



Editorial

Dear readers,

We feel pleased and honoured to introduce to you this thematically diverse first edition of the Newsletter in the year 2020. Although it is only three months old, the year has already proven to be one of grand developments, both in good and exciting but also in challenging and alarming ways.

We will point you to the good things first. As you have hopefully immediately noticed when looking at this Newsletter, the Forum has a new corporate identity! Also, visit the [website of the Forum](#) if you haven't done so lately. In February the newly designed homepage was launched. The provision of information has been extended, the accessibility has been made easier and the experience has been made more appealing. The website has been updated to a whole new digital experience. See for yourselves!

At the same time, the format of the Newsletter has been changed. You will still be informed by the digital Newsletter edition three times a year, but all of the articles will also be available online in the new restorative blog on the EFRJ homepage.¹ This way, discussion about current developments gets much more inclusive, as you have the chance to start an exchange right there and authors can see how their articles are taken up by EFRJ members.

The main challenge of this year seems to be the outbreak of the Coronavirus disease which has rapidly developed into a pandemic. The current situation unsettles people and makes necessary a restriction of the taken-for-granted freedom. It also holds a chance to reflect on what really matters in life and to bind people together in solidarity. The Coronavirus has also had an impact on our upcoming EFRJ conference in Sassari, which has been postponed to June 2021, while other initiatives (such as the training course on creative communication strategies in restorative practices) will be postponed to December 2020. Keep yourselves updated by visiting the [EFRJ website](#). The plans for the [CJPE Summer Course](#) on responses to sexual violence in Barcelona from July 7th to 10th haven't changed yet.

Despite these challenges, we want us all to be happy about the fact that the year 2020 is the year of the Forum's 20th anniversary! That not only calls for celebration, but also for looking back at the Forum's history and looking ahead at the possible pathways to take.

In the first contribution to this Newsletter — an interview with Tim Chapman — we give you a glimpse into RJ's future, as Tim speaks about the key challenges for restorative justice in this special year. He makes the case for addressing injustices in many fields, not just the criminal justice system, like gender, racism, economic inequalities, and environmental challenges. For him striving towards more visibility and recognition of Restorative Justice in the public and by governments as well as engaging 'radically in the lives of citizens' are the most pressing endeavours of this year.

The second contribution, an article by Angela Nöthe, is a personal reflection on a case of extended victim-offender mediation with two migrants in a housing facility for refugees. She gives us not only a glimpse into what extended victim-offender mediation is, but also contemplates the prospects and challenges for this restorative practice with migrants. The article is related to what we see as the second big challenge of this year: the situation of migrants in Turkey and Greece (and elsewhere) which was aggravated (but also made more visible) by Turkish president Erdogan's decision to encourage migrants to go to the Greek border. European governments hesitated with their reactions in fear of yet another 'refugee crisis' as in 2015 and desperate to prove their capacity to act in the best national interest. We deem this topic of migration and integration so important

¹If you wish to contribute to the blog contact the editorial committee or the EFRJ communications officer, [Bálint Juhász](#).

that we encouraged more experts in the field to contribute to the Newsletter. We are happy to announce that there will be two more blog pieces focusing on this topic. The first is by Ioannis Papadopoulos (*PhD candidate at the University of Portsmouth*) and Katerina Soulou (*EFRJ board member and PhD candidate at Aix-en-Marseille University*) on the situation of unaccompanied migrant minors in Greece and how a restorative justice lens could help in dealing with them. The second one by Tehmina Kazi (*development officer at Why me?*) deals with restorative justice in cases of hate crime and migrant integration.

The third and fourth contribution to this Newsletter are both interviews that revolve around Restorative Justice in cases of (sexual) violence against women. Dr Marie Keenan argues that domestic abuse, sexual violence and coercive control are private and personal, but also public and political matters that must be dealt with on both levels. She holds that it is still a challenge to gain social and professional acceptance for the use of restorative approaches in such cases. Ailbhe Griffith speaks about her personal experience with Restorative Justice, how it helped her overcome the victim role and regain power. She also shares how she thinks and feels about the challenges and

safeguards necessary in such cases. Please see also what she says about the film *The Meeting* which is based on her case and her playing the role of herself. Both Ailbhe and Marie will be keynote speakers at the conference in Sassari.

The fourth contribution follows up on the thread of country developments and gives us insights into the situation of Restorative Justice in Kazakhstan. Aksana Kalenova gives us her professional insights on the spheres of the restorative mediation application in criminal matters and the main misunderstandings of the procedure held by the criminal justice authorities. The author provides us with particular examples from her practice and despite a lot of obstacles has a very optimistic conclusion.

The Editorial Committee wishes you to stay safe and to take care during these very unstable times. We hope that the Coronavirus outbreak will not impede your plans and we will keep you posted about ours!

With very warm regards,

Kim Magiera

magiera@paedagogik.uni-kiel.de

Olga Kiseleva

op.kiseleva@yandex.ru

The challenges and prospects for the 20th anniversary year of the European Forum for Restorative Justice

As we are getting more and more busy with the upcoming projects of the new year, we wanted to stop for a moment and ask a couple of key questions from Tim Chapman, the Chair of the European Forum for Restorative Justice's (EFRJ) Board. This will be a special year with our international conference in Sassari (Italy) and the organisation's 20th anniversary celebrations ahead.² We were interested what does he identify as key challenges of the year, and what are the main take-aways from the EFRJ's 20 years of experience.

Now, starting a new year I am curious, what do you see as the most significant challenges in the field of restorative justice?

For restorative justice to be seen by the public and governments as both relevant and indispensable to the resolution of many of the social problems facing countries throughout Europe.

What do you think should be the priorities

that a network organisation as the European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ) should focus on this year?

Involving, supporting and activating our membership, designing, developing and delivering a curriculum of high-quality learning experiences, to engage actively in contributing to and influencing policies that address the real problems that European people face, to include the critical importance of restorative dialogue, and communicating a narrative of restorative

²Please note that this article was written at the beginning of the year, before the coronavirus outbreak in Europe. On 3 April 2020, the EFRJ announced the postponement of the 11th conference to the end of June 2021.

justice that makes sense to people.

This year has a special feature for us: it is the 20th anniversary of the organisation. You mentioned earlier, that we should not merely use the anniversary to celebrate ourselves, but as an opportunity to put important issues in the spotlight. What opportunity does this anniversary mean in the life of the EFRJ?

It is time to be less inward looking and more engaged in supporting people to establish and maintain just relations with each other.

