**Restorative Justice CP**

I advocate treating violent juvenile felons separately from adults through restorative justice.

This is mutually exclusive because it endorses a different punishment for juveniles, so groups aren’t treated the same. It’s also net beneficial. Also, advocating treating both juveniles and adults through restorative justice is severance and intrinsic because this was not the original Aff advocacy. This makes it impossible to Negate because they make all my arguments disappear by shifting their advocacy to coopt them, and their ground is better because they can shift in such ways to answer any objection to their arguments.

The restorative process allows for personal interaction—it functions as moral education and achieves atonement. This is key to restoring the community.

Garvey 03—(Stephen P. Garvey, Professor of Law Cornell School, Restorative Justice, Punishment and Atonement, Utah Law Review, 2003, http://privateweb.law.utah.edu/\_webfiles/academic/journals/utahlawreview/2003\_1/09Garvey.pdf)

My claim here is that when a restorative justice conference is said to work, it’s said to work because it achieves atonement, or at least starts the process rolling. Perhaps the most distinctive feature of the processes associated with restorative justice is, as I’ve mentioned, the face-to-face encounter between the offender and the victim. Together with their accompanying communities of care, as well as other stakeholders, the victim and offender meet as fellow human beings sharing a common humanity. Their dialogue and interactions are not mediated through formal legal rules or structures. Victim and offender speak to one another directly, not through lawyers. There is no judge, only a mediator or facilitator, whose main job is to ensure that the exchange remains within the boundaries of mutual respect When this process works as it should, it brings home to the offender in painful detail the full measure of the injury he has caused. He comes to see his victim as a human being with standing equal to his own. The guilt he formally acknowledged before the restorative process began hits home. Not only does he acknowledge it cognitively, he also experiences it affectively. 40 The processes associated with restorative justice therefore function ideally as mechanisms of moral education. 41 They bring an offender to understand and appreciate the full measure of the damage he has caused, both material and moral; enable him to overcome mechanisms of defense and denial; and teach him what he must do to make amends and gain readmission into the community as a member in good standing.

And, this solves better. A meta-analysis of every relevant study from the last 25 years proves that victims are more satisfied with restorative juvenile justice than with forms of treatment like the AC’s retributive focus.

Latimer writes:

Jeff Latimer, Craig Dowden, Danielle Muise. “The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A Meta-Analysis.” Department of Justice Canada – Research and Stats Division. 2001.

The overall mean effect size for the 13 tests of treatment that explored the impact of restorative justice programming on victim satisfaction was +0.19 (+19%) (SD=.18) with a 95 percent confidence of +0.30 to +0.08 (see Figure 1). Although the effect sizes ranged from +0.44 to -0.19, the latter was the only negative value found in the distribution. In other words, participation in a restorative justice program resulted in higher victim satisfaction ratings when compared to a comparison group in all but one of the 13 programs examined. It should be noted that the one negative result was found in the only program that operated at the post-sentence (or corrections) entry point. Compared to victims who participated in the traditional justice system, victims who participated in restorative processes were significantly more satisfied (t (12) = 3.89, p < 0.01).

And, this also comparatively minimizes recidivism, which reduces the need to restore the communal balance moving forward. Even if Aff argues consistent retribution would always solve these needs to restore the community, it’s still preferable to harm it less in the first place.

Latimer 2 writes:

Jeff Latimer, Craig Dowden, Danielle Muise. “The Effectiveness of Restorative Justice Practices: A Meta-Analysis.” Department of Justice Canada – Research and Stats Division. 2001.

The overall mean effect size for the 32 tests that examined the effectiveness of restorative justice programming in reducing offender recidivism was +0.07 (+7%) (SD=.13) with a 95 percent confidence interval of +0.12 to +0.02. Although the effect sizes ranged from +0.38 to -0.23, more than two thirds of the effect sizes were positive (72%). In other words, restorative justice programs, on average, yielded reductions in recidivism compared to non-restorative approaches to criminal behaviour. In fact, compared to the comparison/ control groups that did not participate in a restorative justice program, offenders in the treatment groups were significantly more successful during the followup periods (t (31) = 2.88, p < 0.01).