

# Editorial: Inaugurating the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*

## Collective reflections on the future of animal rights law

---

**Abstract:** This editorial inaugurates the *Journal of Animal Rights Law* with collective reflections from leading scholars in the field. Contributors trace the historical roots and future horizons of animal rights law, assess current challenges and opportunities, and welcome the journal as a forum for rigorous scholarship and inquiry. They outline priority areas for further research and legal reform, weigh reasons for hope and concern across jurisdictions, and call for greater inclusivity and frameworks that support coexistence with non-human animals. While the task ahead is formidable, the contributors emphasise the scale of the collective potential for change, and what we can accomplish together.

**Keywords:** animal rights; legal change; animal interests; animal rights theory; intersectionality.

*This inaugural volume of the Journal of Animal Rights Law is dedicated to Steven M. Wise (1950–2024), pioneering animal rights lawyer and Founder of the Nonhuman Rights Project, and Dr Jane Goodall DBE (1934–2025), primatologist and Founder of the Jane Goodall Institute, whose lifelong works have profoundly shaped the moral, scientific, and legal imagination underlying the contemporary movement for the recognition of animals' fundamental rights.*

When I became interested in animal rights and legal personhood in the early 2010s, the academic landscape looked very different from today. Outside the United States, there were no established conferences or journals—at least none that I was aware of—and thus, no sustained academic discourse. Many of the conceptual frameworks that structured debate, such as the welfarist/abolitionist division, were based on the work of a relatively small group of primarily American scholars.

Since then, animal law—and animal rights law in particular—has grown and matured. Several journals are now dedicated to animal law, and it is especially welcome that one

focuses specifically on animal rights law. It gives me great pleasure that work on topics such as animal legal personhood, fundamental rights for animals, and animal dignity can now be submitted to a dedicated journal and reviewed by experts in the field.

Launching and maintaining an academic journal is a true service to the scholarly community—often a labor of love that goes unrewarded. I extend my sincere thanks to Marine Lercier and the team for establishing the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*, and I wish the journal every success in the years to come.

### About the Author

**Visa A. J. Kurki** is Associate Professor of Jurisprudence at the University of Helsinki, Director of the Helsinki Animal Law Centre, and Principal Investigator of the ERC-funded *Agency in Law* project.

## Warm Welcome to the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*

It is wonderful to be asked to share some words of welcome to the *Journal of Animal Rights Law* being launched under the admirable leadership of Marine Lercier. The issues animals are facing are pressing and scholars devoted to the field of animal rights law will be greatly assisted by having this forum in which to share their research. It is encouraging to see the field growing – new programs being started and current ones expanding, new journals being launched, and no shortage of challenges to write about and press for solutions to.

Mainstreaming care and concern for animals, their rights and our duties towards them, is crucial for the animal protection movement. This will involve teaching more students about the field and encouraging them to enter it, as lawyers or in other capacities, and reaching more academics with ideas that they can, in turn, work with to further advance the field. It is an exciting time to be involved in animal law and witness the great work of so many individuals devoting their time and energy to something that really matters: helping those whom the law has marginalized to such an extreme extent.

### About the Author

**Angela Fernandez** is Professor of Law and History and Director of the Animal Law Program at the Faculty of Law, University of Toronto.

## **A Forum for Scholarship Furthering Justice for Animals**

Animal law has made tremendous strides in the two decades since I went to law school to pursue animal law and was told by professors that it was not a viable career path. The field has become much more sophisticated and professional, and today there is no question whatsoever that animal law is a viable career path, in both practice and academia. The launch of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*—the first-ever peer-reviewed journal of its kind—is a momentous occasion that cements and advances the field's legitimacy.

Scholarship plays a critical role in helping to achieve justice for animals. It provides a space for working out the problems with our current approaches and how we might remedy them, and for envisioning new types of legal relationships with other animals. But it can only do so effectively if it has a forum. The *Journal of Animal Rights Law* serves as that much-needed forum—a place for exchanging, arguing about, refining, building upon, and spreading ideas.

