot a man in the back in North Minneapolis in 1982, apparently over a $5 loss in a game of dice. (Nelson & Cook, 1992a, p. 1A; the same or a similar description of Willis’ past is found in Furst, 1992a; Nelson & Cook, 1992b; Worthington 1993)

Court workers who knew him had a different impression. The wings on his tattoo and the number of assaults he had been accused of suggested to them that he was a gang “enforcer,” a soldier charged with keeping or meting out “violations.”…He had first come to the attention of Juvenile Court authorities as a truant when he was 14. Since then, his folder had been filled with charges of drinking, disorderly conduct, possession of a small amount of crack, trespassing and other minor offenses…But there was also a conviction for terroristic threats, an incident involving a gun, and the mention of gang activity. (Diaz, 1991b, p. 01A)

The first example highlights the criminal history of Sharif Willis, an employee of The City and the president of United for Peace; and the second example, describing PT Slaughter, appeared in one article of series presented in the Star Tribune that attempted to “get to the bottom of the gang issue” (Lerner, 1991, p. 01A). Associating claims, such as a criminal record, builds skepticism about to whom The City ought to be able to offer viable leadership roles within its communities. Further, as in the second example above, these associating claims act to generate an understanding of a group based on a presumptively objective positioning. Such associating claims compose a specific
understanding about the other constructed and supported within dominant systems or cultures.

The impact of the dominant culture, along with its overbearing presence within the systems that coordinate societal structures, forms a pervasive influence leading to the questioning of how I come to know and belong with the other. Such a pervasive influence feeds into the isolation composed via the there is, which makes us question that which exists on the outside. The other, as he or she is at times presented within the selected articles, is presented not as a person for whom I have a responsibility or could have a responsibility, but is presented as someone on the outside of the middle class dominant culture. The very divisive conceptualization of the other, as seen through an “us versus them” mentality, positions the excluded other as one who has potential and can act within the terms of the social order or who needs to be controlled.

The imposition of the lens of the dominant culture over the non-dominant community that is both embedded within its systems, yet very much isolated because of it, provoked an evident tension with and between members of the dominant and non-dominant communities. From the non-dominant community there appeared to be an evident distrust of the dominant culture, systems, and organizations associated with it. While at times The City was a target for that tension, as it balanced its involvement within both the dominant and non-dominant community, The City also provided space that questions, not the other, but the capacity for systems of the dominant culture to know the other. As we see at times, members of The City were very vocal about the misrepresentation by the dominant culture about its organization, those that it worked with, and alternative cultural perspectives. The City attempted to demonstrate a continued
support for those with whom it worked in part by providing space in which to acknowledge the other. The City’s demonstrations of advocacy and support undermine the use of labels and associative claims to direct how one comes to know and be with the other. Further, The City’s emphasis on the utility of culture, a recognition of the importance that various cultures offer in understandings of knowledge and healing, acknowledges the trace of the other.

As they appear within the selected newspaper coverage, members of The City attempt to arrest the belief that you can come to know the other, especially when positioned from the outside using perspectives from the dominant culture as a way to peer in. The non-dominant community’s efforts to question the reach of the dominant community illustrate the persistence of the ethical. In acknowledging the ongoing presence of the ethical, Levinas (1981/2011b) argues that “life is life despite life” (p. 51). The ethical, being anterior to all, persists regardless of the complacency toward the moral or totalizing efforts to position and know the other. That is not to say that moral or totalizing efforts cannot, too, arrest the ethical; rather, Levinasian thought suggests that the attempts to know the other are not only oppressive in their attempts to establish certainty, but they are isolating in themselves as they undermine our position as being in a world presented by the other.

6.2 Mercy, Charity, and the Verdict

The Levinasian position of mercy, charity, and the verdict further demonstrates the difficulty in attempting to sustain the ethical relation in the midst of ongoing tension from totalizing bodies of thought. As will be discussed, the connotation of justice, and in
effect the criminological narrative devised in its name, leads us to question how one knows the other. Problematically, as Levinas (1981/2011b) explains, justice, though established in the proximity of the other and in a responsibility to the other, becomes reconceptualised as a banner used by the State:

The one for the other of proximity is not a deforming abstraction. In it justice is shown from the first, it is thus born from the signifyingness of signification, the-one-for-the-other, signification. This means concretely or empirically that justice is not a legality regulating human masses, from which a technique of social equilibrium is drawn, harmonizing antagonistic forces. That would be a justification of the State delivered over its own necessities. Justice is impossible without the one that renders it finding himself in proximity. (p. 159)

For Levinas, justice rendered as an equality for all is not an illustration of justice as it exists in proximity. The ethical relation of the-one-for-the-other is asymmetrical, and as such, justice, too, is framed in an understanding of inequality. As Levinas (1981/2011b) explains, “the equality of all is borne by my inequality, the surplus of my duties over my rights” (p. 159). The duties that Levinas notes are positioned within the responsibility that I have to the other; a responsibility demonstrated in the face of the other, for in the moment of the face-to-face the other affirms my being. As Levinas (1981/2011b) argues, “the forgetting of the self moves justice” (p. 159); however, justice becomes positioned and directed within the aims of the State. It becomes a justice rendered within totality, and within which I am removed, questioning whether justice in the State’s name “proceeds from a war of all against all, or from, the irreducible responsibility of the one for the all” (Levinas, 1981/2011b, p. 159). It is the very contention about how justice is framed, and in effect who it serves, that provokes much of the contention seen within the coverage of The City.
The commonly presented skepticism about The City’s work with gang members, including the reference to their criminal past, facilitates an understanding derived from the criminological narrative. The criminological narrative emphasizes the tension that occurs between the ethical and the moral. Notably, the criminological narrative is itself a representation of totalizing thought, used to direct positions about criminal law, criminal behavior, and social reactions. Each of these aspects of the criminological narrative are presented as shared values, relevant to members of the dominant and non-dominant community alike. However, the newspaper coverage illustrates reservations from members of the non-dominant community about the criminal justice system, in which the criminological narrative is actualized, as it is seen to be racist and disproportionately impacting members of the non-dominant community.