I believe that the 20th anniversary means that we have come of age. We have spent 20 years developing the field of restorative justice in Europe and we have made great progress. I think that every European country is engaged in implementing restorative justice in some form. We now need to go out into society and engage radically in the reality of the lives of citizens. We need to see and understand the harm and pain experienced by people and offer realistic and effective means of restoration that can undo injustice and alleviate suffering. In other words, it is time to be less inward looking and more engaged in supporting people to establish and maintain just relations with each other.

And what could be the significance of this moment for the restorative movement?

The movement needs to ask itself: How do we offer high quality restorative processes while avoiding becoming another professional elite?



Tim Chapman

You already have been curating a reflecting and re-evaluating process within the

organisation, the Forum 15 Project, which started in the year of the EFRJ's 15th anniversary. What are the main take-aways from that in your eyes?

Firstly, the process of change is slow and you need to cultivate patience.

Secondly, once change is on the agenda, it is amazing how small progressive steps taken by many people generate so much change. Since we began Forum 15, there is a new energy in the Secretariat and in the membership, which has transformed our communications, our engagement in policy development, our conferences, and both our internal relations and our relationships with other organisations such as the European Commission, the Council of Europe, the United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime, and many other European networks in the fields of justice, security and human rights. Our commitment to the value of justice will always mean that we will pay attention to reforming and humanising the criminal justice system. But we increasingly see that justice also applies to the relations between the genders and sexual orientations, between races, between classes, between cultures, between children and adults in families, schools and neighbourhoods and between the economic system and the environment. Injustices in these areas violate the dignity and solidarity of humanity. This opens up the obligation to develop and facilitate new restorative practices.

And if there would be a Forum 20 Project what would be your suggestion, what should that be about?

I would like a new strategy to address the violence and harm caused by injustice in the relations that I have just mentioned. Restorative justice needs to find processes that engage in gender violence, in racism, in the increasing disconnection between people caused by economic inequality, in cultural difference, in raising children to thrive in the Europe of the future and to restore the vitality of our natural environment.

This year is also special for all Europeans, as we commemorate the 75th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, and in May we will also celebrate the 70th anniversary of the 'Schuman Declaration,' which is a key moment in the establishment of the community we have today in Europe. The experience of the war, and how our societies reacted on this experience when the fights ended, are often considered as experiences that have

defined how we regard communities in Europe and the relations between them. It is also a commonplace, that many of us worry nowadays that our societies have lost their faith in the vision built on humanistic values after the war. What is the responsibility of a person with a restorative background in this sense? Can a restorative experience add something meaningful to this discussion?

For me this is a poignant question. 2020 is also the year that the United Kingdom left the European Union. While I regret this decision, it is important to understand why so many people supported it. For me the responsibility of people, who stand for the restorative values of human dignity, solidarity, justice and

truth, is to engage with people who have lost faith in these values and to listen to them with respect and compassion.

And, finally, a semi-personal question: what is your dream for this year?

To feel that I have done enough and that I can relax in Ireland and travel more for pleasure than for work.

Tim Chapman

Chair of the Board

tj.chapman@ulster.ac.uk

was interviewed by

Bálint Juhász

Training and Communications Officer

balint.juhasz@euforumrj.org

This interview first appeared in [The Restorative Blog](#).

Prospects and challenges for restorative justice with refugees using extended victim-offender mediation

In the following article, I would like to give you a short personal account of the use of mediation in criminal justice with refugees. From 2013 to 2018, I was a mediator in Schleswig-Holstein for extended victim-offender mediation with adolescents (14–18 years) and young adults (up to 21 years of age). In this context, I worked on a number of cases of refugees as perpetrators as well as as victims — sometimes both perpetrator and victim were refugees.

- First, I will make clear the distinction between ordinary and extended victim-offender mediation.
- Then follows a case from my practice that sticks in my memory, because it illustrates both the strengths and also the difficulties in work with refugees.
- Lastly, I would like to run through the challenges and prospects which my understanding of extended victim-offender mediation as a criminal justice measure for refugees can offer.

Distinction between ordinary and extended victim-offender mediation

Extended victim-offender mediation is a type of extrajudicial conflict resolution using the assistance of an appointed mediator within criminal proceedings under the Youth Courts Law with adolescent or young adult offenders up to the age of 21.

Extended victim-offender mediation differs from classical victim-offender mediation in that, in addition to the perpetrator and the victim on both sides, supporters can also be involved in the mediation. Those can be family members, friends, neighbours and other persons whom the parties trust along with professionals, like family support workers, probation officers, court staff or the police (for example, where there are specific safety concerns). The decision on who else and how many people to involve in the victim-offender mediation lies with the participants jointly with the mediator in the pre-mediation meetings. This enables them to have support in equal proportions.

A goal of extended victim-offender mediation is to involve the community (in the shape of the supporting parties) more strongly in the processes leading to the criminal conflict resolution. A reason for this is the idea that a criminal act brings not only personal consequences and harm for those directly involved, but also harm in the immediate and wider environment of those involved. So both participation in extended

victim-offender mediation as well as bringing in supporters always remains voluntary. An advantage as much on the part of victims as on the part of perpetrators is that they need not come to the meeting on their own and throughout the whole process they experience support from people at their side. This consolidates the relationships of those involved with their environment and further develops the participation of the community/society. In addition, supporters can contribute to the finding of solutions and support the young people in complying with the agreement from the extended victim-offender mediation. The agreements can be varied and creative (e.g. financial compensation, personal gifts or community service).

After successful conclusion of an extended victim-offender mediation, the criminal proceedings can be abandoned or a reduced punishment can be obtained (see §§10, 45 & 47 German Youth Courts Law (JGG); §45a German Criminal Code (StGB)). An extended victim-offender mediation can always be deemed successful if one of the accused seriously and actively tries hard for a settlement and best of all an agreement with the victim is achieved which is satisfying for all the participants.³

A case example from practice: facts of the case

Two refugees from Afghanistan (one of them a young adult), who each belong to different tribes and therefore speak different languages, get into a fight at a hostel. The origin of the fight is a rather loud phone conversation, incidentally, a common reason for disagreement if a lot of people have to live together in a confined space. From an initial verbal altercation follows a physical one with injuries on both sides. A third resident calls the police.

Both parties share their side of the story and against both are charges of assault laid (§223 StGB) and against one of the participants a charge of aggravated assault (§224 StGB) since the cause of the injuries to one of the parties is suspected to be the use of a knife.

After referral by the prosecution to the mediation organisation and telephone contact with the parties, both decline taking part in extended victim-offender

mediation because they have already talked through it at a chance meeting. Also they have already thereby reached agreement and settled the conflict. By the standards of conventional, extrajudicial mediation (without any connection with criminal proceedings), there would have been no necessity for further work on the case as the parties saw no need for further clarification.

