

Animalising restorative justice? At the crossroads of interspecies justice and non-violence

*¿Animalizar la justicia restaurativa?
En la encrucijada de la justicia
interespecies y la no violencia*

*Animalizar a justiça restaurativa?
Na encruzilhada da justiça
interespecífica e a não-violência*

Gema Varona Martínez

Director of the Basque Institute of Criminology (University of the Basque Country, Spain) and professor of Victimology and Criminal Policy at the Faculty of Law in San Sebastián, Spain. President of the World Society of Victimology, Chair of the working group on environmental justice of the European Forum for Restorative Justice (2023-2024), and member of the Basque Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters.

Ph.D. in Law, three-year Postgraduate studies in Criminology and International Master in Sociology of Law, she is the main researcher of the joint project with Spanish and foreign Universities (2021-2025), on restorative justice for environmental harms and harms against animals, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science (PID 2020-114005GB-I00, area Law). She has written on restorative justice, animal victimisation, political violence, sexual violence, gender violence, hate crimes and human rights. See her last publications at <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2794-2239>.

Contact: gemmamaria.varona@ehu.es

Data de envio: 03.05.2025

Data de aceite: 23.07.2025

Animalising restorative justice? At the crossroads of interspecies justice and non-violence

¿Animalizar la justicia restaurativa? En la encrucijada de la justicia interespecies y la no violencia

Animalizar a justiça restaurativa? Na encruzilhada da justiça interespecífica e a não-violência

Summary. Introduction, 1. Integrating environmental and animal claims in the restorative field, 2. The need to revise values, principles, terminology and dynamics, Concluding in a never-ending upside down cultural movement.

ABSTRACT

Within the theoretical framework of green victimology and considering previous and ongoing empirical research, this analytical contribution offers a critical look at restorative justice to propose the need to rethink its values, principles, terminology and dynamics to address, in particular, the harms to non-human animals in all its diversity. After a section on the difficulties of integrating environmental and animal claims in the field of restorative justice, a general proposal of revising threshold concepts and processes will be presented. Finally, some conclusions will be driven in relation to the need of a cultural movement that supports an ecological and animal understanding of law.

Keywords: restorative justice, interspecies justice, more-than-humans, non-violence, sensory criminology, cultural criminology.

RESUMO

Dentro do marco teórico da vitimologia verde e considerando pesquisas empíricas anteriores e em andamento, esta contribuição analítica oferece uma abordagem crítica à justiça restaurativa, propondo a necessidade de repensar seus valores, princípios, terminologia e dinâmicas para abordar, em particular, os danos aos animais não humanos em toda a sua diversidade. Após uma seção sobre as dificuldades de integrar as reivindicações ambientais e animais no campo da justiça restaurativa, será apresentada uma proposta geral de revisão dos conceitos e processos limiaries. Por fim, serão indicadas algumas conclusões relacionadas à necessidade de um movimento cultural que apoie uma compreensão ecológica e animal do direito.

Palavras-chave: justiça restaurativa, justiça interespecífica, mais-que-humanos, não-violência, criminologia sensorial, criminologia cultural

RESUMEN

Dentro del marco teórico de la victimología verde y considerando investigaciones empíricas previas y en curso, esta contribución analítica ofrece una mirada crítica a la justicia restaurativa para proponer la necesidad de repensar sus valores, principios, terminología y dinámicas para abordar, en particular, los daños a los animales no humanos en toda su diversidad. Tras un apartado sobre las dificultades de integrar las reivindicaciones ambientales y animales en el ámbito de la justicia restaurativa, se presentará una propuesta general de revisión de los conceptos y procesos umbrales. Finalmente, se indicarán algunas conclusiones en relación con la necesidad de un movimiento cultural que apoye una comprensión ecológica y animal del derecho.

Palabras clave: justicia restaurativa, justicia interespecies, más-que-humanos, no-violencia, criminología sensorial, criminología cultural

RÉSUMÉ

Dans le cadre théorique de la victimologie verte et en tenant compte des recherches empiriques antérieures et en cours, cette contribution analytique propose une approche critique de la justice restaurative pour souligner la nécessité de repenser ses valeurs, principes, terminologie et dynamiques afin d'aborder, en particulier, les préjudices causés aux animaux non humains dans toute leur diversité. Après une section consacrée aux difficultés d'intégration des revendications environnementales et animales dans le champ de la justice restaurative, une proposition générale de révision des concepts et processus sera présentée. Enfin, quelques conclusions seront tirées sur la nécessité d'un mouvement culturel soutenant une compréhension écologique et animale du droit.

Mots-clés: justice restaurative, justice interespecies, plus-que-humains, non-violence, criminologie sensorielle, criminologie culturelle.