I deeply appreciate Marine Lercier and the whole editorial team for making the journal a reality. I look forward to seeing the further evolution of animal law over the coming decades—and know that the JARL will play a pivotal role in it.

### **About the Author**

**Delcianna Winders** is Associate Professor of Law and Director of the Animal Law & Policy Institute at Vermont Law & Graduate School. In May 2025, she was honoured with the American Bar Association's *Excellence in the Advancement of Animal Law* Award for her leadership and contributions to the field.

## **A Historical Perspective on the Task Ahead**

The earliest practitioners of animal law were heavily influenced by the writings of Peter Singer, Tom Regan, and other philosophers who laid the groundwork for animal rights theory. However, the lawyers realized that if one were to convince judges or legislators that nonhuman animals should be granted legal rights, approaching it from a purely philosophical perspective would be unsuccessful. They had to translate those ideas into jurisprudential language.

In 1988, Steven Wise and David Favre, both of whom were serving on the Board of Directors of the fledgling *Animal Legal Defense Fund*, began a series of conversations that culminated in the drafting of a law review article arguing that chimpanzees should have legal rights. That article was rejected by Vermont Law Review (deemed too radical) and never published. But it started both of those lawyers on the path to exploring how to create legal rights for heretofore rightless beings. Each of them chose to tackle an extraordinarily exciting and perplexing question: how does a lawyer start from square one and pave the way for the establishment of legal rights?

Their approaches differed and each has written and published multiple law review articles identifying legal theories that might be successful. Favre has argued that within existing property law concepts, one can chart an incremental course toward the establishment of legal rights. Wise explored the history of how legal rights have been established for certain classes of humans and ultimately selected the common law theory of habeas corpus as a vehicle for the recognition of the fundamental right to liberty for animals. And he took the courageous next step: applying that theory in courts of law. When Wise's first book, *Rattling the Cage*, was published in 2000, it catapulted the discussion of animal rights law to a worldwide audience.

So, where to now?

Fundamentally, animal rights lawyers must convince judges and legislators that animal rights philosophy can be applied successfully within the legal system. That is the challenge that animal rights legal professionals face, and will continue to face in the future.

### About the Author

**Joyce Tischler** is Professor of Practice in Animal Law at Lewis & Clark Law School's Center for Animal Law Studies. She co-founded the *Animal Legal Defense Fund* in 1979 and served as its Executive Director for 25 years.

## **Ever Upward**

My perspective on the animal law/rights movement begins in the early 1980s with the formation of the *Animal Legal Defense Fund* (initially named *Attorneys for Animal Rights*). The upward trajectory of the concepts and scope of the animal rights debate is very clear. As I look around today, there are animal lawyers everywhere. Courses are taught in law schools; legal journals have come into existence where none existed before. State bar associations have sections just focused on animal law, as does the *American Bar Association* and the international legal organization the UIA (*Union Internationale des Avocats*). While anti-cruelty laws have been in existence for considerable time, all states have enhanced the laws and the penalties since the 1980s. The larger humane organizations have created enforcement divisions and in larger cities, there are prosecutors who specialize in animal cruelty cases. There is even the draft of an international treaty available for consideration.

It is no longer embarrassing to discuss the well-being of our companion animals with legislators, as for the most part, animal issues can be bipartisan. However, there is still a large mountain before us which must be climbed. As progress has been made in many areas, confinement of agricultural animals has metastasized into a global enterprise of billion-dollar corporations. (The global meat industry market had revenue estimated at \$1.49 trillion in 2024.) Given the diversity of countries, and the economic and political power this super-capitalist industry possesses, this issue will require an extensive investment of time and resources to counter. This is clearly the challenge of the future, and as of now, I do not see a clear path forward. As I am soon leaving the stage, it is a challenge I must pass on to readers of this new Journal.

## **About the Author**

**Professor David Favre** is Nancy Heathcote Professor Emeritus of Property and Animal Law at Michigan State University College of Law and former dean of MSU Law. He co-founded the *Animal Legal Defense Fund* and is the founder and long-time Editor-in-Chief of the Animal Legal & Historical Web Center, but is 'now 78 years old'.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In Professor Favre's words.

