



EUROPEAN
FORUM FOR
RESTORATIVE
JUSTICE

VIRTUAL
SYMPOSIUM
21-25 June 2021



RESTORATIVE JUSTICE OVER DISTANCE

euforumrj.org



RESTORATIVE JUSTICE OVER DISTANCE

REGISTER HERE

[WWW.EUFORUMRJ.ORG/EN/
VIRTUAL-SYMPOSIUM-RESTORATIVE-
JUSTICE-OVER-DISTANCE](http://WWW.EUFORUMRJ.ORG/EN/VIRTUAL-SYMPOSIUM-RESTORATIVE-JUSTICE-OVER-DISTANCE)

CONTACT

European Forum
for Restorative Justice
Herbert Hooverplein 10
3000 Leuven, Belgium
www.euforumrj.org

 info@euforumrj.org
 +32.466.20.91.12
 [euforumrj](https://www.facebook.com/euforumrj)

SOCIAL

 [@euforumrj](https://www.facebook.com/euforumrj) 
 [#RJoverDistance](https://twitter.com/RJoverDistance) 

EUROPEAN FORUM FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

The European Forum for Restorative Justice (EFRJ) is the largest European professional network on restorative justice (RJ). It counts more than 450 members, including 80 organisations, working on restorative justice practices, research and policy in Europe and beyond. Since its establishment in 2000, the organisation offers support to implement and develop restorative justice through trainings, consultancy, research, advocacy, policy developments and events.

The views presented in this event are the views of the speakers and do not necessarily represent the views of the EFRJ.

This event is supported by the European Union





RESTORATIVE JUSTICE OVER DISTANCE

PLENARIES

- 1 networking game
- 3 interactive dialogues with 6 international renown speakers from 2 other continents
- 1 world café on restorative justice and the pandemic

PARALLEL SESSIONS

- 1 session on practices and 1 on policies
- 4*4 sessions with topics proposed by participants (accepted abstracts)
- 2 sessions proposed by 4 thematic working groups of the EFRJ
- 1 session on 4 current EFRJ projects

The symposium “Restorative Justice Over Distance” provides the virtual space for knowledge sharing and exchange among our growing international community of restorative justice practitioners, researchers, policymakers and activists.

The aim is to map what is happening in the field and also to reflect on the future of restorative justice.

In times when the words solidarity, responsibility and truth are the motto, we wish to better understand what is the position of restorative justice on key issues that matter to our societies where criminal and social justice go hand in hand.

The symposium will include a series of different sessions, such as interactive dialogues with international critical thinkers and thematic presentations on key issues relevant for the field.



PROGRAMME

LAST UPDATE: 18 JUNE 2021

**ALL HOURS ARE EXPRESSED IN CEST
CENTRAL EUROPEAN SUMMER TIME - BRUSSELS TIME**

MON 21/6

- 14-16h Opening and networking game (p.5)
- 17-19h Interactive dialogue (Barter & Schiff, p.7)

TUE 22/6

- 10-12h Parallel presentations (see participants' contributions, p.17)
- 14-16h Parallel session on policy and practice developments (p.10)
- 17-19h Interactive dialogue (Gonzalez & McCants-Turner, p.8)

WED 23/6

- 10-12h Parallel presentations (see EFRJ projects, pp.11-13)
- 14-16h World café on the pandemic (p.14)
- 17-19h Parallel presentations (see participants' contributions, p.18)

THU 24/6

- 10-12h Interactive dialogue (Tauri & Wood, p.9)
- 14-16h Parallel dialogues (see EFRJ working groups, p.15)
- 17-19h Parallel presentations (see participants' contributions, p.19)

FRI 25/6

- 10-12h Parallel presentations (see participants' contributions, p.20)
- 14-16h Parallel dialogues (see EFRJ working groups, p.16)
- 17-18h Closing

EXHIBITION ROOM

Posters, videos, articles available all week long
(p.35)



NETWORKING GAME

OPENING OF THE SYMPOSIUM

MON 21/6

14-16h



14.00h Opening words with EFRJ chair Tim Chapman and EFRJ director Edit Törzs

14.30h Networking game with Fieke Vanhauwaert and Wim Huyzentruyt (Ligand, Belgium)



NETWORKING GAME

This interactive networking game will be facilitated by Ligand, a pioneering organization in the field of restorative practices in Flanders (Belgium). Ligand has lots of expertise in schools, youth care institutions and refugee centers to resolve conflicts and propose strategies that help people to live, learn and work better together. Recently Ligand developed a series of "toolkits" to be used in families, workplaces or schools. Each toolkit contains cards with 120 straightforward questions to get to know each other better, including questions about feelings, interests, preferences or doubts. During this networking game, the team from Ligand will invite you to take time to exchange some information about yourself, to connect with others (despite the virtual world) and to create a positive vibe for the entire symposium's week. You will mostly work in pairs or little groups, so that you can start building relationships with other attendees.