RIASSUNTO

Nell'ambito teorico della vittimologia verde e considerando le ricerche empiriche precedenti e in corso, questo contributo analitico propone un approccio critico alla giustizia riparativa, sottolineando la necessità di ripensarne i valori, i principi, la terminologia e le dinamiche per affrontare, in particolare, i danni agli animali non umani nella loro diversità. Dopo una sezione dedicata alle difficoltà di integrare le rivendicazioni ambientali e animali nell'ambito della giustizia riparativa, verrà presentata una proposta generale di revisione dei concetti e dei processi fondamentali. Infine, saranno indicate alcune conclusioni sulla necessità di un movimento culturale che supporti una comprensione ecologica e animale del diritto.

Parole chiave: giustizia riparativa, giustizia interspecie, più-che-umani, non-violenza, criminologia sensoriale, criminologia culturale .

Introduction

Green criminology and victimology have highlighted the invisibility and magnitude of the harms caused to living beings and ecosystems, not always considered as crimes, with ‘difficult’ victims, of different species, including non-human¹. These harms affect present and future individuals and collectives, sometimes transnationally. In addition, double standards and a lack of responsibility by states and corporations are commonly found in this sort of victimisation at the crossroads of human rights, environmental protection and animal welfare. Nowadays these three issues can be considered public matters in growing tension with economic interests and ways of life that, originating particularly in the Global North, end up having an unequal impact on the entire planet².

Drawing from some results of the research project *Restorative justice for crimes against the environment and against animals: Design of prevention, intervention and reparation programs within a globalised framework*, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (2021-2025), and developed at the Basque Institute of Criminology (University of the Basque Country, Spain), this paper will argue that some threshold concepts in restorative justice need to be rethought from a more-than-human perspective³ and, in particular, a non-human animal perspective⁴. Changing points of view, not only lenses⁵, allows to question some assumptions in classical restorative justice literature and, at the same time, favours the entrance of new stakeholders, vocabularies, ways of communication, practices and policies to transform conditions that lead to harm, including law and legal cultures.

1. Integrating environmental and animal claims in the restorative field

In binding legal documents restorative justice is defined as ‘any process whereby the victim and the offender are enabled, if they freely consent, to participate actively in the resolution of matters arising from the criminal offence through the help of an impartial third party’⁶. Restorative justice means an inclusive approach to crime or harm, based on free and engaged dialogue and reparation, where facilitators intervene in a complex conversation or encounter to repair the harms produced, rather than focusing on punishment or retribution. This requires putting into action principles of voluntary participation based on informed consent; authentic communication, and processes tailored to the needs, capacities and culture of the participants

through a facilitation of direct or indirect, non-judgmental and multi-partial encounters, with honest and confidential dialogue and implementation and monitoring of agreed actions. Specifically, environmental restorative justice aims to apply restorative processes in criminal and social conflicts related to environmental harm.

The ecological turn observed in different sciences, humanities and art⁷ has also reached environmental restorative justice⁸. However, the question or cause of animals⁹ is usually held to be secondary or less relevant in restorative justice literature. There are not many studies talking of “animal” or “more-than-human” restorative justice. We can explain this lack of relevance in the restorative field, first, because mediation and negotiation have existed in the field of environmental law since the 1980s, but not ‘animal mediation’. Second, within green criminology, there is a common understanding to think of the “environment” as including animals. However, that understanding does not fully comprehend the great diversity of species and individuals, including the so-called companion or domestic animals or stray animals, for example. Third, the claims of environmentalists and animal rights defenders have only recently come to some common action in relation to climate change because there is no planet B for any living being.

Moreover, after the COVID-19 pandemic, the World Health Organisation emphasised the idea of One Health¹⁰, signifying the need for interconnection and interdependence of all living beings within the notions of planetary boundaries¹¹, but without questioning human supremacy.

In relation to restorative justice, according to Tepper¹², we might aim at ‘raising awareness of edge spaces—the sidelines or margins beyond the locus of mainstream activities where human and non-human lives intersect—and their relationship with the centre, understood here as the dominant narratives, systems of governance and management paradigms. Central to addressing complex and uncertain socio-ecological and multispecies issues, this simple yet powerful heuristic resonates deeply across many fields including anti-racism, feminism/ecofeminism, postcolonialism, urbanisation studies, and environmental justice’.

Thus, restorative justice can deal with the prevention, intervention and reparation of many kinds of coexistence conflicts. The results of evaluations on the processes and impacts of restorative justice in many countries¹³, including its application to the most serious ones, such as ecocide¹⁴, indicate that restorative justice does not function worse than ordinary justice, and usually in a complementary way. Despite risks of excessive institutionalisation

tion, it allows the entry of alternative visions that enable more open ways, beyond legal language, to express the meaning of harm and justice, through an individual and social prism¹⁵. In relation to this, a fundamental issue in restorative justice is the participation of the closest and most affected community, in a glocalised sense (meaning global impacts in local communities), with a horizontal and respectful perspective. Restorative justice promises a tailored approach where more-than-humans can be considered victims or harmed ones¹⁶, even if the law does not grant them rights or voice in an ordinary judicial process where healing the relationships is not the aim.