## Expanding the Scope of Animal Rights Law

The *Journal of Animal Rights Law* arrives at, I believe, an interesting moment for the development of pro-animal scholarship. Many of the foundations of the modern mainstream animal rights movement can be traced back to scholarly work in analytic and moral philosophy in the 1970s and 1980s. This work arguably informed a primary focus of animal law on improving protections for animals and exploring opportunities to enshrine legal rights for animals within legal systems, such as through recognition of legal personhood.

However, modern animal rights theory is evolving. It is taking on critical perspectives from outside of its original foundations: modern animal rights theory is making connections between the mass violence experienced by animals and those of other beings, as well as locating the contemporary context of animal oppression within wider frames such as colonialism, capitalism and environmental destruction. Modern animal rights theory is also in dialogue with emerging political theory, which is not just concerned with rights protection for individual animals, but is also interested in how to establish just institutions within societies that create the conditions for different beings to flourish.

Given these developments, I am excited for the future of animal rights law. I am particularly excited about the prospects for a more developed animal rights legal philosophy, which is not just concerned with articulating the basis for animal rights within existing legal systems, but is also interested in the deeper and more radical questions about what law is about and whether a non-anthropocentric legal system is possible.

### About the Author

**Dinesh Wadiwel** is Associate Professor of Human Rights and Socio-Legal Studies at the University of Sydney and Chair of the *Australasian Animal Studies Association*.

## **Mainstreaming gender and children in animal rights law**

Despite the extraordinary scale of violence against animals, I find it to be a heartening time in animal rights law. Many new voices are entering, and thus building and validating the field, and also offering valuable conceptual interventions aimed at norm influence, inclusive theorizing, and accelerated legal change. Importantly, contributions focusing on the gendered nature of cultural and legal anthropocentrism and also the corresponding resistance to transform society have better field presence than previously. At the same time, this dimension within animal rights law scholarship and practice should be further augmented to be able to address the patriarchal values and masculinity codes of governance intensifying in many countries that naturalize violence, promote dominance, and maintain animals' legal subordination. Along with other social determinants of anthropocentrism, now is the time to keep top of mind in legal theory and legal strategies aimed at animal rights the formidable force that gender identities have in shaping how we view animals and in creating caring and compassionate social and legal relations with all others.

This gendered focus illuminates also the need for the field to address the education of human children. When we think of the term 'animal rights law,' even those of us immersed in the field do not easily associate it with education law or children's rights. But animal rights law should encompass strategies to stop the gendered and anthropocentric hidden curriculum that teach children that animals are inferior to humans, that kindness to them has limits especially for boys, and reduces children's overall empathy toward animals, heightening gendered differentials and reinforcing the devaluation of emotional responses. These outcomes affect legal norms and ideologies about animals. Ungendering and affirming compassion toward animals in children holds potential for transformative social and legal change. How advocates can make inroads in education and better connect *not learning* and unlearning anthropocentrism to children's rights would be a wonderful new line of inquiry for the field to bring about.

### **About the Author**

**Maneesha Deckha** is Professor and Lansdowne Chair in Law at the University of Victoria, where she directs the *Animals & Society Research Initiative*. She is also the Director of the open-access Documentary Series *Animal Law and Youth Activism*.

## Reflection for the Inaugural Editorial of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*

This is an exciting time for animal rights law, but also a daunting one.

In the positive column, we can point to a number of important developments. Law schools continue to embrace the study of animals and the law by establishing and supporting animal law programs, such as those at Harvard, Yale, George Washington University, Lewis & Clark, the University of Denver, Vermont Law and Graduate School, and the University of San Francisco, to name just a few. Raffael Fasel and Sean Butler recently published the first textbook on *Animal Rights Law*, properly speaking. The rights of nature movement has established itself in international environmental law, with great potential for nonhuman animals and their homes. The animal rights movement continues to refine its tactics, strategies, and ideals with ever-increasing sophistication.