But after being informed that ongoing legal proceedings are pending⁴ and that extended victim-offender mediation is to be understood as an alternative and support (not as a replacement) for the legal proceedings, both parties now want, after information and an explanation of extended victim-offender mediation, to take part in meeting together in order to work on it to be able, if possible, to bring the continuing proceedings to a speedy end (abandonment) or at least to achieve a reduced punishment.

Preliminary discussion

To this end they both want separate one-to-one conversations with the mediator and to outline the facts of the case from their point of view. Not only does the language barrier hide difficulties in communication, but both parties outline the events quite differently. To achieve a conclusive discussion and clarification both now agree to a joint mediation meeting. It will be a further appointment with a volunteer supporter from the hostel and arranged in consultation with a professional interpreter.

Mediation meeting

With the help and in the company of the volunteer helper, who knows both parties and takes them in her car, they arrive at the agreed appointment. The interpreter is also present to overcome the language barriers. Both the accused maintain again that they have definitely agreed and tell their stories but as before very differently and without any real understanding.

The interpreter is legally sworn and therefore obliged to translate neutrally, something which however cannot be assessed on the part of the mediator. In the course of time it becomes a problem for the extended victim-offender mediation because one party

³*Editor's note:* All of this might seem self-evident for those of you who come from countries using conferencing models. In Germany, however, ordinary victim-offender mediation is by far the most common way to implement the ideas of Restorative Justice. In fact, in the German discussion, ordinary victim-offender mediation and Restorative Justice are oftentimes thought of as congruent which brings the danger of curtailing the breadth and diversity of Restorative Justice. Therefore, the extended version is special and important in the German context.

⁴Legal proceedings as part of public law, which follow a public criminal prosecution, involving extended victim-offender mediation with the participation of supporters, (in the public interest) should be completed.

supposes that the other is in an alliance with the interpreter. In addition, neither what the mediator says nor what the other party says is translated in a neutral way. Shortly before the escalation and breakdown of the discussion, thanks to the mediator the situation can be resolved as she openly stresses the centrality of the accusations, clarifies the values and goals of mediation for the interpreter and explains her role to her. It is most important that the work of the interpreter is consistent with the idea of facilitating respectful communication between the parties, whose assessments and decisions are at the centre of the process.

In further discussion, it becomes clear that the criminal proceedings, along with the conflict together with the injuries, is trivial for both. With the help of the mediator the shared experiences of both can be brought out, e.g. the flight from Afghanistan to Germany and their similar situation here. For both it is important to be able to save face. So pride and respect play a fundamental role in dealing with one another. An apology is for one of the parties to the conflict absolutely necessary. This at last is also achieved. After the apology, one of the accused talks about the suicide of his brother that had happened shortly before (confirmed by the volunteer helper). He starts to cry and it becomes clear that he is emotionally fragile. All parties react with sympathy and understanding. The feeling of being understood and accepted seems to help him and, after this outburst of emotions, he seems relaxed.

It is still impossible to decide whether during the altercation actually a knife was used or, because of his emotionally delicate situation, the injuries had been self-inflicted. After this exchange, in spite of their differences, an agreement was found and confirmed in writing how both want their life together in the hostel definitely to be organised in future. The volunteer supporter works with them at finding a solution and supports both participants equally. Finally, they make clear that they are happy about the participation in and the outcome of the extended victim-offender mediation.

Challenges and prospects for extended victim-offender mediation with refugees from the case example

My impression is that the offer of extended victim-offender mediation to work through the conflict in consultation with supporters in a joint and extrajudicial round of talks would be taken up willingly by

refugees as in the case set out above. Because sometimes a strong (family) bond seems to exist among refugees whereby also friends and neighbours are commonly looked on as members of the family and are included in quarrels, supporters could often be brought along happily.

It seems to me that the suggestion that people might want to resolve conflict in a joint dialogue together with family and friends — and not through a judicial process — is more obvious and familiar in many cultures than in German culture. In many cases there had already been attempts undertaken in advance (of mediation through a mediation organisation) to set up a discussion and achieve clarification. Sometimes people had already reached settlements on their own and struck compensation agreements.

Since in mediation in particular the focus is on the background to an offence in terms of both the origin of the conflict and the experiences, emotions and needs associated with it, joint communication in, at best, a common language or similar linguistic circumstances is important. An interpreter can neither translate the exact words nor the intended meaning directly. For this reason it can quickly come to misunderstandings. In addition, the reality that the mediator is not part of the exchange that an interpreter conveys in the discussion, indeed leads, and that the rhythm of the meeting is interrupted means that the parties cannot really speak with each other successfully. Here in my opinion lie the biggest challenges for mediation with refugees, which should not however exclude the process at the outset.

Besides this, a cultural understanding and interest, specifically, curiosity about the prevailing cultural institutions, can help the mediator and give the parties give a feeling of being taken seriously and make the mediation significant and meaningful for the parties.

In Germany, victim-offender mediation should be considered as well as worked towards at every stage in the process (§155a StPO) and it should be accessible to everyone without discrimination. For this, the necessary capabilities need to be extended on the one hand and on the other mediators need to work in reflective and resource sensitive ways and need to be able above all to adjust flexibly to the people with whom they are working. In this way, ordinary and extended victim-offender mediation as means of restorative justice can offer the opportunity to refugees of experiencing an alternative form from a straight-forward judicial criminal process with consequences (which for refugees with an uncertain right to stay can be considerable). Through mediation conflicts can be worked through more sustainably and medi-

ation can also be an effective and socially preventive measure.

Angela Nöthe
Social Pedagogue (B.A.)
Mediator (M.M.)
Mediator in Penal Matters
a.noethe@me.com

Women's rights and the MeToo movements and the public recognition of making restorative justice accessible as service for survivors of sexual violence

A discussion for International Women's Day 2020

Dr Marie Keenan is an internationally recognised expert in two very sensitive and extensively discussed justice related matters: the applications of restorative justice in cases of sexual violence, and child sexual abuse committed within the realm of the Catholic church. In this interview conducted on the occasion of the International Women's Day we focused on first mentioned area of her expertise. We were interested in how she thinks about women's rights and the MeToo movements and the public recognition of making restorative justice accessible as service for survivors of sexual violence.

Restorative justice must contribute to debate and consideration of the public/political dimension of these problem too.

When advocating for such a service, Dr Keenan often collaborates with Ailbhe Griffith a restorative justice advocate, who we also interviewed for the International Woman's Day. Both of them will be among the keynote speakers at our upcoming international conference in Sassari, which will be a good opportunity to listen to them in person and discuss questions evoked by their message.⁵

In your opinion can restorative justice help to restore the imbalance between women and men in society?

From my perspective restorative justice is not specifically about restoring balance in relationship between men and women — that is a much bigger social, economic, legal and political project. Restorative justice as I see it is more about empowering victims of crime when the crime has had the effect of disempowering them, irrespective of the gender of the victim or the offender.