The possibility of animals to be considered as victims goes beyond the debate of animals' rights¹⁷ or their legal personhood¹⁸. According to the Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature¹⁹, rather than treating nature/animals as property defined as such by law, the rights of nature recognise that different life forms have the right to exist, persist, maintain and regenerate their life cycles and humans should respect and enforce those rights. Although not using the term rights and making distinctions among animals, as well as exceptions, the EU recognises five freedoms in relation to animal welfare (freedom from hunger and thirst; from discomfort; from pain, injury and disease; from fear and distress; and freedom to express normal behavior). Also, when the Lisbon Treaty came into force in 2009 it amended the Treaty on the functioning of the European Union and introduced the recognition that animals are sentient beings. Thus, Article 13 of title II states that: 'in formulating and implementing the union's agriculture, fisheries, transport, internal market, research and technological development and space policies, the union and the member states shall, since animals are sentient beings, pay full regard to the welfare requirements of animals, while respecting the legislative or administrative provisions and customs of the EU countries relating in particular to religious rites, cultural traditions and regional heritage'²⁰.

This debate on rights and legal personhood has been criticised for adopting a Western anthropocentric view on animals and nature as rights holders and also by bringing more punitiveness if the violation of rights (relationships) is only responded to with punishment. By contrast, restorative justice could offer a more interdependent notion of relationships and not just legal entities or holders of rights competing in a more 'civilised' legal case.

Moreover, beyond criminal law, restorative justice can work with cases subject to statutes of limitations or cases where no responsible person has been brought to trial. The idea is that injustice can be answered with reparation holding individuals, communities, governments or corporations accountable. In the end, restorative justice works with the possibility of res-

ponding to harm with non-impunity and non-punitiveness. However, this is a very difficult balance because asymmetries of power do exist and, usually, many activists and public opinion in general tend to think that the problem with animal harm is mainly a problem of lack of sufficient criminal law and criminal law agency intervention. Linked to that, perceptions that restorative justice might mean banalisation and privatisation of animal harm might appear. However, as with other kinds of crime, there is no clear evidence that the increasing use of more punitive criminal law has brought less crime against animals or that punishing offenders prevents further victimisation. On the contrary, there is some evidence that criminal law might cause further harm to excluded humans and vulnerable animals²¹. Again, the greatest limitation of restorative justice is also its greatest potential: voluntariness, even though there might be some constraints in the legal system. Although we need more research to assess the way restorative justice works in harm against animals, with all their diversity, there is no apparent reason to state that restorative justice might work worse in animal harm than in cases, for example, of terrorism or genocide. However, as will be mentioned below, it should not be assumed that just any facilitator can understand what is at stake beyond interpersonal victimisation.

2. The need to revise values, principles, terminology and dynamics

Restorative justice has to learn from animal studies, including animal law, but not exclusively from it. This is what is called in this chapter the need for animalising restorative justice. However, talking of ‘animal restorative justice’ or ‘animalising’ restorative justice seems a provocation for many restorative justice experts. If restorative justice is about a civilization process and humanising relationships, then how to include non-human relationships?²² In animal law studies and human-animal studies, we have long become used to this criticism: banalising human suffering and downgrading restorative justice if focused on animals. However, taking animals’ suffering and needs seriously is probably one of the most urgent tasks we have to create a more empathetic world and to develop transformative practices for all. Restorative justice involves the community transcending privatisation and interpersonal relationships to tackle structural and cultural violence, but that community is mostly thought of as a human community. In this sense, green sensory criminology²³ and the notion of interspecies justice²⁴, also informed by decolonial and indigenous epistemologies²⁵ are pushing for a more reflexive and critical anthropocentrism²⁶ that can be related to an adaptation of non-violence literature in this field from the cultural and

structural understanding of positive peace by Lederach and Galtung to the human non-violent communication involved in Rosenberg²⁷. These might be entry points for understanding different ways of intelligence, learning, healing, consciousness, sentience and communication, beyond human supremacy²⁸, without rejecting the reality of conflicts and tensions in needs, rights and ways of living.

Restorative justice has to learn from interspecies justice to respond to conflicts of animal-human coexistence. Sophie Chao and Danielle Celermajer define multi-or interspecies justice as that which includes the interests of non-humans, such as other animals, plants, forests, rivers and ecological systems, which implies a moral and political obligation for political, legal, judicial and educational systems to take these interests into account when making decisions involving different perspectives on truth²⁹.