This session will be facilitated by Fieke Vanhauwaert and Wim Huyzentruyt (Ligand). Fieke (and colleagues) assisted more than 30 youth care organisations in Flanders to implement the restorative practice of 'Positive Reorientation'. Her 10-year long passion supports care workers in families and youth care organisations in developing a loving attitude and presence towards their work environment. Wim has a master in Geography; his drive for better schools and education connected him with Ligand. Nowadays, he supports schools and refugee centers in Flanders to implement a restorative culture in their organisation. He is expert in facilitating conversations (in classrooms, teams, families) about issues that really matter.



INTERACTIVE DIALOGUES

WITH SIX INTERNATIONAL SPEAKERS

MODERATED BY BRUNILDA PALI

MON 21/6

17-19h Dominic Barter &
Mara Schiff

In this dialogue, Dominic will speak about the political aspects of restorative justice and its relation to power dynamics; Mara will focus on the limitations of restorative justice language and narratives and/or its contribution to address system and structural violence.

TUE 22/6

17-19h Thalia Gonzalez &
Johonna McCants-Turner

In this dialogue, Thalia will speak about the role of restorative justice, wellbeing and equity or as a structural health intervention, based on her recent research on the intersection between school-based restorative justice and public health; Johonna will reflect on restorative justice as an approach to ending police violence, particularly in schools where youth experience high rates of harmful contact with police.

THU 24/6

10-12h Juan Tauri &
William Wood

In this dialogue, Juan will challenge the claims made about the emancipatory potential of restorative justice practices for marginalised communities, and most especially for Indigenous peoples residing in settler-colonial contexts. William will discuss restorative justice as it pertains to social marginalization and trauma in the lives of young people.



INTERACTIVE DIALOGUES

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SPEAKERS

MON 21/6

17-19h



DOMINIC BARTER

International consultant on Dialogical System Design and restorative systems (Brazil)

Dominic Barter collaborates in promoting sustainable, inclusive, adaptable responses to community needs. Over the last 25 years he has worked with marginalised communities, organisations, local and national governments, the UN and international agencies promoting cooperation and change, primarily in the areas of justice, education, governance, collaborative community finance and local self-determination. His innovations have inspired changes in 50 countries, from drug-gangs to corporations, in prisons, hospitals, churches, social movements, universities, police departments, militia, civil conflict and its aftermath, schools and public policy. In the mid-90s he collaborated in the development of Restorative Circles, a community-based and -owned practice for dynamic engagement with conflict that grew from conversations with residents in gang-controlled shantytown favelas in Rio de Janeiro. He adapted the practice for the Brazilian Ministry of Justice's national projects in Restorative Justice and supports its application around the world. In recent years he has supervised the mediation program for the Police Pacification Units in Rio and served as invited professor at the Standing Group for Consensual Methods of Conflict Resolution, at the High Court of Rio. A long time student and colleague of Dr. Marshall Rosenberg, Dominic served as Board President of the Center for Nonviolent Communication.



MARA SCHIFF

Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida Atlantic University (USA)

Mara Schiff has been a restorative justice scholar, practitioner, speaker and advocate for nearly 30 years. She is currently an Associate Professor in the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida Atlantic University, Vice-President of the National Association for Community and Restorative Justice (NACRJ), and President of PeaceWorks Consulting, Inc. In 2018, she was publicly elected to serve a 4-year term on the School Board of the School District of Indian River County (Florida). Schiff examines restorative philosophy and practice in criminal-legal, juvenile, and educational arenas. She has written about the limitations of restorative language and narrative, and called for interdisciplinary approaches to address systemic structural violence. She has authored multiple books, book chapters and articles in academic journals such as *Contemporary Justice Review*, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *Washington University Journal of Law and Policy*, and *Criminal Justice Review*. Her article, "Can Restorative Justice Disrupt the School-to-Prison Pipeline?" (2018) is currently the 5th most widely read article in *Contemporary Justice Review*. Schiff speaks and trains nationally and internationally on restorative and racial (in)justice in justice, education, and community settings and works with school districts implementing restorative strategies to shift disciplinary policy, climate and culture.