What is your opinion about the women's rights movement bringing public attention to gender-based violence?

Without the women's movement I don't believe we would have any attention paid to the issue of gender-based violence. It is through the work of the feminist movement to begin with, rape crisis centres and domestic violence services and lobby groups with the help of investigative journalists and the media that we have gotten any attention for these crimes against women and children. Having said that in my area of expertise of sexual violence, domestic abuse and coercive control I am concerned about all victims of such crime irrespective of gender. We know from research and clinical practice that male children as well as female children experience the suffering and harm associated with child sexual abuse. In relation to adult rape and sexual violence and domestic abuse/coercive control while the majority of these crimes largely affect adult females and are perpetrated by adolescent or adult males, nonetheless we cannot ignore the male victims who suffer from the effects of these crimes too.

In restorative justice we tend to aim for bringing back the conflict to the people involved in it, focusing on the relational

⁵Please note that this article was written before the EFRJ announced the postponement of the 11th conference to the end of June 2021.

barriers among people and their own personal stories. Whereas the MeToo movement aims to bring personal cases to the public sphere and often draws generalised conclusions from them. Do you think there can be a common ground between these two seemingly contradictory purposes?

I will focus my answers here on sexual crime and domestic abuse or coercive control. These crimes are both private/personal and public/political and we must not lose sight of either dimension in my view. If we confine our attention to the personal /private sphere of these crimes and focus our attention only on the immediate people involved and their relational connections, the broader dimensions of culture, socialisation, inequality, injustice, and the gender dividend — all the factors that are part of the context in which these problems arise and are addressed — are not countenanced or considered sufficiently. However, if we focus only on the public and political aspects of these crimes then processes designed to help with individual healing, personal storytelling and personal empowerment are not given sufficient attention. Sexual and domestic violence and abuse are both private/personal and public/political and require attention at both levels. Victims of sexual and domestic violence and abuse have suffered for far too long from an approach that saw their problems as merely ‘private’ — nothing to do with ‘me.’ Restorative justice must not contribute to this thinking. The women’s movement moved these crimes from the private/personal sphere to the public/political one. Restorative justice must contribute to debate and consideration of the public/political dimension of these problem too. We are well placed to do this with our community emphasis. This part of our mission however needs further theoretical and clinical elaboration.

Research says that about 5% of cases of sexual violence reach the criminal justice system, often because such violence occurred within a relational context. In what way restorative justice can offer a different form of justice for those ones who do not wish to initiate a criminal justice procedure? How can those cases be identified and reached to offer a restorative justice programme?

A minority of sexual violence cases are reported [for a variety of reasons] and an even smaller number of cases result in a conviction. Internationally this prob-

lem is known for its high attrition rates. The reasons for this are multiple — wider than your suggestion of occurring within a relational context — and beyond the context of this short answer — but I would refer interested listeners and readers to the very comprehensive [Gillen Reports](#) conducted by Sir John Gillen in Northern Ireland on the factors involved in securing justice for victims of sexual crime. To get to the role of restorative justice in this I am certainly of the view that the time has come that we can no longer deny victims of sexual crime restorative justice, as an additional justice mechanism for them. I do not advocate restorative justice as an alternative to criminal justice unless for those victims who do not wish to go the criminal justice route – but as an additional justice mechanism for any victims who want it. We know of course for the majority of victims because of the high attrition rates involved in sexual crime, restorative justice were it to be available for victims might be the only justice they receive.



Dr Marie Keenan

A few points here however are very important to emphasise:

First, restorative justice following sexual violence must in my view be a victim-initiated process. We are very used in youth offending and other types of crime to working with offender-initiated restorative justice. Restorative justice following sexual or domestic violence and coercive control involves an entirely different lens: victim initiated rather than offender initiated or focused.

Second, while the dialogue aspect of restorative justice following sexual violence is often the key to empowering victims, and the focus on ‘Agreements’ less so in many cases, there may be a role for having ‘Agreements’ in place also in restorative justice cases that have not had a criminal justice outcome, and such agreements could include such considerations as the

offender going for therapy etc. [Project Restore](#) in New Zealand use such an approach effectively from what we can see.

It is common to characterise people who committed sexual abuses as monsters. Furthermore, one who attempts to talk about them in more subtle terms and tries to listen to their part of the story can be easily denounced as someone who does not respect the victims. How do you see this?

Dehumanisation makes no sense if we want to help individuals who have acted in an inhumane manner ...

Because of the impact of sexual crime perpetrators are often seen as monsters and spoken about in disrespectful terms. This vilifies them further and drives them underground. I understand completely the detestation of and revulsion for the harm that the perpetrator has inflicted. I also understand how this detestation and revulsion can become located at the personhood of the individual. However, my belief is that disrespect as an approach never works if we want to help people change from disrespectful to respectful ways of behaving and living; dehumanisation makes no sense if we want to help individuals who have acted in an inhumane manner to act in more respectful and sensitive ways to other human beings. Therefore while ‘discharging’ anger is understandable for the impact of such degradation and hurt as is inflicted on victims of sexual crime, adopting this as a ‘stance’ is not useful — actually it is unhelpful to the mission.

What were your main challenges you had to face when you first proposed the application of restorative justice in cases of serious harm, such as sexual violence?

Gaining social and professional acceptance for the idea continues to be a challenge. However, research and writing up the case examples is important here. This is why Ailbhe also devotes her precious time to this in helping other victims who are suffering to know of the existence of restorative justice and the possibilities of restorative justice to help them in the aftermath of sexual crime.

Do you see it becoming more accepted today?

Yes, slowly. We can no longer deny this service to victims and offenders. However, our job is to make the process as physically, procedurally and legally safe as humanly possible. The [2012 EU Victims’ Dir-](#)

[ective](#) has helped the case enormously too, as well as [Council of Europe recommendations](#), and research of course. However, more outcome research is necessary and we must continue to be in services in legislation in some cases, but with adequate statutory funding in the main.

Our job is to make the process as physically, procedurally and legally safe as humanly possible.

In your eyes, what would be required to make restorative justice more widely accessible in cases of serious harm?

In some cases legislation, political will; in all cases adequate statutory funding and service provision as a legitimate arm of state policy and service provision. Estelle Zinsstag and I found that where services close to us it is usually because of inadequate funding or key passionate individuals leaving to take up other employment. This situation thus tells us that for sustainability and longevity of service provision, services must be well embedded in the state’s repertoire of responses to sexual violence and not dependent on passionate individuals with inadequate funding who drive the process.

What do you aim to achieve by giving common presentations with Ailbhe Griffith? What is the impact of her presence on your message?