Beyond coexistence, and revising existentialism, starting from Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*, which implies accepting the materiality of our condition and the link between contingency and freedom, as well as the indeterminacy of meaning and responsibility, philosopher Corine Pelluchon shows that ecology requires enriching this vision of existentialism³⁰. In her view, ecological existentialism is not reducible to coexistentialism, which simply certifies the evidence of our belonging to a community of living beings. According to her, ecological existentialism implies breaking with the terrestrial imaginary and thinking of the human being from the perspective of the sea and all its inhabitants, as part of a liquid ontology, which breaks the territorial obsession behind the contradictions of the international law of the sea, divided between the imperative of preserving an ecosystem essential to our survival and the economic and military rivalries that lead to its overexploitation, sometimes linked to nationalist conceptions usually connected more to a land territory. Against any idea of rootedness and identity politics, a phenomenology of marine life emphasises the fluidity of the self and conceives our immersion in the common world, which refers to memory and immemoriality, to the mother sea conceived in its precedence over the land, according to this author. These ideas allow us to connect current oceanographic perspectives with some epistemology and indigenous knowledge.

This is an example on how restorative justice has to question law as *ius puniendi* of the nation state that has fostered exclusion and has to expand its vocabulary in this area in relation to some of its central notions, for example, non-violent communication, voice, dialogue, listening or empathy have to be thought also in terms of relationships with non-human animals beyond identities. The same applies for the words inclusion, connection, humani-

ty, agency, needs, and rights. In particular, facilitators have to reflect about their own anthropocentrism and the meaning of voluntariness, participation, commitment, confidentiality, safe space, safe relationships, reparation, recovery, restoration, forgiveness, justice, healing, learning or well-being. At the same time, they need to broaden their values towards a vision of ecological ethics, with justice and accountability being fundamental. However, the values of respect for human dignity, solidarity, responsibility towards others, and truth through dialogue are insufficient if they only refer to human beings.

To rethink all this, restorative justice has to go to other forums to learn and dialogue with different guardians, representatives, professions and sciences: from philosophy and ethical studies to law and natural science, and including non-scientific knowledge such as art. There is much to learn from rural communities and also human-animal studies, including, in particular, critical animal studies, to question the human centric focus in all disciplines and draw attention to the myriad of interspecies contexts and (more or less conflictual) human-nonhuman encounters, studied in different fields of knowledge.

With that learning, for every case where restorative justice can be applied, from cruelty to companion animals to wildlife illegal trade, among others, facilitators have to reflect on some of the following questions from that reflexive standpoint and try to craft meaningful encounters in meaningful spaces beyond courtrooms.

1. What are the harms that need to be addressed?
2. How would a restorative process be initiated (linked to the criminal justice system or not)?
3. What sensitivities/capacities/qualities would the (co)facilitator(s) need?
4. How can risks be minimised?
5. What kind of encounter could take place, where and when?
6. What stories, sounds, voices, images, silences, experiences, smell, textures etc. can be perceived?
7. What kind of reparations could be made?
8. Who and how should they be involved in the follow-up?
9. What happens if the agreement is not fulfilled? Is there any valuable learning out of the process? How to proceed restoratively?

Concluding in a never-ending upside down cultural movement

Instead of falling into a legal escapism versus legal skepticism binary, we need a deeper ecological and animal turn in social life, law³¹ and restorative justice. Specifically, law can help us to advance in rights and wellbeing, but it also brings the costs of the hegemony of Western visions, ignorant of the grammar of animacy that might be present in other cultures. Paraphrasing Robin Wall Kimmerer³², a wider animal consciousness requires appreciation and celebration of interconnection in order to avoid harmful responses to conflicts of coexistence³³. To engage young human generations as stakeholders, we also need to connect with them and we need to include animal studies in basic, higher and informal education. At the same time, we need to nurture a restorative justice culture with real access to qualified and well trained facilitators.

Trying to find justice for animal harm in the criminal justice system is a wild goose chase. Restorative justice might be a dark horse, surprisingly achieving more good than bad. It might be a platform to experience radical otherness, learn and think with animals from a reflexive anthropocentrism and an embodied knowledge. Segarra³⁴ proposes moving from an ethics based on similarity (human exceptionalism) to an ethics based on difference, sometimes immense difference, to arrive at an ethics of relationality and responsiveness, from a shared vulnerability: the child we were, the animal we are. Responsivity is defined by her as the capacity to respond to the call of the other. An other that can call out in another language or with silence to allow an encounter or connection, even from the impenetrability of the animal other, but also from the sharing of the world or “a phreatic layer of the sensitive”, in J.C. Bailly’s words, where humans construct beautiful and atrocious mental representations, separated from reality, to try to make sense of the world³⁵. Restorative justice is one of them and originated from the concern of not provoking more real harm.

Acknowledgements

This article has benefited from the financial support for the project *Restorative justice for crimes against the environment and against animals: Design of prevention, intervention and reparation programs within a globalised framework*, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (2020 Call I+D+i Projects, PID2020-114005GB-I00. Area: Law) (2021-2025).