As Raddon (2015) argues, the criminal justice system demonstrates prejudice in efforts to validate concerns about safety. The justification of prejudice by the judicial system facilitates practices of primary and secondary exclusion. In describing the system’s role in facilitating exclusion, Raddon (2015) writes:

Labelling theory has exposed a mechanism of primary exclusion, the tendency of social institutions to create “deviance” through labelling, yet mechanisms of secondary exclusion can be seen at work here associated with the phenomenon of the revolving door…the expression of the impacts of returning to the “community” where the “community” is no more than a reflection of the process through which one has been denied citizenship. (p. 39)

Members of the non-dominant community were often very vocal about the recognized prejudice that Raddon highlights, as the labels and the associative claims, as discussed in 6.1, justify the breach of the responsibility to the other. The breach of responsibility highlights an emphasis on the concern for safety as directed by the criminological narrative, over a consideration of the broader implications that the criminal justice system
could have for the other. In highlighting some of the implications that an assumed
knowledge about the other can have on individuals and communities positioned outside
of the dominant culture, Nelson (1995) writes:

Historically, the results of uninformed opinions held by those in power have been,
for example, vigorous and vengeful pursuits to destroy the tribal life of American
Indians (only recently were American Indians legally allowed to practice their
religious rites) and the promotion of stereotypical fear at the mere mention of
African American gangs in our inner cities. Our stereotyping of people into
enemies to be feared or strangers to be misunderstood obscures an appreciation of
the simple act of one person caring for another or whole communities caring for
each other. (p. 5)

As was highlighted in Chapter 2, the conception of the deviant and deviant
behavior often facilitates public reactions about what is important to control and what are
the best strategies for crime control. Problematically, the devised strategies are
commonly applied outside of the communities for and in which they were developed
under the direction of the criminological narrative. The prioritization of the
criminological narrative over the other conceals the role of the system in the production
of the deviant and emphasizes the concern for safety. The consideration of what safety
means and the role of the system in mitigating concerns for safety is noticeably
ambiguous as members of the non-dominant community largely denounce the judicial
system while members of the dominant community, though at times acknowledging its
limitations, often provide reassuring reflections about its value to communities.

The positional attitudes about the value and the effectiveness of the system to
address concerns of safety following instances of violence or unrest was often presented
dichotomously, correlating to moments interpreted to either favor the dominant
community or the non-dominant community. For example, following the acquittal of
officer Dan May in March, 1991 for the fatal shooting of Tycel Nelson, Minneapolis
Police Chief John Laux noted that “the finding was proof that the system, with all its imperfections is working” (quoted in Hodges, 1991a, p. 01A). The jury’s finding and the fact that officer May’s case was presented in front of an all-white jury prompted resentment and disappointment from members of the non-dominant community. Similar divergences appear around the criminological narrative and the construction of the deviant. For example, in 1988 when Farley Cotton, a former gang member and an employee at The City was shot while working at The City’s drop-in center, much of the emphasis within the newspapers’ coverage speculated about Cotton’s gang status. The notion of gang, as it was presented, was largely subsumed with criminological connotations that projected a notable uneasiness about gang members and their role in community efforts. However, in response to the shooting and efforts to work with gang members, Jim Nelson emphasized that “the young man who came in here and shot our staff person is the very person we want to work with” (quoted in Kaszuba, 1989, p. 01B). Where The City attempted to develop a sense of belonging Nelson’s position exposes that such aims are counterintuitive when structured in the framework of an exclusionary system. As such, Nelson’s statement prompts efforts to think otherwise, emphasizing that to devise an understanding of the other based on a single action creates very unstable and isolating circumstances that restrict the development of belonging.

The divergence of opinion around the justice system, further presented as the consideration about how the justice system elicits inclusionary or exclusionary practices, is a demonstration of the ethical impulse. The ethical impulse, here, can be understood as the attempt for the Said to be unsaid; that is the reversion from the said to the saying. In his description of the Saying and the Said, Critchley (1999) explains:
The Saying is my exposure—corporal, sensible—to the Other, my inability to refuse the Other’s approach. It is the performative stating, proposing, or expressive position of myself facing the Other… By contrast, the Said is a statement, assertion, or proposition (of the form S is P), concerning which the truth or falsity can be ascertained. (p. 7)

Where the said can be recognized in the justice system’s attempts to construct understanding based on one’s actions, the presented divergence of opinion about the justice system between the dominant and non-dominant community opens the possibility for questioning the said. While the said and the meaning of the justice system fixates on the action, the divergence of opinion demonstrates that there is a broader acknowledgment of the other as he or she exists within their respective community that is missed when you attempt to structure the basis for knowledge. The place of divergence, then, demonstrates a questioning about the capacity for the justice system to concretely dictate the terms of right and wrong, as facilitated by the criminological narrative.

Where The City, too, was vocal in its opposition about the isolating and prejudiced fixtures of the criminological narrative, it also tried to name the terms of the criminological narrative as it existed within the neighborhoods where it worked, bringing it into a critical conversation. Thus, the vocal attempt to, in effect, unsay how the criminological narrative is positioned, illustrates an attempt to reposition how justice is assessed by the State; that is, as was presented at the start of this section, a movement from justice that is “a war of all against all” to that embedded within the “irreducible responsibility of the one for all” (Levinas, 1981/2011b, p. 159). Where the former prompts the divergence between the dominant and non-dominant community, the latter bridges divergence through an acknowledgment of the other.
As is presented throughout the newspapers’ coverage, there was an evident concern by members of the non-dominant community about the occurrence of violence within their communities. In response, The City attempted to validate the capacity for leadership roles that those from within the communities where it worked offered. Furthermore, The City attempted to address the concerns of violence happening within its communities by offering a mediating role within the community. The City endeavoured not to punish negative behavior, but to acknowledge it and address it as it existed for the other and for community. Such efforts do not fixate on justice as it appears within the Said, but attempt to continually unsay, presenting what Levinas (1981/2011b) seems to idealize enigmatically as “saying saying saying itself” (p. 143). The process to say and unsay reflects the unknowability of the other, who remains wholly other, despite the attempt to control the understanding of the other, in past, present and future, through the confines of totalizing thought and systems, of the said. To say and unsay is to recognize the unknowability of the other and to acknowledge the responsibility that I have in the proximity of the one-for-the-other.