At the same time, however, the industrial exploitation of animals continues to grow exponentially on farms and in laboratories across the globe. Animals' natural habitats are increasingly imperiled by development and the climate catastrophe. Although some judges are open to animal rights, others seem woefully unfamiliar with the legal and ethical arguments of animals' advocates. And the global shift away from democratic norms and towards authoritarianism bodes poorly for a broadly emancipatory future.

These perilous times call for bold theorizing that will problematize animals' legal status, wrestle with the thorny practical and ethical questions of transformation, and suggest pathways forward for experimentation. That is why I am excited to see the creation and publication of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*, which promises to help forge that path. Its commitment to being free and open-access will ensure broad availability of the important ideas it conveys, and its commitment to peer-review will ensure it publishes high-quality scholarship that will contribute to important debates about our future with the nonhuman world.

### About the Author

**Matthew Liebman** is Professor of Law and Justice for Animals Endowed Chair at the University of San Francisco School of Law, and former Director of Litigation at the *Animal Legal Defense Fund*.

## **The Good News and the Bad News**

Animal rights law is facing perhaps its greatest challenge yet. As the calamitous consequences of the climate crisis are becoming inescapable, many humans are falling back on a basic drive for self-preservation, preferring to hoard resources rather than to share them with those in need. To make matters worse, many liberal democracies are in steep decline, with authoritarian demagogues seizing power by stoking a wildfire of public anxiety. Animal rights advocates will have to make their case in such increasingly hostile circumstances, facing at best people with limited time and mental bandwidth and, at worst, those accusing them of terrorism. This is the bad news.

But there is also good news: animal rights law itself holds the key to overcoming many of these challenges. The climate crisis affects not only humans, but all animals. Protecting the rights of animals, including a right to a healthy environment, will therefore be vital not only to safeguard animals' interests, but also to confront the wider emergency facing us all. Courts and lawmakers around the world are increasingly recognising the inseparable links between humans, animals, and nature more broadly, and animal rights advocates will play a crucial role in turbocharging this development to make the planet more liveable for all earthlings. Animal rights can also help make democratic systems more responsive to the interests of all those governed by them. As such, it can help combat the felt disconnect between the governed and the elites as well as the rising inequality that turn many away from democracy.

The pivotal task will lie in convincing both decision-makers and the general public of the transformative promise that animal rights law holds. And the laudable creation of a specialist journal such as the *Journal of Animal Rights Law* will no doubt be instrumental to this task.

### **About the Author**

**Raffael N. Fasel** is University Assistant Professor in Public Law and Fellow of Jesus College at the University of Cambridge, co-Director of the *Cambridge Centre for Animal Rights Law*, and Board Member of the *Nonhuman Rights Project*.

## **Correcting a Fundamental Flaw in the Current Legal Regime as an Incremental Step Towards Achieving Animal Rights**

A key attribute of animal rights law is recognizing, valuing and protecting the inherent interests of animals independent of their usefulness or benefit to humans. The current legal regime governing all nonhuman animals fails miserably in this regard, as the law not only characterizes all nonhuman animals as personal property or a resource (for animals in the wild) for humans, but all laws supposedly designed to protect animals are a function of humans' use of the animal, rather than the interests and needs of the animal.<sup>2</sup> For example, there are no laws governing dogs, pigs, or orcas that are designed to protect the species' inherent interests such that they have a life worth living. Instead, there are laws governing companion animals, animals used for research, animals used for food or clothing, animals used for entertainment, etc., that set minimum standards for the animal while allowing for the most efficient use of the animal within the specific context. Moreover, generally, even the most minimal legal protection against intentional cruelty does not apply to all animals, as there are invariably a variety of exceptions, including for trapping and hunting, for customary farming practices that in any other context would be deemed 'cruel,' and for animals used in research.