INTERACTIVE DIALOGUES

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SPEAKERS

TUE 22/6

17-19h



JOHONNA MCCANTS-TURNER

Assistant Professor in The Center for Justice and Peacebuilding at Eastern Mennonite University (USA)

Johonna McCants-Turner is an educator, activist-scholar, writer, sought-after public speaker and trainer who has worked for over two decades to advance personal and social transformation in pursuit of safety and justice. Her work on youth-led organizing, trauma healing, anti-racist feminisms, and reparative approaches to justice is published in *Voices in Urban Education*, *Making Peace with Faith*, the *Routledge International Handbook of Restorative Justice*, and *Colorizing Restorative Justice*, among other venues. She is currently writing a book that explores the intersections of reparative justice and womanist theology. A faculty member of Eastern Mennonite University's Center for Justice and Peacebuilding and the Director of the Zehr Institute for Restorative Justice, she will transition to serving as Associate Professor of Peace and Conflict Studies at Conrad Grebel University College at the University of Waterloo (Ontario) in July 2021. McCants-Turner holds a PhD in American Studies and a graduate certificate in Women's Studies from the University of Maryland, as well as a graduate certificate in urban youth ministry from Fuller Theological Seminary. She is a founding advisory circle member of *Life Comes From It*, a grantmaking initiative that supports grassroots movement-building projects and organizations for restorative justice, transformative justice, and indigenous peacemaking led by communities of color in the U.S. She is formerly a special education teacher in the District of Columbia (D.C.) Public Schools, the founding director of the *Visions to Peace Project*, and a 2007 Soros Justice Fellow with the Open Society Institute. As a teenager and young adult, Johonna was an award-winning poet.



THALIA GONZÁLEZ

Senior Scholar in the Center on Poverty and Inequality at Georgetown University Law Center (USA)

Thalia González is a nationally recognized interdisciplinary legal scholar who explores contemporary theoretical and empirical questions at the intersection of law, society, inequality and public systems. A core theme within her work is the examination of how restorative justice operates within law and policy to address disproportionality, structural inequality, and systemic harm. She is the principal investigator of a project funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation examining the relationship between school-based restorative practices with girls of color and protective health outcomes. She is also the co-investigator of a project funded by Grantmakers for Girls of Color evaluating how youth-led restorative justice practices may mitigate the impact of school closures due to COVID-19. González's work has been published in top legal and peer-reviewed journals. Her research fields also include race and gender, health equity, social determinants of health, juvenile justice, public interest legal practice, domestic human rights, and education law and policy. González has served as external reviewer for the Department of Justice, national foundations, and numerous high impact journals as well as a consultant for the National Institute of Justice. She currently holds an appointment as a Senior Scholar in the Center on Poverty and Inequality at Georgetown University Law Center and sits on the Advisory Committee for the Restorative Justice Research Institute and the Advisory Board for the Restorative Justice Center at the University of San Diego.



INTERACTIVE DIALOGUES

BIOGRAPHIES OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SPEAKERS

THU 24/6

10-12h



JUAN TAURI

Ngati Porou lecturer in criminology at the University of Waikato (New Zealand)

Juan Tuari is a Ngati Porou lecturer in criminology in the Division of Arts, Social Sciences and Law at the University of Waikato. Juan has carried out research and published on a range of issues, including state responses to Indigenous critique of crime control, the globalisation of restorative justice, the impact of institutional research ethics processes on Indigenous-led research, and Indigenous experiences of crime control policies and interventions in settler colonial contexts.



WILLIAM WOOD

Senior lecturer in criminology and criminal justice at Griffith University (Australia)

William Wood's research includes restorative justice, youth justice and offending, punishment and corrections, and crime and media. William's research on restorative justice (RJ) has focused broadly on three themes: 1) how participants use RJ, 2) the effects of institutionalizing RJ, and 3) existing gaps and problems in RJ claims making. William is the author of numerous journal articles, chapters, and other works on RJ, and his research has appeared in several leading journals including *Justice Quarterly*, *The British Journal of Criminology*, *Social & Legal Studies*, *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *Victims & Offenders*, and *The International Journal of Restorative Justice*. In 2019 William delivered the Annual International Journal of Restorative Justice lecture in Perth Australia, entitled "The Indecent Demands of Accountability for Young People in Restorative Justice." In this work and others, William argues that many of the normative assumptions present in RJ literature and practices have ignored the role and effects of trauma and social marginalisation in the lives of young offenders. William's current work is thus focused on two areas: the effects of institutionalizing RJ, and the intersection of RJ and trauma. Aside from academic research, William has also conducted evaluative and consulting research for governmental and public agencies in Australia. He holds a PhD (Sociology) from Boston College, and an MDiv from Union Theological Seminary in New York City.