The City’s efforts to include those who are otherwise blamed for crime or who demonstrate, or are at-risk of demonstrating, “criminal behavior” is an illustration of the responsibility presented within the ethical relation. Responsibility, and the accompanying concept of substitution, acknowledge my role in the connectedness to the other. In answering the question “why does the other concern me?,” Levinas (1981/2011b) explains that “what is at stake for the self, in its being, is not to be” (p. 117). In highlighting the very vulnerability of my being Levinas reaffirms the signification of my responsibility to the other. The ethical relationship with the other exists prior to ego, prior
to self, within the confines of proximity and is recalled in the face of the other (Levinas, 1981/2011b). In describing the ethical relationship as illustrated in the face of the other, Levinas (2001) explains:

The first thing which is evident in the face of the other is this rectitude of exposure and defenselessness in his face, the human being is most naked, destitution itself. And at the same time, he faces. It is in the manner which he is completely alone in his facing us that we measure the violence perpetrated by death. Third moment of the epiphany of the face: it makes a demand on me. The face looks at me and calls to me. It lays claim to me. What does it ask? Not to leave it alone. An answer: here I am. My presence vain, perhaps, a gratuitous movement by presence and responsibility for another person. To respond, ‘here I am’ is already the encounter with the face. (p. 127)

As Levinas emphasizes, the acknowledgment of the face of the other in their nakedness and helplessness is to recognize the responsibility of the-one-for-the-other: the asymmetrical relationship in which I am asked to be without assurance. The vulnerability presented within the ethical relation is largely negated with a system of justice that strives for an equality that is precipitated by the differentiation of the other (i.e., who is deviant?). The May 1992 announcement about the formation of United for Peace demonstrated an attempt to unsay the viability of justice as conceived in the totalized framework of conceptual equality. The City’s efforts in effect represented an attempt to rearticulate justice within an understanding of the ethical relation. That is to say, The City acknowledged members of United for Peace as important leadership figures within their communities, who were largely overlooked as such within the purview of the criminological narrative and the construction of the deviant.

In a collaborative effort to further the relational aims and a sense of belonging, and to validate initiatives formed within the community, The City helped to facilitate relations and fund the formation of United for Peace. The articles covering the
announcement of United for Peace illustrate the supportive representation of members from both the dominant and non-dominant community. Upon its formal conception, early efforts were made to sustain a level of support for the organization. Prominent figures affiliated with United for Peace, and representatives of the both the dominant and non-dominant community, including figures such as Spike Moss, a staff member at The City, and Deputy Chief Dave Dobrotka, were forthcoming in their acknowledgement of United for Peace’s aims to mitigate violence through mediatory involvement (see Cook, 1992d and Parker, 1992b for featured coverage of Moss and Dobrotka’s partnership via United for Peace). The vocal reassurances that Moss and Dobrotka offered worked in part to validate the sense of hopefulness that was reflected within the early coverage of United for Peace. While such a hopefulness, as it was addressed at United for Peace, was in part a support of United for Peace’s aims to minimize gang tensions and improve the standing of black youth (Diaz, 1992b), the initial hopefulness also attempted to camouflage an uneasiness about the capacity for sustained support amid any sign of violence otherwise deemed “gang related.”

Although United for Peace was acknowledged for its involvement in mediating conflicts within the community (see Brunswick, 1992a; Furst, 1992a; “Letters from readers,” 1992c; Leyden, 1992b for an overview of their earlier efforts), the September 1992 fatal shooting of officer Jerry Haaf marked a salient instance of violence that eclipsed sentiments of hopefulness with those of uncertainty. Following an act of violence, justice asks that we respond to the other; it is within this response that the Levinasian notions of mercy, charity, and the verdict lie. The purposeful withholding of a verdict, the judgement of the other whether that judgment be for or against the other
demonstrates a consideration of the other via a perspective of mercy or charity. Mercy and charity reflects the capacity to acknowledge the other’s existence ahead of your own (Levinas, 2001). In framing the capacity for charity, Tahmasebi-Birgani (2014) suggests that “in the face of injustice to the other, Levinas raises not so much the question of ‘Who should be blamed?,’ but rather, ‘What am I to do?’” (p. 109).

Summarizing the later investigation of the incident, Worthington (1993) explains:

Investigators were led to four men, all members of the Vice Lords, who prosecutors said were retaliating for the rousting by transit officers earlier that day of a black bus passenger. Two have been convicted; the other two await trial. Meanwhile, three more Vice Lords are charged with the killing of Edward Harris, a fellow Vice Lord suspected of informing in the Haaf investigation. (p. 1)

The fatal shooting of officer Haaf, and the resultant investigation, once again provoked divergent perspectives about justice in the dominant and non-dominant communities. As is illustrated in much of the coverage during the latter period of 1992, the emphasis by the dominant community—most notably by the police, the police federation, and politicians—surrounded efforts to position “who should be blamed?” As was presented in the latter part of section 5.2, the Police Federation was the most vocal in its attempts to point blame. In the immediate aftermath of the shooting, the Federation considered putting forward a vote to censure Deputy Chief Dave Dobrotka for his involvement in supporting and coordinating collaborative initiatives between the police and United for Peace (Parker, 1992c; see McGrath, 1992 for a more extensive article about the criticism surrounding Dobrotka’s partnership with United for Peace). While this vote ultimately did not occur (Furst & Leyden, 1992a), the Federation’s efforts to point blame beyond
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9 All four individuals (Mwati McKenzie, Shannon Bowles, Monterey Willis, & A.C. Ford) convicted in the fatal shooting of officer Haaf received life sentences (Williams, 2002).
10 David Dobrotka left the Minneapolis Police Department in 1994 to becomes the Police Chief in Glendale, Arizona (Collins, 2007).
attempting to find those involved in the shooting, also became a platform from which to
generate support for the police and conceptions of justice in the guise of safety.