A paradigm shift in the law is needed if we wish to move away from viewing animals as mere 'things' to serve human ends, a paradigm that is in direct odds with a rights-based framework. Moreover, when human use dictates the legal protection for the animal, the standards are inadequate to protect the animal's individual physical, emotional, psychological, and social needs. Instead, the interests, capabilities and needs of the individual animal must dictate the standards for protection, independent of the 'use' they may serve to humans.

Finally, if properly drafted, implemented, and enforced, such universal standards for each species would necessarily require that certain uses of animals end since many human uses would be inherently incompatible with the standards necessary to protect the animals'

---

<sup>2</sup> I noted this early in my tenure and briefly wrote about this issue then. Joan Schaffner, 'A Rabbit, is a rabbit, is a rabbit . . . Not under the law' (2013) 1 Global Journal of Animal Law <<https://journal.fi/gjal/article/view/148685>> accessed 4 October 2025

physical, emotional, psychological and social needs, moving our legal regime towards a rights-based paradigm.

### **About the Author**

**Joan E. Schaffner** is Associate Professor of Law at The George Washington University Law School, Faculty Co-Director of the *Animal Legal Education Initiative* (ALEI), Past Chair of the ABA TIPS Animal Law Committee, the ABA International Animal Law Committee, and the AALS Animal Law Section, and Fellow of the *Oxford Centre for Animal Ethics*.

## **Because a Lion Is: Rethinking Animal Law Through Ubuntu, Intersectionality and Inclusive Justice**

Animal law stands at a critical inflection point — marked by both the intensifying scale of animal exploitation and the growing sophistication of legal responses to it. Around the world, legal systems are beginning to question the legal fiction of animals as mere ‘property,’ and activists are strategically leveraging constitutional, administrative, environmental, corporate and other frameworks to expand protections. Yet these advances unfold alongside deepening entrenchments of industrialised cruelty, environmental crises and systemic inequality, often justified in the language of economic necessity, cultural tradition, or even development.

As advocates, it has never been more important to recognise that the interests of humans, animals, and Nature are fundamentally interconnected. We must reject the false binary between human rights and animal rights and instead advance a vision of justice that is inclusive, relational, and rooted in compassion. We must harness the tools of law to imagine and enact more just multispecies futures. This includes not only litigating and legislating, but interrogating legal epistemologies, decolonising animal protection norms, and amplifying the voices of movements that situate animal liberation within broader struggles for justice. This demands that we actively dismantle entrenched systems of oppression, exploitation and violence and the powerful structures that uphold them - while building coalitions that are collaborative, strategic, and intersectional.

In the (South) African context, the philosophy of (Eco-)Ubuntu reminds us to widen our moral circle to include more-than-human beings. As Archbishop Desmond Tutu reflected: ‘We are human because a lion is, because a snake is, because a mountain is.’ Our own humanity, dignity and freedom are intimately bound to the living world. True freedom, as Nelson Mandela insisted, is not simply the absence of chains, but living in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others. That ‘other’ must include both humans and more than humans that we share our planet with.

To meaningfully protect animals, we must also pursue accountability through transparency. For too long, exploitative industries have operated behind closed doors, shielded by legal and corporate opacity. These hidden harms implicate not only trillions of sentient beings, but vulnerable human communities and the living systems on which all life depends. The law, at its best, must serve as a light: exposing injustice, enabling reform, and ultimately, transforming the world into one where all beings may flourish in dignity and freedom.

### About the Author

**Amy P. Wilson** is Co-Founder and Executive Director of *Animal Law Reform South Africa*, Board Member and Co-Founder of *Lawyers for Animal Protection in Africa (LAPA)*, Doctoral Candidate, Lecturer, and Research Associate at the University of Johannesburg, and an Independent Expert with the United Nations *Harmony with Nature* Programme.

## Reframing Human Wildlife Conflict

The framing of human wildlife conflict remains wildlife law’s most urgent and under-addressed legal frontiers. Across many jurisdictions, non-human animals deemed as ‘problem animals’ are often pathologized and governed under ‘nuisance’ and ‘animal control’ frameworks. Elephants who raid crops or big cats who stray into human settlements are often subjected to lethal responses. Meanwhile, most legal systems fail to confront the corresponding accountability of ‘problem humans’ who fail to plan for coexistence, encroach on habitats and ecotones, pollute landscapes and incite conflict.

