**Deter and Restore CP**

I advocate implementing a series of graduation incentives and parent training to preemptively reduce crime and a restorative justice system to punish it after the fact.

This is mutually exclusive because it endorses a different incentive and punishment unique to 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.

Graduation incentives decrease crime by incentivizing good behavior. The AC’s theory of deterrence has been proven less effective.

Bell writes:

Programs and Policies to Prevent Youth Crime, Smoking, and Substance Use: What Works? First Edition Wisconsin Family Impact Seminars Briefing Report Edited by Karen Bogenschneider Assistant Professor, Child & Family Studies, UW-Madison Family Policy Specialist, Cooperative Extension, UW-Extension & Mary Ellen Bell Public Information Specialist, Cooperative Extension & Kirsten Draper Linney Project Assistant, Family Impact Seminars Design and layout by Elizabeth Ragsdale February 1997 University of Wisconsin-Extension Center for Excellence in Family Studies School of Human Ecology University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Peter Greenwood, Director of RAND Corporation’s Criminal Justice Program, compares the cost effectiveness of prison with four approaches to intervening early in the lives of children at some risk of eventually getting into trouble with the law: two years of home visits followed by four years of day care; parent training and family therapy for families with young children who behave aggressively in school; four years of cash and other incentives to encourage disadvantaged high school students to graduate; and monitoring and supervising high school-aged youths who have already shown delinquent behavior. For each strategy, Greenwood estimates the number of serious crimes that might be prevented for each million dollars spent. A similar estimate is provided for the California “three strikes” law, which gives longer sentences to repeat offenders. The three strikes law is estimated to reduce serious crime by 21 percent. Graduation incentives might bring about a reduction of 15 percent and are estimated to save enough money to pay most of the program’s costs. A combination of parent training, graduation incentives, and supervision of delinquents would prevent additional crimes. California voters supported the three strikes law, so it appears the public believes that a 21 percent reduction in crime is worth the program’s cost of $5.5 billion a year. Adding graduation incentives and parent training—at a cost of less than 1 billion dollars a year—could double that crime reduction. Phyllis L. Ellickson, Senior Scientist at the RAND Corporation, addresses what we know about keeping kids from going off track. Two approaches that were popular in the past have had little success: the information approach, which stresses the negative consequences of risky behaviors, and the general skills approach, which helps children acquire a more positive self-image by improving their skills in decision-making, communication, and problem-solving.

They cannot say perm and add the percentage reductions together: my advocacy deters all the criminals theirs does because offenders who can be deterred by a marginal increase in sentence length are similarly deterred by my incentives. It is not they decrease X, and I decrease X, so the perm reduces 2X. Rather, there’s no solvency deficit because my reduction solves for their group absent longer sentences.

And, restorative justice comparatively minimizes recidivism.

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 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).

Criminals who can be deterred are not the most violent, committed offenders. They will never cause much harm if they can be scared off by marginally longer sentences, but focusing on recidivism minimizes crime among the most violent population that actually kills people—the sociopaths who cause real harm—so it is a more important goal.