Ailbhe had such a good outcome from her restorative meeting, having had years of unnecessary suffering by being denied such a service, as have other men and women with whom I have been involved, we want to try to spread the message: restorative justice might have something to offer victims who would like this opportunity and it has something to offer offenders who want to do something honourable in the face of having done something so dishonourable to another human being. The job of facilitators is to let the victim decide, ask the offender if he is willing and make the process as safe as humanly possible.

Dr Marie Keenan

Lecturer, School of Social Policy, Social Work and Social Justice

University College Dublin

marie.keenan@ucd.ie

was interviewed by

Bálint Juhász

Training and Communications Officer

balint.juhasz@euforumrj.org

This interview first appeared in [The Restorative Blog](#).

A restorative approach to sexual violence and the #MeToo movement

Interview for the International Woman's Day 2020

Ailbhe Griffith advocates for restorative justice as an option for the survivors of sexual violence. She is a survivor of a sexual assault herself, and after being traumatised for years, she learnt about restorative justice as a possible approach to address her harm and decided to take part in a restorative process and confront her attacker, what she recalls as an 'utterly transformative' experience. Her journey did not end there. She started to collaborate with Dr Marie Keenan, who is an international expert of the field, in discussing restorative justice and sexual violence publicly. In 2018, she acted herself in Alan Gilson's film, *The Meeting*, which re-tells her story by focusing on the restorative encounter.

Ailbhe Griffith along with Marie Keenan will be keynote speakers on our upcoming conference in Sassari.⁶ On this International Women's Day we asked her about her perspective on restorative justice for survivors of sexual violence and about the MeToo movement.

You heard about restorative justice accidentally, several years after you were attacked and sexually assaulted. Can you recall how you learned about this option? And what made you think, this could be something for you?



Ailbhe Griffith

Restorative Justice was something I wanted before I even had the language or terminology to describe it. To summarise, I had spent several years occasionally talking about my desire to confront the man

who offended against me face-to-face. One particular day, one of my sisters said to me that what I was describing was a thing called 'Restorative Justice'.

I was shocked and surprised to hear it was a thing, that it had a name and that it was a process. She had heard about it because she was a student of Marie Keenan's and suggested I contact Marie to discuss what I was feeling. Marie and I met soon after. There began my restorative journey. Ultimately, I felt it was something I needed to attain closure from negative impacts of being a victim of crime. I felt I would achieve this because this need had grown organically over the years within my mind. I had tried all other methods I could think of to overcome the traumatic impact, but it was only within a face-to-face meeting I felt I could regain my power.

The application of restorative justice is often criticised in cases of sexual harm. One reason why it is disfavoured is that it is seen as giving an easy way for the offender to escape his deserved punishment. You met your offender after he spent years in prison. Was it easier for you to meet him after years have passed and knowing he already served his sentence?

I would only advocate for restorative justice after sexual violence as an additional mechanism of justice, not as an alternative to criminal justice. There are many reasons why I believe that this is important but one obvious reason is the protection of the public. If there is not a strong reason to dissuade individuals who sexually offend to repeat their offences, then I think risk increases. Having said that I personally am not convinced that a prison sentence has the power to rehabilitate, and that's where, from an offender

⁶Please note that this article was written before the EFRJ announced the postponement of the 11th conference to the end of June 2021.

perspective, I feel restorative justice may hold power. From a victim's perspective and in my particular case, I think I could have met him earlier than I did, had I been aware of restorative justice at that time. I believe these meetings can take place in prisons too, so I would have still been satisfied having the meeting when he was actively serving his sentence. Meeting him when he was out of prison was useful because I believe he had started to blend back into a normal enough life, so perhaps he was in a better place to engage in the meeting? One point I would like to add on this more generally is that it may be seen by some as 'giving an easy way out for the offender' but in many instances of sexual assault a criminal conviction is not achieved, due to the fact that there is no reporting of the crime, or else as a result of insufficient evidence. As Marie has said in the past, it may be the only form of justice available for these victims, and I agree.

Another reason why restorative justice is opposed in such cases that it could lead to re-victimisation. What would you respond to this? What measures have been taken to avoid re-victimisation in your case?

I acknowledge that is a big fear within the general population, but I would suggest that, with proper preparation of both victim and offender, the risk is greatly diminished. As Marie has often stressed, there is great importance in having facilitators who trained in the impact and dynamics of sexual violence, conduct these meetings too. The emotional charge and intensity of meetings in sexual violence cases, I believe, means that extra care should be taken in preparing the parties for as many foreseeable outcomes as possible. Ultimately, in my case there were a few general measures and other practical measures employed to avoid me being re-victimised again. Restorative Justice Services in Dublin did an excellent job in preparing me for the meeting by conducting many preparation meetings over the course of several months. During these meetings I would gain insight into what I may/may not expect from the offender should he choose to continue on into the face-to-face meeting. I found these meetings critical and very useful to avoid any sense of re-victimisation as I went into the meeting with my 'eyes wide open'. I was emotionally and psychologically prepared for it and most importantly I had a choice at all times on whether or not to proceed. Additionally, from a more practical perspective, the offender and I arrived at the building at different times. I did not see him arrive and vice versa. Similarly, he left after me. Finally, I was very

much part of the decision-making process when we were discussing how the room would be laid out on the day. I chose to have a table between us because I did still want a physical barrier, but I did want to sit directly opposite him so I could look at him directly in the eye. All of these types of subtle decisions are important and help reduce risk and minimise the potential for re-victimisation.

Based on your restorative justice experience, would you offer such a programme to other victims of sexual harm? Why? And what would be your arguments to encourage them to consider a restorative justice program?

It firmly ended my 'victim' identity that I believe I had created in my own mind and I think that is something I feel that can be common in survivors.

With absolute conviction I would recommend restorative justice to other victims of sexual crime. It must be something they want of course and it is not something that every victim will want and that must be acknowledged. However, I know that it is an incredibly powerful tool to help crime victims to overcome their trauma and experience healing and closure. For me it firmly ended my 'victim' identity that I believe I had created in my own mind and I think that is something I feel that can be common in survivors. This was because I found it totally empowering and changed how I perceived the man who had sexually and physically assaulted me. He was no longer the monster, but instead the human behind the behaviour. It was this that made me realise that it was and never will be my identity but an experience. By speaking openly about my experience of restorative justice and how it can be a way of finding healing and peace, I have always hoped to encourage victims who already feel that they may want to meet their offender to move forward with the process (as long as it's done in the right way).

You often tell about your participation in restorative justice together with Prof. Marie Keenan. How do you experience this collaboration?