Notes

1. Gema Varona Martínez (ed.), (Dykinson 2025); Rob White '**Green Victimology and Non-Human Victims**' (2018) 24(2) *International Review of Victimology* 239.
2. Ascensión García, Nigel South and Gema Varona Martínez '**An Increasingly Warmer, Unfairly Structured and Environmentally Interdependent Planet**' (2024) 09-09 *Revista Electrónica de Criminología*, <<https://www.revista-e-criminologia.net/copia-de-numero-actual-2>> accessed 19 November 2024
3. David Abram, an ecophilosopher and cultural ecologist, coined the phrase 'the more-than-human world' in 1996 in his book **Spell of the Sensuous. Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World**. (Pantheon books 1996), as explained in César Rodríguez-Garavito (ed) **MORE Than Human Rights: An Ecology of Law, Thought, and Narrative for Earthly Flourishing** (NYU 2024). See also Catherine Price and Sophie Chao '**Multispecies, More-Than-Human, Nonhuman, Other-Than-Human: Reimagining Idioms of Animacy in an Age of Planetary Unmaking**' *Exchanges* (2023) 10.2 *The Interdisciplinary Research Journal* (2023). <<https://exchanges.warwick.ac.uk/index.php/exchanges/article/view/1166>> accessed 28 December 2024
4. If not specified, in this article the term 'animal' means non-human animal.
5. Harold Zehr **Changing Lenses: A New Focus for Crime and Justice** (Herald Press 1990). See also Joanna S. Brebner, Maria Loconsole, Daniel Hanley and Vera Vasas '**Through An Animal's Eye: The Implications of Diverse Sensory Systems in Scientific Experimentation**' (2024) *Proceedings of the Royal Society* <<https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/full/10.1098/rspb.2024.0022>> accessed 30 December 2024.
6. Article 2 d) Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of October 2012 establishing minimum standards on the rights, support and protection of victims of crime, and replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA [2012] L 315/57, Art 2 d). See also references to restorative justice in the preamble of this Directive and its Article 12. See in other jurisdictions, Lacey Levitt, David B. Rosengard and Jessica Rubin (eds), *Animals as Crime Victims* (Edward Elgar 2024).
7. César Rodríguez-Garavito '**More Than Human Rights: What Can we Learn from Trees, Animals, and Fungi?**' (Open Global Rights, 28 October 2022) <<https://www.openglobalrights.org/more-than-human-rights-trees-animals-fungi/>> accessed 19 November 2024.
8. After an international seminar in 2019, the working group on environmental restorative justice (ERJ) was created in 2020 within the **European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ)** <<https://www.euforumrj.org/working-group-environmental-restorative-justice>> accessed 20 November 2024. Some members

contributed to the book by Miranda Forsyth, Felicity Tepper & Brunilda Pali (eds), **The Palgrave Handbook of Environmental Restorative Justice** (Springer International Publishing 2022). The EFRJ ERJ working group edited a *Practice Guide* in 2025.

9. Iyan Ofor and Antonio Cardesa-Salzmann ‘**Multispecies Lawscapes in the Anthropocene: Priorities for a Critical, Constitutional Turn in Climate Change and Biodiversity Law**’. In: Richard Caddell and Phillipa McCormack (eds), *Research Handbook on Climate Change and Biodiversity Law* (Edward Elgar Publishing 2024).
10. Laura Reese, Laura A. ‘**Community Factors and Animal Shelter Outcomes**’ (2022) 27(1) *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science* 105
11. Daniel W. O’Neill, Andrew L. Fanning, William F. Lamb, and Julia K. Steinberger ‘**A Good Life for all within Planetary Boundaries**’ (2018) 1(2) *Nature Sustainability* 88.
12. Felicity Tepper ‘**Amplifying Edge-Awareness: Socio-Ecological Restorative Approaches to Human-Wildlife Coexistence**’. In: Gema Varona Martínez (ed), *Criminología verde: Alternativas a la impunidad y al punitivismo frente a los daños bio-socio-ecológicos/Green Criminology: Alternatives to Impunity and Punitivism Facing Bio-Social-Ecological Harms* (Dykinson 2025), 1
13. See United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime **Handbook on Restorative Justice Programmes**, 2nd edition (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 2020), where, despite its front cover, there is no mention of cases in relation to animals or the environment, although chapter 6 is dedicated to serious crimes.
14. Ecocide means any unlawful or arbitrary act committed in the knowledge that there is a substantial likelihood that it will cause serious damage that is widespread or long-lasting to the environment, Group of Independent Experts for the Legal Definition of Ecocide, June 2021. See also at <https://stopecocidio.org/definicion-legal-del-ecocidio>. As such, ecocide, beyond the proposal for its inclusion as international crime, has been included in several criminal codes, like the Belgian one. On animals, see Piers Beirne, ‘Theriodicide: Naming Animal Killing’ (2014) 3(2) *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 49; Kai Horsthemke, The Dreaded Comparison: Genocide and Theriodicide in (2024) Wendy A Wiseman and Burak Kesgin (eds), *Lost Kingdom: Animal Death in the Anthropocene*, 31; Marina Lostal De-objectifying Animals: Could they Qualify as Victims before the International Criminal Court? (2021) *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 1
15. John Braithwaite ‘**Evidence for restorative justice**’ (2014) 40.2 *Vermont Bar Journal* 18. In any case, there are many aspects to be researched within general restorative justice and, in particular, its application to this field. See, for example, William R. Wood and Masahiro Suzuki, ‘Getting to Accountability in Restorati-

ve Justice' (2024) 19(7) *Victims & Offenders*, 19(7) 1400.