This asymmetry is both an ethical failure and a legal blind spot. As human development expands into ecological spaces, the concept of 'social carrying capacity,' which refers to how much inconvenience and loss humans are willing to tolerate from wildlife, continues to shape conflict policy. Unfortunately, this concept centres on human convenience rather than environmental and ecological justice. Non-human animals living in transitional zones, ecotones and dispersal areas face the brunt of this legal ambiguity. These biodiverse edges are rich in life yet poorly protected in law, leaving non-human animal populations exposed to both displacement and retaliatory harm.

It is time to reframe this issue to centre on coexistence rather than conflict. Animal law must grow and be forefront of interrogating the structures that produce and sustain human wildlife conflict, inequitable development, inadequate response to environmental justice, inadequate zoning, and unsustainable extractive economies. Legal innovation must centre coexistence frameworks that recognize non-human animal agency, expand protections in ecotones, and hold humans accountable to higher standards of ecological stewardship. The future of animal law lies in the building of jurisprudence that respects coexistence in shared spaces, environmental justice, and interspecies justice.

### **About the Author**

**Jim Karani** is Director at *Lawyers for Animal Protection in Africa* (LAPA) and a PhD candidate in Criminal Justice at John Jay College (CUNY).

## **The Law Owes Animals a Debt**

The law owes animals a debt. While philosophy and the social sciences have produced a valuable body of theory and research that sheds light on the injustice we impose on animals, the law still clings to speciesism. This is curious.

Law, a discipline with centuries of development, doesn't need to invent anything to reject speciesism and extend the protection of rights to animals that do not belong to the human species. Therefore, it is time for the law to assume its role and be consistent with its promises of justice and equality. The philosophy of law, human rights, international law, and critical

perspectives on law, among others, have a vast amount of tools to contribute to protecting animals from the exploitation to which we subject them.

Society also demands this debt from us: activists and organizations that fight for animals know that legal tools are scarce, and they predominantly avoid litigation or legislative changes. Therefore, it is the task of those who conduct legal research to expand the boundaries of current legal theories in light of what philosophy, the social sciences, and the natural sciences teach us about discrimination and violence against animals.

### About the Author

**Silvina Pezzetta** is a PhD CONICET Senior Researcher in Animal Law and Ethics (Argentina) and has held Visiting Fellowships at Harvard Law School's Brooks McCormick Jr. Animal Law & Policy Program and the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law.

### Spanish Great Ape Law

The Spanish Ministry of Social Rights is drafting a Great Ape Law, required by Animal Welfare Law 7/2023 of March 28. Meanwhile, captivity appears to be even worse for them than for humans. Humans already live indoors by choice, with a radio or TV. Apes live in nature, exercising vigorously over vast territories. Captivity makes them ill. For example, cardiovascular disease, which is rare in the wild, affects 70% of captive male gorillas and kills 41% of them. Humans know they are there temporarily, have visitors and permits. Apes face life sentences, with no hope or friends' visits and obsess with escaping or despair. Humans improve their post-release prospects by obtaining qualifications, while other apes lose their entire culture, making captivity irreversible. Captive women are protected from males, and all have a choice about who they spend time with. Apes are forced into cohabitation, with even reproduction decided for them. Babies are often killed as virtually all captive apes develop signs of mental illness, with males becoming overaggressive and mothers lacking maternal knowledge. Mothers fall further into depression when their baby dies. Chimp Natalia from Valencia, for example, carried her dead baby for 7 months. Zoos are like mental hospitals in reverse: instead of discreetly treating the condition, they create it and exhibit it. And those who attempt to escape are shot dead.

Every country should urgently create a Great Ape Law.

### **About the Author**

**Paula Casal** is an ICREA Professor at the Law Department of Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Co-Director of the UPF Centre for Animal Ethics, President of the *Great Ape Project*–Spain, and Associate Editor of *Politics, Philosophy & Economics* and co-editor of LEAP.