In the coverage of the investigation, the newspapers present support from within
both the dominant and non-dominant communities in the attempt to identify and find
those involved. While for the dominant community this support is presented as an
endeavour towards rebuilding a sense of safety, for the non-dominant community this
support is seen as an effort to mitigate the underlying hostility and generalized racism
motivated by the investigation. Largely undermining the concerns of the non-dominant
community, the coverage by the newspapers highlights aspects aligned with the dominant
community’s concerns for safety: the police were quick to sever ties with United for
Peace (Brunswick, Leyden, Furst, & Baden, 1992); an initial reward of $50,000 was
established for anyone who could offer information leading to convictions (Furst &
Leyden, 1992a); this reward was soon upped to $100,000 (Baden, 1992a; Brunswick,
1992c; Leyden, 1992e; for articles discussing the later controversy of this reward money
see Brunswick & Holston, 1992; “Letters from readers,” 1992d); two suspects being held
on “unrelated charges” had an unusually high bail set at $200,000 (Brunswick, 1992d;
Brunswick & Furst, 1992); a $3 million bail was set for two of the suspects charged in the
shooting of officer Haaf (Cook, 1992f); there was a presumed guilt of United for Peace’s
president, Sharif Willis, throughout the entire investigation despite the absence of formal
charges; United for Peace helped to coordinate the arrest of the fourth suspect in the Haaf
investigation (Brunswick, Leyden, & Diaz, 1992).

The presented attempts to help facilitate the conviction of those involved in
officer Haaf’s death relates to the cloud of unease that is provoked by violence. While
Levinas seeks the capacity to both say and unsay in order to avoid the fixation on totalizing thought, the violent act consumes us: it serves as a fixed point from which to expose the vulnerability of the solitary subject. Vulnerability reflects the feeling of uncontrollability presented via the there is. In an effort to alleviate feelings of vulnerability both the dominant and the non-dominant communities are seen participating to help restore order in an effort to mitigate the very vulnerability exposed in the fixation of the violent act. Thus, justice and the presented offering to punish those responsible is directed not in the name of the other, but in the name of my vulnerability. The conviction of the other is seen as an element of restored order; order further pursued through the advocacy by members of the dominant community for tougher crime measures. For Levinas (1989), “the extermination of evil by violence means that evil is taken seriously and that the possibility of infinite pardon tempts us to infinite evil” (p. 139). Evil, in its threatening ambiguity, becomes a fixture in which justice is reconstituted within the framework of the criminological narrative and universal law. Evil, then as Levinas (2001) explains, is the refusal of the responsibility to the other. Thus, as it appears in the newspapers’ coverage during and after the Haaf investigation, in the aims for renewed order it was not the other and the use of efforts already in place that the dominant community turned, but rather what we will come to distinguish as the third and the universal systems embedded within the political.

6.3 The Third and Substitution

The period following the September 1992 shooting of officer Haaf prompted major changes for The City. In December 1992 the *Star Tribune* (Grow, 1992d; Leyden,
1992g) reported that Jim Nelson, the long-time executive director of The City,\textsuperscript{11} would be resigning.\textsuperscript{12} In commenting on Nelson’s resignation, Applegate Nelson (2001) shares powerful reflections about how Nelson’s resignation impacted the organization and its members. As is generally reflected by Applegate Nelson (2001), the transitioning period following the announcement of Nelson’s resignation prompted a rift in the organization as many of the established efforts and long-term friendships began to falter.

Amid the impending changes happening at The City, the 1992 shooting of officer Haaf also prompted a shift in the conceptualization of community as it was positioned within the criminological narrative. As was explored in Chapter 2 (see 2.2.2 Social control, community, and the criminological narrative), the criminological narrative, which has been used to offer a broader conceptualization of The City’s efforts during the 1987-1992 period, positions The City’s efforts as that facilitated by the second major transformation of criminological thought. Again, this second major transformation was marked by an attempt to decentralize power over deviancy control by promoting community directed initiatives. As Cohen (1985) argues, the decentralized and deinstitutionalized efforts, while manageable for some, for others raised the concern that such attempts would only strengthen a centralized system. In the period following the Haaf shooting it is the latter of the two beliefs about decentralized efforts that predominated, precipitating increasing control by the State over the implementation of deviancy control measures.

\textsuperscript{11} Jim Nelson was The City’s executive director from 1979 until 1993.
\textsuperscript{12} While my positioning, as very much outside of the organization, does not allow me to comment on the significance of Nelson’s resignation, I would direct anyone who is interested to Jo Applegate Nelson’s dissertation entitled, \textit{A crossroads year at a crossroads place The City School: A Minneapolis alternative school 1992-1993}. 

In a demonstration of distrust for The City in early October 1992—amid the Haaf investigation—members from the St. Paul City Council criticized a preliminary report contracted by the city of St. Paul to The City about the state of the gang issues within St. Paul (see Collins, 1992; Davis, 1992a, 1992b; Grow, 1992c; Lonetree, 1992a, 1992b; Smith, 1992; Soucheray, 1992a; “Study by The City,” 1992). Much of the Council members’ criticism targeted the discrepancy between the estimated large number of active gang members identified in the report to be involved in St. Paul as compared to the lesser by more than half estimate offered by the St. Paul Police Department. In a critique of the reporting during the earliest days of the Haaf investigation, Applegate Nelson (2001) spotlights an article by Philip Kretsedemas, which highlights how this incident with the St Paul City Council was part of a general undermining of knowledge presented by members of the non-dominant community, and more specifically an undermining of The City’s aim to work with youth in the community. In the review of the incident, Applegate Nelson (2001) foregrounds Kretsedemas’ explanation of how the reporting by the dominant community facilitates the undermining of non-dominant community efforts and knowledge:

The City, Inc., the organization that developed the grant proposal that kicked off United for Peace, may not get more money to complete its study of black street gangs. Typical of inner city reporting, the report began with an account of what The City, Inc. was trying to accomplish and ended with a cynical statement by a member of the Minneapolis City council who feels The City, Inc.’s work is an unnecessary defense of delinquent youth. (Quoted in Applegate Nelson, 2001, p. 55)

13 In the newspaper coverage, The City’s initial report is said to estimate that 1,200 to 1,500 young people were connected to black gangs, while the police estimate that about 600 young people are involved in gangs of all races and ethnicities (Soucheray, 1992a).
14 See Davis (1992b) to review the article that Kretsedemas was referencing in his critique.
The St. Paul City Council voted unanimously in late October to end the contract with The City (Smith, 1992b). Kretsedemas’ critique was part of a larger piece he wrote for *Colors: Minnesota’s Journal of Opinion by Writers of Color* in the January/February 1993 issue in which he addressed the newspaper coverage of the Haaf investigation between September 26 through to October 4. In larger segments reviewed by Applegate Nelson (2001), Kretsedemas highlights the very biased dominant community position of the *Star Tribune* and the *Pioneer Press* newspapers. In her reflections about Kretsedemas’ piece and the period that it covers, Applegate Nelson (2001) shares in Kretsedemas’ critique about the silencing of the non-dominant community during the early coverage of the Haaf investigation:

The inner-city perspective on the story, including that of The City, went largely unheard. Mainstream media kept the focus on the juxtaposition of a senseless murder of a decent, white police officer who was a ‘regular guy’ with investigations, many which never led to charges, of black gang members who were turning the Twin Cities into someplace sinister like New York. (p. 55)

The newspapers’ emphasis on the violent act in conjunction with the emphasis on the dominant community’s distrust of United for Peace and The City, served to discredit The City’s work and reposition the issue of gangs to a perspective associated with authorities within the dominant community. The attempt by the dominant community to chalk The City’s efforts as simply another failed experiment largely undermined the voices within the non-dominant community, including members of United for Peace, which were adamant in their desire to continue to help mitigate the impacts of violence, racism, and poverty within their communities. The perspective from the non-dominant
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15 For examples of articles emphasizing this juxtaposition that Kretsedemas highlights see Brunswick, 1992b; Grow, 1992b; Klobuchar, 1992a.
community often indicated the impacts of broader systemic violence (see; however, the
fixation on the violent act within the coverage of the Haaf investigation generally
overshadowed the place for such concerns. As Cohen (1985) argues, the threatening
centralized model for deviancy control
lingers amid the intent to discredit, or simply ignore, the voices and efforts of
organizations and individuals from the non-dominant community. It is within the
intention for renewed control that we see the forced inclusion of the third.

The third presents a complication for Levinas as it impacts the capacity to fulfill
the responsibility to the other. For Levinas (2001), upon the inclusion of the third,
“judgement, comparison are necessary. One must consent to comparing incomparable
beings: the I’s, all of them unique. One must be able to clarify their uniqueness as a type
without chaining them to it” (p. 230). The inclusion of the third thereby compels the
involvement of the State to help control and protect the third, the fourth, the fifth, etc., as
my capacity for charity and mercy is overridden by my responsibility to the other; I am
forced to choose an other ahead of all incomparable others. The State, via the political,
facilitates the creation and implementation of totalizing structures and directs the
accompanying discourse about what is needed to protect the vulnerable others.

For Levinas, there is something reverent in the initial engagement with the other;
something that is lost or perhaps something that we move away from as we begin to
recognize the other through the filter of the political and its accompanying structures and
discourse. Levinas, in his skepticism of totalizing structures, holds that the ethical
relation with the other is compromised when we reference it through totalizing structures.
Within these structures, the ethical relation is limited as it is not the face of the other that
is presented, but a requirement to know and compare the incomparable other to an idealized conceptualization. Such an interference of the ethical relation indicates that the totalizing structure, though potentially established in the name of the egalitarian and just State, must, as Levinas (1981/2011b) notes, be “set up and also maintained” (p. 159). The creation and maintenance of totalizing structures risks oppressing the others, as my responsibility to the Other leaves me and the others vulnerable to the devised protection of the political and its totalizing structures.

As we see in the case study, perspectives from the dominant community primarily guided the development of a strengthening centralized criminological system. The Police Federation was one of the first to come forward with proposed changes to police operations, including, but not limited to, efforts to develop a gang task force and to further drug enforcement (Brunswick & Furst, 1992). 17 Unsurprisingly, the Federation’s recommendations reflected what Howell (2000) notes is the common prioritization of crime and violence reduction strategies by law enforcement. In Howell’s (2000) view, “law enforcement agents view suppression tactics, crime prevention activities, and community collaboration—in that order—as most effective in preventing and controlling crime” (p. 53). As a point of clarity, suppression tactics, as Howell (2000) describes them, “use the full force of the law, generally through a combination of police, prosecution, and incarceration to deter the criminal activities of entire gangs, dissolve them, and remove individual gang members from them by means of prosecution and incarceration” (p. 21).

17 The gang task force that was soon after developed was eliminated in 2013 and replaced in June 2015 by a six-person gang interdiction unit that was intended to help “identify, disrupt and defuse gang violence throughout the city” (Norfleet, 2015, para. 4).
Within the attempts to develop new gang and violence reduction strategies to replace the seemingly “failed” efforts of The City and United for Peace, the State relied upon the professionalized body (including police, academics, social workers, etc.) to help devise effective replacements. In a critique of professionalized efforts to devise empirically proven effective initiatives for the ostensibly chaotic, Cohen (1985) suggests that most criminological studies fall under three categories:

1. **evangelical**, in which we are told that this or that project has achieved a breakthrough in reducing recidivism, in involving the community or whatever (and that further research is needed to confirm this result);
2. **fudgy**, in which under the heading of “evaluation” words such as process, control group, feedback, flow-chart, objectives, goals, inputs, and system are arranged in random order (and more research is called for); and
3. **nihilistic**, in which it is shown that nothing, after all, works, everything costs the same (and more research is probably needed). Little of this helps towards understanding the underlying picture, and much reading between the lines is required to see what these projects and programmes are about. (p. 7)

Cohen’s remarks offer a poignant critique for gang and violence reduction research as the majority of formally assessed strategies are deemed failed efforts, with even the most successful being limited in their sustained effects. A notable example is Klein’s (2011) assessment of the limitations of Irving Spergel’s Little Village Project in Chicago, which in Howell’s (2000) comprehensive assessment of gang and violence reduction programs over the past half century was one of the only positively reviewed programs. While the classically categorized prevention, intervention, and suppression programs are determined to be ineffective on their own (see Spergel & Grossman, 1997; Howell, 2000; Klein & Maxson, 2006), the more contemporary emphasis on comprehensive strategies—strategies “combining program elements such as social services, crisis intervention, gang suppression, and community involvement” (Howell, 2000, p. 34)—provide a vague and
broad approach that can, too, detract from the acknowledgement of those within the communities which they target.