As far as advocating for restorative justice in sexual violence cases, Marie and I seem to come as a pair and have done so right from the time we met in 2013. Our collaboration and friendship has grown organically over time. Advocating collaboratively for restorative justice was not something we necessarily

planned, but I think based upon my experience I simply couldn't resist the idea of communicating its benefit and its power to other crime victims. I believe for Marie, although I don't want to speak on her behalf, she has also seen first-hand how helpful it can be for victims who want it. I just feel fortunate to have met her.

Do you have any suggestions for practitioners (e.g. mediators, facilitators) to improve the way restorative justice is offered and delivered in cases of sexual harm?

My main suggestion for anyone facilitating cases of restorative justice in cases of sexual violence, beyond the excellent preparation and extra training that I discussed earlier, is to pay extra attention to ensuring the victim feels empowered in the process at all times. Sexually violent crime is highly intrusive and deeply disempowering. Within these meetings the victim will most likely be looking to rebalance that sense of disempowerment. I would suggest avoiding making any decisions on behalf of a victim or deciding what's best for them. For example, anticipating what they can or cannot handle and therefore whether the meeting should go ahead or not is not ideal. In these cases, more than most, I feel it is critical to let the victim decide as it is that that will help rebalance the power in their own minds.

You played yourself in a film re-enactment of your story, *The Meeting*. What were your motivations to undertake this role?

As I mentioned I am a passionate advocate for restorative justice. My motivation in sharing my story from the beginning was to highlight that there is a need to make this available for victims because I know from my own experience that some victims will want and need it. I had travelled with Marie, domestically and internationally attending different conferences and communicating this belief. However, when the opportunity to create a film based upon my experience came up, it struck me as an excellent way to really illustrate what it is all about. Talking about your experience is helpful, but actually showing people what took place really brings the point home in a powerful way. This is particularly true because the film had a really talented director; Alan Gilsean. Naturally I never anticipated a film would be made about it, nor did I expect to participate in the actual film beyond contributing to the script. However, it did take shape rather organically and I felt it was the right thing to do so that we could show its value. I am thrilled

to have brought it to many audiences already and I hope that we have helped, to some degree, to raise the profile of victim-initiated restorative justice in Ireland already.

Did the artistic creation have an impact on your relationship to your own story? If yes, how?

I think the main impact it had on my relationship to my own story is that I began to see it from a more objective viewpoint. It was incredibly interesting from that perspective because I suppose when you are living an experience in real time nothing that happens seems particularly dramatic at the time, albeit you may experience its intensity and profundity. It's when you look back, and in my case at the film, and see it more objectively you realise what an incredible thing it really was. It just makes me more appreciative of having experienced the gift of restorative justice.

I would love to see #restorativejustice in the same tweet as #MeToo much more often.

Did you share your story with a #MeToo hashtag? Or asking another way, do you think your story aligns with issue the MeToo movement aimed to raise awareness about?

Practically speaking, I never have shared my story with a #MeToo hashtag. However, I think I would love to see #restorativejustice in the same tweet as #MeToo much more often! When I think of the MeToo movement, I think it's wonderful that people now feel much more open to talk about their experiences of sexual assault and of the inadequacies of the CJS for victims of sexual violence, and of the need to empower those who have been disempowered. There was sense of righteous anger in the air and it was an amazing thing to see and it was the right time for it. However, following my restorative justice meeting, I had lost my sense of being disempowered and of being angry about my personal experience. It had evaporated. However, I believe we are at an evolutionary stage now where there is a need for something else to come in and fill the healing void. What I mean by that is that we're now beginning to acknowledge the levels of sexual violence that permeate our society, so not only do we need to find ways to hold people to account using the criminal justice system, we need to find ways to help heal people who have been harmed by it. It's going to take

a very long time, possibly generations, to make society violence-free zone, so in the meantime, finding mechanisms for healing are critical. I acknowledge there is no single solution for this, but I am absolutely certain that part of the solution is restorative justice. I believe restorative justice is evolving and becoming more mainstream and that soon many people will begin to see its full value to help close the void.

What would be your number one priority to advocate for to improve women's situation in society?

In many ways I am fortunate that I do not, in my general life, experience much gender-oriented discrimination or bias and in that way feel a little underqualified to answer the question. However, I do know there is a huge gap because many women are not in that situation. Rather than considering it from a women's rights perspective though, I tend to think about it from a gender equality perspective. The ultimate

goal should always be that women and men are treated fairly and equally within society and where this falls short we need to rebalance things. My own feeling is that the number one priority to improve women's situations in society across the globe is access to a full education, because in that there is freedom and independence. If you can think freely and earn enough money to survive, there is enormous freedom in that to help avoid women being trapped in situations where they are disempowered.

Ailbhe Griffith

Survivor of sexual violence
Advocate for Restorative Justice
was interviewed by

Bálint Juhász

Training and Communications Officer
balint.juhasz@euforumrj.org
This interview first appeared in [The Restorative Blog](#).

Mediation in criminal matters in the Republic of Kazakhstan

The article is dedicated to the application of mediation in criminal matters in Kazakhstan from the point of view of a practising mediator. It presents an analysis of the mediation applied at the pre-trial stage, as well as at the stage of enforcement of a criminal sentence imposed by a court.

The Law of Kazakhstan 'On Mediation' was adopted on January 28, 2011. Since its adoption criminal disputes (conflicts) have been included in its scope. Nevertheless, the potential of mediation as a restorative justice instrument was not assessed at the stage of developing this law that ultimately led to a limitation of its application in criminal proceedings.

The aim of this paper is to clarify the characteristic features of mediation in criminal proceedings in Kazakhstan, to analyse the existing problems of its application and to trace the prospects for the development of mediation in criminal matters in Kazakhstan.

History of restorative justice in Kazakhstan

The legal system of the Kazakh nation before the accession of Kazakhstan to Russia (until the 18th century) was based on an approach close to a restorative one. The relations between people were regulated primarily by common law — *adat*. The nomadic life of the Kazakh nation could not allow building jails. Thus, punishments related to compensation for

material damage as well as for harm to life, health, honour and dignity.

Where there were cases when an offender was not able to pay a fine imposed by a judge (*biy*), then his family or clan had to do it for him. In the nomadic society of the Kazakh nation, the unity of a family and of a clan played a crucial role because they had influence on the offender in terms of preventing him from committing offences. The worst punishment was the expulsion from a family or from a community.

The key justice institution in Kazakhstan during that period was the *Court of biys*. As was mentioned previously a *biy* was a judge, but it was not an official position; he was neither appointed nor chosen. Normally a *biy* was a person who knew common law very well and was known as a wise, honest and fair person. For the community of that period it was vitally important to maintain peace between clans and tribes. For that reason a *biy* tried to make a decision that was acceptable to all of the participants of a dispute or a decision that at least the majority would consider fair.