16. On agency, capability and political duties of humans, see the different perspectives. In: Sue Donaldson and Will Kymlicka *Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights* (Oxford University Press 2011); and Martha Nussbaum *Justice for Animals: Our Collective Responsibility* (Simon and Schuster 2023).
17. For a panoramic analysis of animal law in twenty-six countries and in the European Union law, see Federico Dalpane and Maria Baideldinova (eds) *Animal Law Worldwide. Key Issues and Main Trends Across 27 Jurisdictions* (Springer 2024). See also Y Epstein and E Bernet Kempers 'Animals and Nature as Rights Holders in the European Union' 86 *Mod Law Rev.* 1336; M Montes Franceschini 'Traditional Conceptions of the Legal Person and Nonhuman Animals' (2022) 12 *Animals* 2590 and J Bolliger 'On the Rights of Sentient Beings: The Case for Expanding Due Process of Law to Non-Human Animals' (2024) 50(1) *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*, 6; Challie Facemire and Clayton Kinsey 'Animals in the Courtroom', (2024) 32 *J. L. & Pol'y* 1.
18. In 2024, Indigenous leaders of New Zealand, Tahiti and the Cook Islands signed a treaty (He Whakaputanga Moana) that recognises whales and dolphins as legal persons, although its legal impact is uncertain, also in relation to responses beyond punishment. For many Indigenous groups across Polynesia, whales hold an ancient sacredness and spirit that connects all life. See 'Groundbreaking Whale Rights Law Inspired By Māori King's Legacy To Be Unveiled In London' (2024) <<https://pacific.scoop.co.nz/2024/11/groundbreaking-whale-rights-law-inspired-by-maori-kings-legacy-to-be-unveiled-in-london/>> accessed November 21 2024.
19. Global Alliance for the Rights of Nature (w.d.) <<https://www.garn.org/rights-of-nature/>> accessed 30 December 2024.
20. See *Executief van de Moslims van België and Others v. Belgium* ECHR 2024 (<https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/fre?i=002-14289>).
21. Gema Varona Martínez (2023); Kelly Struthers Montford, Darren Chang and Selingul Yalcin 'Anti-Carceral Approaches to Addressing Harms Against Animals: Considerations on Multispecies Restorative and Transformative Justice' (2024) *Law & Social Inquiry*, 1; Asamblea Antiespecista de Madrid and María José Bernuz ¿Puede la cárcel defender a los animales? (Ochodoscuatro ediciones 2023); Justin Marceau and Lori Gruen (eds), *Carceral Logics: Human Incarceration and Animal Captivity* (Cambridge University Press 2022).
22. John Pratt 'Norbert Elias, The Civilizing Process and Penal Development in Modern Society' (2011) 59(1_suppl). *The Sociological Review*, 220; D J Cornwell, J Blad y M Wright (eds), *Civilising Criminal Justice: An International Restorative Agenda for Penal Reform* (Waterside Press 2013); Grazia Mannozi Towards a 'Humanism of Justice' through Restorative Justice: A Dialogue with History'