The emphasized categorization of programs and strategies is, as Cohen highlights above, quite ambiguous. This ambiguity and the requirement to understand programmatic efforts based on the categories they comprise, was seen to work against the assessment of The City by authority figures in the newspaper coverage. While in the fuller accounts of The City, it is certainly befitting of a comprehensive approach, the often isolated presentation of The City offered by the newspaper coverage led experts, like Irving Spergel (see reference to Spergel’s Little Village Project above), to classify The City’s work as an intervention effort. The newspapers’ descriptions often reductively framed The City’s efforts as outreach work, which professional pundits largely considered ineffective. Quite notably, the success that Spergel found in his Little Village Project shared notable similarities to the fuller accounts (see Nelson, 1994; Applegate Nelson, 2001) of The City. While The City is a seemingly failed experiment, its failure in large part was embedded within a much larger system of complexity involving its positioning within and between the dominant and the non-dominant community.

To undermine or discredit the trace of The City is to risk justifying an act of violence in the name of the political, or the attempt for restored order. Violence as suggested here is in reference to what Levinas positions as “the first violence.” As Levinas (2001) explains, the first violence dictates that “in the concern not to misrecognize the face of the other man [sic] is the refusal to see only the face” (p. 56). The first violence is provoked by the requirement for me to compare incomparable others in order to distinguish which of the others concerns me first. To establish the political and
conceptions of justice in a framework solely directed by the interests of the dominant community is to undermine and discredit the voices and concerns of those from the non-dominant community. The political established in an attempt to conceal the trace of the other suggests a weakness in my responsibility for the other outside of the confines of its conceptualization. I inflict the first violence when I renounce my responsibility to the other and allow for their persecution. For Levinas, justice and the political cannot replicate the responsibility to the other; there is no substitution for this. As Levinas (1981/2011b) explains:

The more I return to myself, the more I divest myself, under the traumatic effect of persecution, of my freedom as a constituted, willful, imperialist subject, the more I discover myself to be responsible; the more just I am, the more guilty I am, I am ‘in myself’ through the others. (p. 112)

Guilt and the persecution of the other as determined by the verdict, while justified in the compositions of the political, further isolates me as I become consumed by the determined conditions in which I may seemingly know or persecute the other.

6.4 Conclusion

In expanding on the newspapers’ coverage of The City in Chapter 5, I have used Chapter 6 to provide a deeper discussion of the relationships, events, and follow-up to events that appeared in the 1987-1992 coverage. I have directed this discussion using key aspects of Levinasian ethics looking to consider how the ethical relationship with the other and the way in which we come to know and be with the other is impacted by the circumstances happening within and between communities. Thus, I have looked to examine how the ethical relations fits within the consideration of community, how the
ethical relation comes to be questioned, and whether or not the ethical relation can be reasserted.

In the consideration of relationships, my use of Levinasian ethics has explored how a perceived vulnerability facilitated through a politics of fear can arrest the ethical relation in favor of a desire to know the other. The presumed belief is that in knowing the other I can control against that which makes me feel most vulnerable. However, for Levinas, to try to know the other is to oppress the other, and to re-expose the very vulnerability that I have tried to control.

Key events, like the fatal shooting of Tycel Nelson and the fatal shooting of officer Jerry Haaf, also at times served to arrest the ethical relation, as the fixation on the moment—or the fixation on the violent act as I have also positioned it—designates how we are to know and understand the other. That is to say, in the fixated moment we are forced to judge the actions of the other by looking to constructed systems, like the justice system, to form a basis from which to orient meaning. However, the reduction of the other to not only their being in the fixated moment, but also to their presentation within constructed systems undermines the responsibility that I hold to the other and an acknowledgment of the guilt that I, too, share in the actions of the other.

In the follow-up to key events I have illustrated how the political is commonly looked to as a way to move forward and to correct that which the fixation on the moment highlights as being flawed or dangerous. However, for Levinas the future with the political is uncertain as you do not know whether the political will promote the ethical relation or control against it. Thus, in the attempts to correct presumed flaws and
presented dangers, the political asks that we compare incomparable others in the effort to maintain an established order.
CHAPTER 7: MOVING FORWARD

In the presented consideration of Levinasian ethics, and the relation that is being with and for the other, I suggest a fuller contemplation of the conceptualization of community. I am not suggesting here that Levinasian thought offers up blueprints for a better vision of community. Levinas is enigmatic in his overall exposition and it would be remiss to suggest anything structured within the said, the knowable or the idealized more generally. Levinasian thought emphasizes the importance of the ethical relationship and draws attention to the negation of the other in the attempts to know or define the other through their essence. For Levinas (1981/2011b), “essence is the very fact that there is a theme, exhibition, doxa or logos, and thus truth. Essence is not only conveyed, it is temporalized in a predicative statement” (p. 39). While The City’s efforts were largely composed out of a responsibility to the other, the newspapers’ coverage provoked a consideration of the other as positioned within either the dominant or the non-dominant community. The selected newspapers’ orientation as that firmly established within and influenced by the dominant community noticeably impacts the depiction of the other, as those outside of the dominant community were thought of as a projected image, or in the essence of what they were not, but could aspire to be.

Within this study I have highlighted the divergence in the consideration of the other between the dominant community and the non-dominant community by interrogating their differing understandings of justice and the criminological narrative. Holding very different meanings for those within the dominant community versus those from the non-dominant community, the established divergence with regard to justice and the criminological narrative that appears within the newspapers’ coverage, be it through
delusion or through grace, illustrates the persistence of the ethical impulse to demonstrate the trace of the other. The ethical impulse through its demonstration of the responsibility to the other attempts to mitigate the grounds for which divergence appears; however, the ethical impulse is compromised by the fixation on the violent act. The violent act serves as a justification by which to renounce the responsibility to the other; a separation reinforced through the guise of the political that further removes the trace of the other and offers a reconceptualization of the just and noble other in its stead. In the isolation of the conceptualized other, the ethical impulse persists: “each of us is guilty before everyone and for everything, and I more than all the others” (Dostoevsky, 18 as cited in Levinas, 2001, p. 56).

7.1 Implications for Future Research

I would propose that my consideration of The City and the newspapers’ coverage of The City between 1987 and 1992 offers three prominent aspects that are useful in one’s consideration and work with the Other and others. These three prominent aspects could inform future studies.