PRACTICE & POLICY

PARALLEL PRESENTATIONS

TUE 22/6

14-16h

VIRTUAL
ROOM 1

RJ POLICY DEVELOPMENTS

This panel is dedicated to RJ policies and strategies. Our policy officer will start the panel by giving a short presentation on EFRJ policy strategies as well as on recent RJ policy developments at the EU and at the International level. Most of the panel will then be dedicated to the Restorative Justice: Strategies for Change (RJS4C) project. This is a collaborative project initiated by EFRJ members in 2019 which aims to encourage the development of restorative justice in Europe, inspired by the CoE Rec on RJ (CM/Rec(2018)). It seeks to achieve this by identifying, connecting and supporting a small group of persons – the 'Core Members' – in each participating jurisdiction, whose role it is to develop and implement a co-created strategy with a larger group of policymakers, practitioners, researchers, activists and other relevant, local parties. The project involves ten participating jurisdictions: Albania, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Ireland and Scotland. During the panel we will hear about the developments and the challenges faced in the Czech Republic, Estonia, the Netherlands, Portugal and Scotland. A Q&A session will follow with the participants.

Laidi Surva (EE), Sónia Maria Moreira (PT), Gemma Fraser (Scotland),
Annemieke Wolthuis (NL)

EFRJ team: [Laura Hein](#) & [Petra Masopust Šachová](#)

VIRTUAL
ROOM 2

RJ PRACTICE DEVELOPMENTS

Two EFRJ committees join their forces to facilitate a discussion about the most important values and principles of restorative justice and the barriers that hinder their implementation. The Values and Standards Committee and the Training Committee are both working within the EFRJ to develop access to high-quality restorative justice. In the past two years the Values and Standards Committee has been working on a Manual that identifies the values and standards behind the best practice. The Training Committee has been busy with developing a framework that makes learning about them accessible. In this session the members of these committees invite attendees for a participatory exploration of the European landscape. How do the values and principles prevail in the different contexts? And what challenges emerge from these insights? How can access to high-quality practices further improved?

EFRJ Values & Standards Committee and EFRJ Training Committee

EFRJ team: [Balint Juhasz](#) / [Edit Törzs](#) & [Tim Chapman](#)



EFRJ PROJECTS

PARALLEL PRESENTATIONS

WED 23/6

10-12h

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

LETSGOBYTALKING HATE CRIMES AND RJ

Malini Laxminarayan/ Edit Törzs (EFRJ),
Francesca Bertelli (IT), Mallin Roiha (ES)



I-RESTORE CHILD VICTIMS AND RJ

Marcos de Barros (HU), Mariana Semini (AL),
Katerina Soulou (GR), Emanuela Biffi (EFRJ)



Moderator: Annemieke Wolhuis

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

RE-JUSTICE JUDICIAL TRAINING ON RJ

Silvia Randazzo (EFRJ)



MEDIAREJ TRAINING OF RJ TRAINER

Julia Barjau (EFRJ), Emanuela Biffi (EFRJ)



Moderator: Maia Chochua



EFRJ PROJECTS

PARALLEL PRESENTATIONS

WED 23/6

10-12h - ROOM 1

RJ AND SPECIFIC VICTIMS OF CRIME

Restorative justice, both as a discipline and in practice, has seen substantial growth in the past 30 years. Research has been increasing that examines how this form of conflict resolution can also apply to other, potentially more challenging contexts, for example in serious crimes such as sexual violence and homicide. In both of these instances, the specific context requires a deeper understanding of the complexities and characteristics of these types of crime and the victims involved.