### **Animal Law in a Global Tech Era**

First, congratulations on the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law*. Education and the open exchange of ideas are cornerstones of the law, and this journal represents an important step forward.

Looking ahead, I believe one of the most significant developments that will shape animal law now and in the future is the rapid advancement of technology. Today, every animal—companion, farmed, and wild—is impacted by Artificial Intelligence (AI). It is reshaping the legal profession and altering the landscape for animals—in positive and negative ways. To remain relevant, animal lawyers must have a seat at the table with scientists, researchers, and developers as they make decisions and implement technologies that impact our work.

Also, I am more convinced than ever that animal lawyers must step beyond the comfort of the legal discipline and national borders in which we practice. After three years as president of the Animal Law Commission of the *Union Internationale des Avocats*, a Paris-based global association of lawyers, I have seen firsthand that animal law has yet to achieve the recognition it needs and deserves. That recognition will only come from our willingness to proactively advocate and collaborate globally. We must engage with those outside our traditional spheres and communicate the value of our work, which has far-reaching implications not only for animals, but humans and the planet.

### **About the Author**

**Yolanda Eisenstein** is an animal lawyer and writer, President of the *Union Internationale des Avocats* (UIA) Animal Law Commission and Board Member of *Lawyers for Animal Protection in Africa* (LAPA).

### **Concluding Reflection: From the Editor-in-Chief**

I wish to conclude with a reflection on the collective effort that has made this first volume of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law* possible. The reflections gathered herein attest to the intellectual generosity, imagination, and principled commitment of a growing community dedicated to advancing the legal and moral recognition of non-human animals. I am grateful to the distinguished scholars who contributed their perspectives to this inaugural editorial, offering guidance and encouragement at a pivotal moment for animal rights law and the movement in general.

The field stands at a critical juncture where its philosophical and historical foundations intersect with rapidly evolving legal, social, and political contexts. It faces pressing challenges: fragmented enforcement, limited standing and remedies, uneven protection across species and jurisdictions, and the structural and marginalisation of animal interests, yet also unprecedented opportunities: doctrinal innovation, comparative and transnational learning, and the forging of alliances that bridge scholarship, advocacy, and practice.

Across this collection, contributors identify areas where further research and legal reform are most urgent and call for a more inclusive and globally attentive field, one that centres coexistence with non-human animals and amplifies voices from underrepresented regions and communities.

The *Journal of Animal Rights Law* is conceived as an inclusive forum for rights-based scholarship and open inquiry. Our commitment is to intellectual independence, free open-access, methodological pluralism, and editorial integrity and care. The work ahead is considerable, but so too is the potential for positive change. I invite authors and readers to join us in deepening the study and practice of animal rights law and to contribute to its development through rigorous scholarship, innovative legal thought and ethical reflection, interdisciplinary engagement, and collaborative work towards a world in which all sentient beings enjoy legal rights.

### **About the Author**

Marine Lercier is a Doctoral Researcher and PhD candidate in Global Animal Law at the Autonomous University of Barcelona. She is the Founding Director of the *International Centre for Animal Rights and Ethics* (ICARE) and a Board Member of the *Culture and Animals Foundation*.

### **Acknowledgments**

As Editor-in-Chief, I wish to express my gratitude to the scholars whose reflections animate this inaugural editorial; their generosity of time and intellect has made this collective opening possible. I am equally indebted to the members of the *Journal of Animal Rights Law's* editorial team—past and present—and to all who have contributed to conceiving, shaping, and establishing the journal. I further thank our reviewers for the rigour and care they bring to the peer-review process, and our Advisory Board for their kind support, guidance, and encouragement.

The *Journal of Animal Rights Law* gratefully acknowledges the *Observatoire Québécois de Droit Animalier* (OQDA), *Manifund*, and the *International Centre for Animal Rights and Ethics* (ICARE), whose generous support enables us to remain independent and freely open-access.