After the accession of Kazakhstan to Russia, the in-

stitution of *biys* continued to function for some time. However, after the establishment of the Russian legal system it disappeared completely.

While being a part of the Soviet Union a punitive criminal policy was formed in Kazakhstan. The attitudes of lay people formed by the Soviet propaganda as well as of those within the criminal justice system was based on the principle: 'A thief should be in prison.' Unfortunately such way of thinking still prevails in the legal system of Kazakhstan.

Mediation at the pre-trial stage

In 2010 'The Concept of the Legal Policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for the period of 2010–2020 regarding the Formation of an Optimal Model of Criminal Proceedings' was adopted. The priority directions of the criminal justice development were formulated as the humanisation of the criminal punishment and a reduction of the prison population. Thus, 'gradual introduction of the new institutions of restorative justice based on reconciliation of the parties and compensation for harm' was included into the text of the Concept.

In 2014 the new Criminal and Criminal Procedural Codes were adopted in Kazakhstan; they entered into force on January 1, 2015.

According to Article 8 of the Criminal Procedural Code the tasks of the criminal procedure are

- criminal offences prevention;
- impartial, swift and full solving and investigation of criminal cases;
- identification and prosecution of persons who committed them;
- fair trial and correct application of criminal law;
- protection of persons, society and state from criminal offences.

At the same time, taking into account the new governmental objective of the introduction of restorative justice into the criminal justice system, it would be appropriate to introduce responsibilities to the criminal procedure such as

- restoration of violated rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of citizens, state and legal entities,
- promotion of the peaceful settlement of disputes and

- the development of respect for law and justice.

Today the Criminal Code of Kazakhstan provides for exemption from criminal liability on the ground of reconciliation of the parties (Article 68).

The exemption conditions are as follows:

1. commission of a criminal offence, of a crime of a small or medium degree of gravity (that is an intentional crime, the maximum term of punishment for which does not exceed 5 years, or a negligent crime);
or
commission of a serious crime not related to causing death or serious harm to health for the first time by a special category of citizens (minors, pregnant women, women with young children, men raising children on their own, women over 58 years old, men over 60 years old);
2. full compensation of the damage caused and repairing the harm.

At the same time it should be noted that today the exemption on the ground of reconciliation of the parties is possible only if a person was not previously exempted from criminal liability for the same reason within the time limits for a conviction to become spent. This rule was introduced in December 2019, and entered into force on January 1, 2020 due to the fact that, with the adoption of the Criminal Code in 2014, repeated commission of crimes doubled from 15% to 35%.

The increase of recidivism could be connected with the expansion of the practice of exemption from criminal liability on the ground of reconciliation in the complete absence of a system of rehabilitation for persons who committed criminal offences.

The first problem of the mediation application at the pre-trial stage is the lack of awareness of the parties. When a crime is committed, only the criminal justice authorities know about it. As long as they are not bound by the task of restoring the violated rights that is not provided in the Criminal Procedural Code, they have no obligation to inform citizens about the possibility of reconciliation by taking part in mediation.

In addition, the work of the criminal justice authorities is assessed by particular quality indicators based on the number of cases transferred to a court to be resolved there, and, therefore, these bodies are not interested in the reconciliation of parties at the pre-trial stage.

The second problem refers to the procedural time limits. The time allowed for a preliminary investigation in Kazakhstan averages two months. Considering that, in order to exempt a person from criminal liability, a full compensation for damage is necessary, the time to restore the violated rights of a victim is clearly not enough if we are talking about the honest independent earnings of the accused. The criminal justice authorities, unfortunately, are interested only in the material compensation. Furthermore, when our agreements contained offenders' voluntary obligation to undergo treatment, the courts excluded this provision and asked us 'not to intervene in a sphere that is not regulated by law.'

This situation is a reason for possible perversions. In most cases, damage to victims is compensated by offenders' relatives (but not by a strong community or a clan that could influence an offender as it was earlier in the history of the nomadic people; unfortunately, family and family ties in Kazakhstan are nowadays not so strong), for example, by an offender's mother or grandmother. In this case, the offender does not take any responsibility at all.

Moreover, both victim and offender need further assistance in avoiding victimisation of the first and preventing a repeated commission of crime by the second. However, in Kazakhstan there is no such system. Even in a case of *de facto* compensation for damage there is no further restorative work with the parties to a conflict; that, of course, may lead to reoffending.

Mediation at the trial stage

It is in the court where parties to a conflict learn about mediation for the first time. The judge informs the parties about their right to mediation while enumerating all of the procedural rights of the parties. The mediation rooms in courts as well as mediators on duty in criminal courts largely contribute to that. Parties can agree to mediation at any moment in a trial until the judge retires to the deliberation room. The parties may also conclude a mediation agreement at the stage of appeal.

However, a number of problems arise even in this case.

The time limits remain an important problem. The average time for the case examination in a court is one month. Unlike in the civil proceedings, the conclusion of the mediation agreement does not constitute a ground to suspend the proceedings. This of course impedes compensation and practically excludes such

a form of compensation for damage as earning the necessary sum of money by a defendant.

Furthermore, the issue of compensation for damage to a victim is not the only subject of discussion in the framework of a mediation procedure.

A mediator together with the parties analyses the reasons for committing an offence, facilitates discussion on what is to be done to prevent such a situation in the future and works with the victim to avoid effects on the victim's behaviour and emotional well-being.

A main sticking point in the development of mediation in the criminal justice system of Kazakhstan turned out to be a misunderstanding of the scope of its application. Many criminal justice officers think that mediation can only be applied as a ground for exemption from criminal liability.

However, this is a misunderstanding. The Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Kazakhstan foresees that after reviewing a civil claim in a criminal case the court can take a decision to approve a settlement agreement or a mediation agreement and terminate the proceedings (para. 5 of Article 170).

The legal nature of criminal offences and civil claims arising from them is different: namely, civil law disputes arising from the fact of causing harm and damage by a criminal offence are not criminal disputes but civil ones. Therefore, in this case the application of mediation in a civil lawsuit filed during criminal proceedings is subject to civil procedural standards.

Thus, when resolving a civil lawsuit in a criminal case, mediation can be conducted regardless of the seriousness of the crime. Although, if this is a crime category to which Article 68 of the Criminal Code is not applicable, a mediation or an agreement cannot be considered as a ground for exemption from criminal liability on the ground of reconciliation.

At the same time, if in a civil suit in the framework of a serious crime or of a crime of minor or medium gravity, where a victim does not agree to reconcile, but the damage is compensated, a judge must take this fact into account as a mitigating circumstance.