LETSGOBYTALKING HATE CRIMES AND RJ



In cases of hate crimes, the consequences are often more harmful for victims as a result of the link with the violence or harassment against their identity. While restorative justice might give a new tool or approach to deal with these crimes, before applying it to these cases, however, it is important to understand how best to approach victims and offenders of hate crime (including offender motives), the harm they suffered and caused, the root of this behaviour and the impact on larger society of these types of crimes. In order to contribute to our knowledge on restorative justice in cases of anti-LGBT hate crime, an interactive panel will investigate how appropriate RJ may be when the harm committed is against one's identity. The panel will explore the topic more generally, including findings from the LetsGoByTalking project (a multi-country EU project examining RJ in anti-LGBT hate crime cases), in addition to delving into more specific topics such as hate crimes in schools, the role of the police, and good strategies for dealing with this particular group.

Malini Laxminarayan is the EFRJ project officer; she has worked as a researcher on a number of justice-related topics, including restorative justice, transitional justice and gender-based violence. Francesca Bertelli is a Research Fellow at the University of Brescia where she obtained her PhD in Business and Law in 2020; her main research areas are European Private Law and Sustainable Development, fields in which restorative justice may have a lot of potential. Malin Roiha is a researcher at the European Social Research Unit, part of the Department of Social Anthropology of the University of Barcelona; she has previously conducted research related to hate crimes, hate speech, LGBT-phobia, racism and victims' rights.

I-RESTORE CHILD VICTIMS AND RJ



In cases involving child victims, the evolving developmental capacities of children and their individual and social differences (e.g. age, gender, level of education, family background, socio-economic conditions) are to be considered to propose child-focused and child-friendly response to harm and wrongdoing. This applies to all services working with children, including RJ practitioners, who may encourage more creative, innovative and tailor-made processes to engage with children and take into consideration their needs and also their rights within the justice process.

The EFRJ is one of the partners in i-RESTORE, a EU-funded project coordinated by Terre des hommes to better protect child victims rights through RJ. In this panel, some of the researchers will present the main findings of the project, which involved an international board of experts in RJ and children rights as well as national child advisory boards in Albania, Greece and Romania.

Annemieke Wolthuis is the vice-chair of the EFRJ. She engaged in i-RESTORE on behalf of Restorative Justice Nederlands (RJN) together with Malini Laxminarayan (see "LetsGoByTalking"). Emanuela Biffi is the project office on behalf of the EFRJ (not present in the panel because of the general coordination of the symposium). The panel will include also Marcos de Barros (project coordinator of Terre des hommes Hungary), Mariana Semini (researcher and trainer for Terre des hommes Albania) and Katerina Soulou (trainer for Terre des hommes Greece). The Romanian researcher and trainer Cecilia Popa will not be present.



EFRJ PROJECTS

PARALLEL PRESENTATIONS

WED 23/6

10-12h - ROOM 2

RJ AND TRAINING

Over the last years, Europe has seen the development of very different training proposals related to restorative justice. Training may address different type of professionals working in the criminal justice and other relevant fields to receive a basic introduction to RJ to support referrals to RJ services. Other training is more specific for RJ practitioners, focusing on basic and advanced RJ skills development.

RE-JUSTICE JUDICIAL TRAINING



Judges and public prosecutors are important gatekeepers who often have a significant role with respect to access to restorative justice processes. It is thus important that judicial actors are suitably informed about potentials and possibilities of RJ. However, the training of judicial professionals requires a specific approach that takes into account the particular context in which such professionals work. This panel discussion will focus on the specific challenges and peculiarities of training judicial actors on RJ, drawing on experiences from the RE-JUSTICE project. The project aim in fact to provide training on RJ to judges and public prosecutors in Greece, Italy and Spain, where the three Southern EU MS are the actual recipients of the training activities, while Belgium sees the partnership of KU Leuven, the Belgian Institute for Judicial Training (IGO) and Moderator (NGO), that together with the EFRJ and the European Judicial Training Network (EJTN) provide their technical support through the well-established knowledge and capacities on training and implementation of RJ practices. This discussion will highlight some key considerations with respect to providing sustainable judicial training, with emphasis on the direct experiences and perspectives of judges and public prosecutors, on their training needs and their crucial role in an effective application of RJ across Europe.

Silvia Randazzo (EFRJ), Monique Anderson (BE), Ivo Aertsen (BE) and 4 judges from Greece, Italy, Scotland and Spain.