- (2017) 5(2) *Restorative Justice* 145; G Maxwell and A Morris '**Meeting Human Needs: The Potential of Restorative Justice**'. In: *Justice as a basic human need* (NOVA 2006); T Opie y L. M. Roberts '**Do Black Lives Really Matter in the Workplace? Restorative Justice as a Means to Reclaim Humanity. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion**' (2017) 36(8) *Restorative Justice: An International Journal* 707; Jo Wailling, Allison Kooijman, Joanne Hughes y Jane K O'Hara '**Humanizing Harm: Using a Restorative Approach to Heal and Learn from Adverse Events**' (2022) 25(4) *Health Expectations* 1192
23. Lorenzo Natali '**The Social Perception of Environmental Victimization. A Visual and Sensory Methodological Proposal**' (2024) 81(5) *Crime, Law and Social Change* 561
24. Marta Segarra *Humanimales. Abrir las fronteras de lo humano* (Galaxia Gutenberg 2022). In relation to interspecies justice, see Russil Durrant '**Animal Ethics and Species Justice: Our Direct Justice Obligations Towards Invertebrates**'. In: *Invertebrate Justice: Extending The Boundaries of Non-Speciesist Green Criminology* (Springer Nature Switzerland 2024). See also Ragnhild A Sollund and Martine S B Lie (eds), *Criminal Justice, Wildlife Conservation and Animal Rights in the Anthropocene* (Bristol University Press 2024).
25. Mihnea Tănăsescu '**Rights of nature, legal personality, and indigenous philosophies**' (2020) 9(3) *Transnational Environmental Law* 429
26. Delphi Carstens and Evelin Geerts 'Donna J. Haraway's. **Ecofeminism Revisited: Critical New Materialist Pedagogies for Anthropocenic Crisis Times**' (2024) *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education* 40; Rachel Yerbury 'Reconceptualizing Human-Wildlife Interaction Places and Bonds through Ecopsychology: Healthy Reciprocal Relationships' (2024) 12(1) *Human-Animal Interactions*
27. Michael Allen Fox **Understanding Peace. A Comprehensive Introduction** (Routledge 2013)
28. Doris Schneeberger '**Historic and Current Discussions About Nonhuman Animal Rights: Welfarism vs. Abolitionism, Utilitarianism, Deontological Positions, Feminist Animal Ethics, and the Political Turn**'. In: *Envisioning a Better Future for Nonhuman Animals: Towards Future Animal Rights Declarations* (Springer Nature Switzerland 2024)
29. Sophie Chao and Danielle Celermajer '**Introduction: multispecies justice**' (2023) 19.1 *Cultural Politics* 1
30. Corine Pelluchon **L'être et la mer: Pour un existentialisme écologique** (PUF 2024)
31. Marta Giménez-Candela and Raffaella Cersosimo **La enseñanza del derecho**

animal (Tirant 2021). See also Tiago Fensterseifer and José Rubens Morato Leite ‘**Towards Ecological Law? Environmental Law on the Threshold of a New Ecocentric Legal Paradigm in the Anthropocene**’ (2024) 64(2) DPCE Online 928. These authors talk about the principles (*in dubio pro animale and pro Natura* (et clima) to legally protect the most vulnerable entity in a relationship. This does not mean to abolish the core principle of presumption of innocence, but it can be interpreted as focusing in protecting and, if so, repairing, not just punishing (for which the presumption of innocence cannot be discarded).

32. Robin Wall Kimmerer **Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants** (Milkweed editions 2013)
33. Cassie Pedersen, Cassie and Rob White ‘**Discourses of Discord: Animal Activism and Moral Judgement**’ (2021) 1. 3 *International Criminology* 178.
34. Op cit. (2022).
35. Boris Cyrulnik ‘**¿Por qué la guerra?**’ *El País* (28 July 2024) <<https://elpais.com/ideas/2024-07-28/por-que-la-guerra.html>> accessed 19 November 2024.

Bibliography

ABRAM, David. **Spell of the Sensuous: Perception and Language in a More-than-Human World**. Pantheon Books, 1996.

ALLEN FOX, Michael. **Understanding Peace: A Comprehensive Introduction**. Routledge, 2013.

ASAMBLEA ANTIESPECISTA DE MADRID; MARÍA JOSÉ BERNUZ. **¿Puede la cárcel defender a los animales?** Ochodoscuatro Ediciones, 2023.

BEIRNE, Piers. **Thericide: Naming Animal Killing**. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, v. 3, n. 2, p. 49, 2014.

BOLLIGER, J. **On the Rights of Sentient Beings: The Case for Expanding Due Process of Law to Non-Human Animals**. *Mitchell Hamline Law Review*, v. 50, n. 1, p. 6, 2024.

BRAITHWAITE, John. **Evidence for Restorative Justice**. *Vermont Bar Journal*, v. 40, n. 2, p. 18, 2014.

CARSTENS, Delphi; GEERTS, Evelin. **Donna J. Haraway's Ecofeminism Revisited: Critical New Materialist Pedagogies for Anthropogenic Crisis Times**. *Southern African Journal of Environmental Education*, 2024.

CHAO, Sophie; CELERMAJER, Danielle. **Introduction: Multispecies Justice**. *Cultural Politics*, v. 19, n. 1, p. 1, 2023.

CYRULNIK, Boris. **¿Por qué la guerra?** *El País*, 28 jul. 2024. Disponível em: <https://elpais.com/ideas/2024-07-28/por-que-la-guerra.html>. Acesso em: 19 nov. 2024.

DALPANE, Federico; BAIDELDINOVA, Maria (eds.). **Animal Law Worldwide: Key Issues and Main Trends Across 27 Jurisdictions**. Springer, 2024.

DONALDSON, Sue; KYMLICKA, Will. **Zoopolis: A Political Theory of Animal Rights**. Oxford University Press, 2011.

DURRANT, Russil. **Animal Ethics and Species Justice: Our Direct Justice Obligations Towards Invertebrates**. In: **Invertebrate Justice: Extending the Boundaries of Non-Speciesist Green Criminology**. Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024.