7.1.1 Conditional Belonging

As appeared in Chapter 5 (see 5.4 Developing comprehensive community solutions), I conceptualize conditional belonging as facilitating the purposeful exclusion of individuals within systemic aims for order, security, or what could otherwise be proposed as progress, development, effectiveness, or success. I suggest that conditional

---

18 This quote from Fyodor Dostoevsky’s *Brothers Karamazov* prominently appears in Levinas’ work as it guides his understanding of the responsibility to the other and his later consideration of substitution, as presented in *Otherwise than Being*. 
belling is reinforced within and between communities during moments of presented disarray in order to re-establish perceived control. As it is positioned within this current study, I suggest that Quinney’s (1975) third sub-element of the criminological narrative, that is, the social reaction to crime, is a provocation to conditional belonging. Conditional belonging provokes a homogenized conceptualization of others and space, attempting to ensure control within a given time. Where my use of conditional belonging in Chapter 5 focused on the presented issue of controlling youth unrest within the city center of Minneapolis, further considerations about the control of space—whether that be through gentrification or the controlled narrative of space—could also be useful within discussions of conditional belonging.

Butler and Watt (2007) discuss that the controlled presentation of space can be both invisible and highly visible. As they argue, “although in one sense such ‘no-go areas’ are effectively rendered invisible to the majority of people…in another they are all too visible via media-fuelled representations of concentrated deviance” (p. 85). The newspapers’ coverage of The City demonstrated that the fixation on the violent act within media depictions offers a construction of space that sits largely outside of the lived experiences of those within the spaces. Resultant effects thereby facilitate efforts to control the space as directed and imposed by the dominant community; what I would alternatively argue is an effort to remove the trace of the other and construct a façade in its place. Reactive efforts undermine the established value, knowledge, and leadership by those within a given space to mediate conflict and to combat larger systemic issues that often receive less attention in the concentration of the isolated moment.
This concept of conditional belonging that emerged in this study, in concert with Butler’s controlled presentation of space, could be informative to other similar case studies in the field of child and youth studies, and cultural criminology. In her reflections about her work at The City School, Applegate Nelson (2001) comments on how routinely one can attempt to control and regulate the behavior and actions of others, acknowledging that such attempts for control often undermine and negatively impact diversity. Applegate Nelson (2001) comments on how efforts to control and regulate “leaves a fairly homogenous group of compliant kids” (p. 35), while a commitment to diversity “requires embracing cacophony, dissonance, and defiance” (p. 35). Recognizing the often commonplace use of rules and regulations, the integration of conditional belonging in further studies could be valuable in questioning how and why rules and regulations are framed and how they impact the reflection of the other and/or a given space.

7.1.2 Finding the Trace

Immersed within the compilation of newspaper articles was a presentation about how we can think about and know the other. The vast array of voices and opinions can often lead us to question the relationship with the other; however, the notion of the trace offers a notable methodological tool that can help position how discourse is being used to control knowledge and power, and in turn, whether or not discourse reinforces the responsibility to the other or undermines it. Amid the attempts to control the other and space, the enduring trace of the excluded, controlled, or oppressed other—that to whom the political allows me to question or renounce my responsibility—persists. The trace is not something that can be erased. As Levinas (1996) explains:
the trace would seem to be the very indelibility of being, its omnipotence with regard to all negativity, its immensity incapable of being self-enclosed, somehow too great for discretion, interiority or a Self...the trace does not effect a relationship with what would be less than being but obliges with regard to the Infinite, the absolutely Other. (p. 62)

The significance of the trace comes from its established relation with what Levinas (1972/2006) calls illeity, “a relation, personal and ethical, a relation, obligation, that does not unveil” (p. 41). The trace is not so much “found” in the sense that it can be articulated or captured within a moment; the trace disrupts, questioning that which we assume we know or drawing us out of the fixation on the moment (i.e., an isolated presentation of the other from which we presume knowledge and understanding).

The capacity to “find the trace” can be daunting in the midst of what Levinas classifies as the political, as the political constructs layers—systems, policies, programs—in the desire to establish order and a homogenization around shared aims. The occurrence of the violent act, or a moment which exposes vulnerability within the established order, provokes the construction of new layers within the political. Each new layer inhibits the exposure of the trace that is recognized in the face of the other, as the political necessitates that we question the other in order to ensure order and security. The questioning of the other is captured within the fixation on the moment, what Levinas suggests as a betrayal of sorts. In describing this betrayal Levinas (1981/2011b) suggests that “we have been seeking the otherwise than being from the very beginning, and as soon as it is conveyed before us it is betrayed in the said that dominates the saying which states it” (p. 7). Thus, to know the other is to lose sight of the other, and to trap the representation of the other within isolated considerations of space and time risks the simultaneous inclusion of some and the exclusion of others (Cohen, 1985; Young, 1999).
While I do not assume that the trace ceases the political, I do suggest that it serves to disrupt the fixation on the moment and rearticulates the responsibility that I hold to the other. Amid the systemic attempts for order and security, the responsibility for the other takes precedence. Thus, responsibility, whatever that may look like, could coordinate with efforts within the political or it could act outside of the political: does the political necessitate connectedness through aspired order, or does it acknowledge the other’s faults as my own? As The City’s efforts demonstrate, where the dominant community questioned the viability of those that The City worked with to offer leadership roles, The City attempted to demonstrate the importance of acknowledging those who were otherwise excluded. The trace resonates in the vocalization of the other: in the trace’s thematization, “the extraordinary is inserted into an order; the Other is absorbed in the Same” (Levinas, 1972/2006, p. 40); in its actualization, the trace disrupts order through its “lateral relation” in which it seemingly participates within order and yet distances itself from order.

The trace offers a point in which to establish an ethical grounding for research (i.e., one that seeks to interrupt and demonstrate how discourse or aspects of the political can undermine the responsibility to the other). Thus, the trace could be used as a methodological tool, taken up in community-based research as a way to move away from assessment-style research towards research that prioritizes the relationships and responsibilities of one to the other.
7.1.3 Building Community

Depending on its conceptualization, community can be invaluable in its capacity to help facilitate the responsibility to other. As becomes apparent in Nelson (1994, 1995) and Applegate Nelson’s (2001) reflections on their experiences from working at The City, idealized considerations of community do not allow for the chaotic dynamics of the day to day—chaotic, here, simply acknowledging that which cannot be neatly predicted or understood. As was presented with Nelson’s (1994, 1995) six points of assessment for building community—a sense of history and place, making relatives and relationships, the utility of culture, comprehensive and community approaches, advocacy and institutional opposition, and a commitment to reflection, experimentation and research—The City’s efforts to build community was very much embedded in the relation with the other.