Furthermore, when parties to a conflict come to a decision on compensation for damage according to an instalment plan and a relevant article of the Criminal Code contains a criminal sanction alternative to deprivation of liberty the court can approve such an agreement by imposing such an alternative sanction. In this case the offender is put on probation.

The court can impose obligations to fulfil the terms of a mediation agreement (to pay compensation) in the framework of probation. In the case of a failure

to fulfil these obligations, the court can replace a sanction by changing it to imprisonment. However, due to the punitive bias of the Kazakhstani justice, this practice is still available only in isolated cases and only in East Kazakhstan.

Here is a small example that demonstrates the rejection of restorative approaches by the punitive justice system. A theft from a residential building was committed. The total sum of money stolen was 260,000 tenge (approx. 617 euros). In the previous ten years a victim, Mrs O., had been robbed three times and the damages were never paid to her. On two previous occasions she filed claims for damages; the claims were not satisfied and the criminals were imprisoned. In prison there is no possibility of earning money; so the offenders could not make any compensation. After their release they avoided execution of the judgment at all costs and an opportunity legally to recover money from them was actually lost.

The mediators passed the papers to the defendant who was in the detention facility. Then he wrote a request asking for a professional mediator. Afterwards the mediator contacted the victim. It should be noted that the mediation could not be conducted in the detention facility and so the provisions of the agreement between the parties were elaborated individually with each of the parties. During the mediation procedure, the victim and the offender, Mr V., agreed that he would pay her 30,000 tenge (62 euros) of compensation per month. The offender presented a plan stating where and how he is going to earn this money. His employer was ready to provide assurances that he would hire him with a proper salary. The sanction of the article prohibiting theft provides for both restriction of liberty and imprisonment. The court accepted a mediation agreement, approved it but sentenced the offender to imprisonment practically depriving him of the opportunity to compensate the damage in accordance with the agreement. The interests of the victim who also requested the court to put the offender on probation obliging him to fulfil the terms of the agreement were ignored.

The victim was left without compensation for the third time while the offender could not use the possibility of rehabilitation.

Mediation at the stage of the criminal sentencing

As a general rule, parole in Kazakhstan applies to convicts in cases where they have paid in full a sum of a civil suit to an injured party.

However, the first paragraph of Part 1 of Article 72 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Kazakhstan provides for the right of a court to release a person serving a sentence (restraint or deprivation of liberty) after the actual serving of its terms if the court recognizes that for the offender's correction a full service of the imposed sentence is not necessary. This rule permits an application for conditional release without an obligatory full repayment of a sum claimed in a civil lawsuit.

In East Kazakhstan the practice of applying mediation before submitting applications for parole is currently developing.

Basically an offender asks a mediator to invite a victim to take part in mediation. During the mediation procedure, the mediator facilitates negotiations between the parties on execution of the court judgment on civil claims in the case of an offender's parole. The decision made by the parties is written down in the mediation agreement.

Moreover if according to an agreement the damage is compensated before the court decision on parole, the court is *obliged* to release an offender (para. 2, Part 1 of Article 72 of the Criminal Code). If in accordance with an agreement, there is an instalment plan for the compensation for damage a court *has the right* to release an offender by approving an agreement as the one concluded in the framework of execution of judgment upon civil claims. In this case an obligation to compensate for damage should be provided for in the decision on parole in the framework of probation. In a case of failure to fulfil this obligation parole may be cancelled.

For example, if victim and offender agree on compensation of 2,000,000 tenge (4,750 euros) when 1,000,000 tenge (2,375 euros) are transferred to a victim and consequently, a victim refuses the rest of the sum, then, in the absence of other malicious violations by offender, the court is obliged to release him on parole.

If victim and offender agreed that in a case of parole the offender pays 2,000,000 tenge dividing the sum by 50,000 tenge (119 euros) per month, the court has the right to release him, imposing obligations to compensate the damage in the framework of probation. In a case of failure to fulfil these obligations parole may be cancelled.

Similarly mediation is applied in cases of replacing a sanction with a milder form of criminal punishment.

Thus the aim of applying measures alternative to criminal punishment is achieved. Moreover, offenders are motivated to compensate for damages caused by a crime.

Reality poses new challenges before us. Mediators often not only facilitate the communication but also work on the implementation of the terms of agreements by the parties and on the rehabilitation of persons who have committed criminal offences. It is too early to declare that Kazakhstan has a restorative justice system, as well as to state that restorative mediation is extensively applied. However, we are taking the first steps, and not without success. The good news is that Kazakhstan is a pioneer in the use of mediation in the criminal matters, at least among the countries of Central Asia and the countries of the

Commonwealth of Independent States.

Aksana Kalenova

Professional mediator
Senior lecturer
Faculty of Economics and Law
Sarsen Amanzholov
East Kazakhstan State University
President
East Kazakhstan Centre for Mediation and Law
'Alternative'
aksana_kalenova@mail.ru

Calendar

Summer course 7–10 July 2020 Criminal Justice Platform Europe and EFRJ *Responses to sexual violence* Barcelona. More details from [EFRJ](#).

20th anniversary of the EFRJ 1–5 December 2020 Leuven, Belgium, including a Winter School, seminars and a RJ Art festival. More info will come soon.

EFRJ Conference June 2021 Conservatorio Luigi Canepa Sassari, Sassari, Sardinia, Italy. More information from [EFRJ](#).

Not an EFRJ member yet?

Join forces with other RJ professionals throughout Europe and beyond and sign up via [our website](#). (If you are a member but have not yet renewed for 2017, you can use the same link.) The process only takes five minutes. You can also email the [Secretariat](#) or use the address below.

As a member you will receive:

- three electronic newsletters a year
- regular electronic news with interesting information



Supported by the
Justice Programme
of the European Union

- reduced conference fees and special book prices
- the opportunity to publicise your book and/or advertise your event in the regular EFRJ Newsflash — contact [Bálint Juhász](#) opportunities to learn from, meet and work with RJ colleagues
- reduced subscription fee to *Restorative Justice: An international journal*
- and much, much more ...

Editorial Committee:

Publisher: EFRJ [Coordinator: Emanuela Biffi (Belgium), E-mail: emanuela.biffi@euforumrj.org]

Guest Editors: Kim Magiera and Olga Kisleva, E-mail: newsletter@euforumrj.org

Members: Claudia Christen-Schneider, Heidi Jokinen, Olga Kisleva, Kim Magiera, Branka Peurača, Nicola Preston, Silvia Randazzo, Diāna Ziedina, Robert Shaw

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

— EUROPEAN FORUM FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE VZW

Hooverplein 10, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

www.euforumrj.org

info@euforumrj.org

Tel. +32 (0)16.373.598

0474 656 137 • RPR Leuven

Mob. +32 (0)466.20.91.12