EUROPEAN FORUM FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE (EFRJ). **Working group on Environmental Restorative Justice (ERJ)**. Created in 2020 after an international seminar in 2019. Disponível em: <https://www.euforumrj.org/>. Acesso em: 20 nov. 2024.

EUROPEAN FORUM FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE (EFRJ). **Practice Guide**. Edited by the ERJ working group, 2025.

EUROPEAN UNION. **Directive 2012/29/EU of the European Parliament and of the**

Council of October 2012 Establishing Minimum Standards on the Rights, Support and Protection of Victims of Crime, and Replacing Council Framework Decision 2001/220/JHA. L 315/57, 2012. Disponível em: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/>. Acesso em: 28 jul. 2024.

EPSTEIN, Y.; BERNET KEMPERS, E. **Animals and Nature as Rights Holders in the European Union.** *Modern Law Review*, v. 86, p. 1336, 2024.

FORSYTH, Miranda; TEPPER, Felicity; PALI, Brunilda (eds.). **The Palgrave Handbook of Environmental Restorative Justice.** Springer International Publishing, 2022.

GARCIA, Ascensión; SOUTH, Nigel; VARONA MARTÍNEZ, Gema. **An Increasingly Warmer, Unfairly Structured and Environmentally Interdependent Planet.** *Revista Electrónica de Criminología*, 2024. Disponível em: <https://www.revista-e-criminologia.net/copia-de-numero-actual-2>. Acesso em: 19 nov. 2024.

GIMÉNEZ-CANDELA, Marta; CERSOSIMO, Raffaella. **La enseñanza del derecho animal.** Tirant, 2021.

GLOBAL ALLIANCE FOR THE RIGHTS OF NATURE. **Rights of Nature.** Disponível em: <https://www.garn.org/rights-of-nature/>. Acesso em: 30 dez. 2024.

GROUP OF INDEPENDENT EXPERTS FOR THE LEGAL DEFINITION OF ECOCIDE. **Ecocide Means Any Unlawful or Arbitrary Act Committed in the Knowledge...** June 2021. Disponível em: <https://stopecocidio.org/definicion-legal-del-ecocidio>. Acesso em: 2024.

HORSTHEMKE, Kai. The Dreaded Comparison: **Genocide and Theriocide.** In: WISEMAN, Wendy A.; KESGIN, Burak (eds.). *Lost Kingdom: Animal Death in the Anthropocene.* Springer, 2024, p. 31.

KIMMERER, Robin Wall. Braiding Sweetgrass: **Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants.** Milkweed Editions, 2013.

LEVITT, Lacey; ROSENGARD, David B.; RUBIN, Jessica (eds.). **Animals as Crime Victims.** Edward Elgar, 2024.

LOSTAL, Marina. De-objectifying Animals: **Could They Qualify as Victims before the International Criminal Court?** *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, p. 1, 2021.

MANNOZZI, Grazia. **Towards a 'Humanism of Justice' Through Restorative Justice: A Dialogue with History.** *Restorative Justice*, v. 5, n. 2, p. 145, 2017.

MARCEAU, Justin; GRUEN, Lori (eds.). **Carceral Logics: Human Incarceration and Animal Captivity.** Cambridge University Press, 2022.

MONTES FRANCESCHINI, M. **Traditional Conceptions of the Legal Person and Nonhuman Animals.** *Animals*, v. 12, p. 2590, 2022.

NATALI, Lorenzo. **The Social Perception of Environmental Victimization: A Visual and Sensory Methodological Proposal.** *Crime, Law and Social Change*, v. 81, n. 5, p. 561, 2024.

NUSSBAUM, Martha. Justice for Animals: **Our Collective Responsibility.** Simon and Schuster, 2023.

OFFOR, Iyan; CARDESA-SALZMANN, Antonio. **Multispecies Lawscapes in the Anthropocene...** In: CADDELL, Richard; MCCORMACK, Phillipa (eds.). *Research Handbook on Climate Change and Biodiversity Law.* Edward Elgar Publishing, 2024.

O'NEILL, Daniel W.; FANNING, Andrew L.; LAMB, William F.; STEINBERGER, Julia K. **A Good Life for All Within Planetary Boundaries.** *Nature Sustainability*, v. 1, n. 2, p. 88-95, 2018.

PELLUCHON, Corine. **L'être et la mer: Pour un existentialisme écologique.** PUF, 2024.

PRICE, Catherine; CHAO, Sophie. **Multispecies, More-than-Human, Nonhuman, Other-than-Human...** *Exchanges: The Interdisciplinary Research Journal*, v. 8, p. xx, 2023. Disponível em: <https://exchanges.warwick.ac.uk>. Acesso em: 28 dez. 2024.

REESE, Laura A.; REESE, Laura. **Community Factors and Animal Shelter Outcomes.** *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, v. 27, n. 1, p. 105-120, 2022.