Within the purview of Levinasian thought, The City’s perspective on community acknowledges that I am a part of both the failures and successes of the other: the responsibility to the other is unwavering, as there is no substitution for my responsibility to the other. Notably, Applegate Nelson (2001) acknowledges that difficulties can lead you to question the relation with the other and in turn how you come to know and understand community. In her reflections on events that occurred during the 1992-1993 school year at The City School, Applegate Nelson (2001) asks:

was community built during the 1992-93 school year at The City? How does one evaluate success or progress given the goals? Is community being built even as assumptions are being questioned? Are we in community when people are not particularly nice to one another? (p. 89)
A central aspect for both Nelson (1994, 1995) and Applegate Nelson (2001) is the idea of making relatives; however, relationships, too, are chaotic. When relationships are tested through the provocation of systems and discourses of social control it can be valuable to question the conceptualization of community; does your understanding of community leave room for the ethical relationship? I say this not as a means to undermine community, but as a way to reemphasize the priority of the responsibility to the other and the asymmetry of the relation with the other.

Upon reflection, and expanding on Nelson’s six points of assessment for building community, Applegate Nelson (2001) presents an additional five complimentary points for building community: create opportunities for conversation, embrace paradox, elevate collective effort, make a place for celebration and tragedy, and build on capacity. Create opportunities for conversation emphasizes how the space for conversation can get lost at times, which can impact the strength of relationships within a community. Thus, this point suggests the importance of creating opportunities for people to talk to one another. Embrace paradox acknowledges that the appearance for stability and order, which is commonly just out of reach, is less important than the authentic relationships that compose community and which are naturally messy. Elevate collective effort reflects on the position that “communities are built by members sharing responsibility and offering their talents to the collective effort” (Applegate Nelson, 2001, p. 93). Applegate Nelson (2001) notes how the role of leadership is significant in the direction and capacity for such collective effort. Make a place for celebration and tragedy highlights that being in a community can be both joyous and tragic. As such, it is important to have processes and strategies that accommodate for both and which do not isolate individuals, but allow them
to move forward together. Finally, to *build on capacity* emphasizes the strength that a community holds when it recognizes the fullness and capacity of those within it. While I have only briefly described each of these additional points, I have highlighted them here to demonstrate the necessary evaluation of community in order to help reprioritize the responsibility to the other. Applegate Nelson’s additional points are a reflection of the responsibility to the other as they exist for those within that community.

Thus, I would suggest that research on community organizations must move away from measurements of success and failure, but rather remain consistent within the values of the community itself—i.e., as determined through their self-reflection and the space they create for the other.

### 7.2 Concluding Remarks

In the preceding pages I have attempted to examine how The City, Inc.’s work within North and South Minneapolis neighborhoods during 1987 and 1992 was positioned within a collection of *Minneapolis Star Tribune, St. Paul Pioneer Press, and Chicago Tribune* newspaper articles. This focus period is but a partial reflection of The City’s efforts during its extensive years of operation, including the rich history of The City, the neighbourhoods where it worked, the people it worked with, the city of Minneapolis more broadly, and the more generalized discussions of social order that were infused within the reviewed newspaper articles and the accompanying pieces used for this study. While I have attempted to capture what was available to me, this is but a limited view and as such I cannot suggest that what I have provided is a true or an accurate representation of The City during this period.
Similarly, I acknowledge that the selected newspapers that I have used for my evaluation are largely representative of the dominant culture. While I don’t see this as an impediment to the current study, it does hold certain limitations as the dominant community is commonly presented as holding the knowledge and dictating the direction for community strategies. The prominence of the dominant community’s voice in the selected newspapers often undermines the voice, experiences, knowledge, and concerns of those from the non-dominant community. While I have attempted to highlight the divergence of understanding between the dominant and the non-dominant communities where possible, my coverage of certain events may have been, in part, impacted by the information presented within the selected newspaper articles. Furthermore, my positioning as a researcher from outside of Minneapolis leaves me less acquainted with the broader contextual circumstances that framed The City during the 1987-1992 focus period. Additionally, my current positioning as that within the dominant community also potentially undermines my capacity to highlight some of the more subtle and underlying concerns that were possibly being vocalised by members of the non-dominant community within the compiled resources.

I have attempted to structure this study so as to mitigate the presented limitations above by including the voice of The City where appropriate. In highlighting how the depiction of community was reflected within the newspapers’ coverage of The City, I have attempted to frame my analysis using The City’s six points of assessment for building community. Again, there are potential limitations surrounding my representation of each of these six points, as they too hold a history and have been adapted to the changing experiences, complexities, and relationships at The City. While I have
attempted to draw on aspects presented within the compiled articles that speak to each of these six points, the presented focus of The City within the newspapers, too, is limited as they only offer a partial scope of The City’s programmatic efforts. As such, the use of these points in the initial framing of my assessment allows for a better consideration about how systems of control from the dominant community impact how The City was able to work within its own conceptualization of community.

I have attempted to complement the assessment of community using Levinasian ethics as a way to question how the depiction of community impacts how we come to know and be with the other. For Levinas we have an established responsibility to the other that precedes all else. The ethical relation to the other is often questioned within overarching systems of social order that can quickly condemn the other and arrest the ethical relation and thereby the responsibility to the other. The emphasis on condemning the violent act is misguided for Levinas, as true violence originates in the structured comparison of incomparable others: “the violence of the sword lets the will it seeks to dominate escape. True violence preserves the freedom it coerces” (Levinas, 1998, p. 30). Levinasian ethics, then, questions the way the dominant community comes to try to know and understand The City, along with the neighborhoods and the people with whom it worked; further, it questions how we have reached understandings of failure and success. For Levinas, failure and success, whatever that may look like, is going to happen. The difficulty arises in maintaining a position of responsibility that acknowledges my guilt in the other’s: “not to see the suffering of the world is not to bring this suffering to an end” (Levinas, 1990, p. 188). Thus, to know The City through the captured moments or through generalized forms of comparison is flawed, as there are countless complexities
and dynamics within and between the dominant and the non-dominant community within this case study that the generalized analysis and consideration of an organization can hardly capture. That is not to say that The City was a perfect organization, nor did it aspire to be, but it was certainly more than merely another failed experiment.
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