MEDIAREJ TRAINING OF TRAINERS



Given the growth of restorative justice in these past years, there is an immediate need to provide training (basic or advanced) to RJ practitioners as well as to RJ trainers. Across Europe, trainers may be senior practitioners working in a RJ service and/or academics with much experience in active pedagogical teaching programmes. Currently, not much is known on who are these trainers and, more specifically, how to "train the trainers" within the RJ field. What are the RJ trainers' professional and educational backgrounds and what relational and technical skills do they need in their work? Do they belong to any local or national network of trainers, teachers and practitioners in RJ? What are their sources of inspirations? How does a training for RJ trainers look like in terms of methods, format and implementation? The first stage of the Erasmus+ MEDIAREJ project focuses exactly on these questions to attempt to provide guidelines and recommendations for designing training for RJ trainers. This presentation will focus on the findings included in the handbook (a draft will be ready by end June 2021). The discussion will serve as a first feedback on the project results, as the handbook will serve as the basis for designing several activity sheets that will form the contents for a training of RJ trainers.

Julia Barjau and Emanuela Biffi (EFRJ) and other project partners.



WORLD CAFÉ

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE
DURING AND AFTER COVID-19

WED 23/6

14-16h



Photo by Alice Borjgelli on Flickr.com

The COVID-19 pandemic created challenges for all sectors of our societies, including restorative justice services and restorative practitioners.

How did you experience this past year, maybe delivering or participating in a restorative justice encounter online, or even using your skills for restorative-oriented interventions in your community, or simply keeping a restorative attitude in your relations in times of confinement? And how do you look forward to the future? What are your views and ideas for potentially restorative responses to the harms caused by the pandemic and the many lockdowns?

We all have some experiences to share: in different ways, everyone became an expert in responding to the challenges of the pandemic. For this reason, we wish to engage into a discussion with each other, using the world café format facilitated by Ian Marder (Maynooth University, Ireland).

In 2020, under the coordination of Ian, a group of over 60 professionals gathered in virtual discussions to share ideas and concrete practices related to restorative justice and restorative practices in the times of coronavirus. In this two-hour world café, you will have the opportunity to meet others, share your experiences and reflections in small group and plenary conversations, and look forward to the next steps in the field.



EFRJ WORKING GROUPS

PARALLEL DIALOGUES

THU 24/6

14-16h

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

RESTORATIVE CITIES

This 2 hour workshop will use a case study (based on two experiences dealt by two restorative cities, one in Italy and one in the UK) to encourage a discussion over traditional approaches and restorative responses to conflict situations in community contexts. The aim is to reflect about different aspects relevant to develop a restorative strategic action plan; among others: 1) Identification of responsible parties (individuals as "victims"/ "offenders"/ wider community and organisations/ institutions) to be involved in a restorative-oriented response; 2) Encouragement of cross agency cooperation, when more institutions/ services are involved to respond to a certain situation; 3) Proposal of concrete restorative methods to be used with individuals, groups, families, institutions, etc.

The case study is divided in two parts: a general issue within a social housing district and a concrete conflict situation involving young people. Participants will be assigned to random breakout rooms to discuss questions and report to the plenary for the discussion.

On behalf of the EFRJ Working Group on Restorative Cities: Gian Luigi Lepri (IT), Chris Straker (UK), Cristina Vasilescu (IT), Bruna Dighera (IT) Ivo Aertsen (BE), Marian Liebmann (UK), Magdalena Taraszkiewicz (PL), Merita Xhediku (AL).

EFRJ team: Emanuela Biffi/ Julia Barjau & Patrizia Patrizi

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

VIOLENT EXTREMISM

This 2 hour dialogue session will focus around the practice paper "Restorative justice in cases of violent extremism and hate crimes" prepared by our working group of experts (including researchers and practitioners) in the use of restorative justice in cases of violent extremism, polarisation and hate crime. The paper is available all week long in the Exhibition Room (p.35). It addresses RJ practitioners with a set of key questions relevant to identify risks and challenges when proposing restorative justice in cases of violent extremism. It also includes testimonies with the main key-lessons learnt from restorative experiences and research in the field. After a brief presentation of the paper, the working group will welcome feedback and other experiences from the audience.

On behalf of the EFRJ Working Group on Violent Extremism: Joakim Hope Soltveit (NO), Lucy Jaffe (UK), Miriam Attias (FI), Emmanuelle Crane (FR), Graziella Fourez (BE), Katrien Lauwaert (BE), Cheryl Lubin (USA), Roberto Moreno (ES).

EFRJ team: Emanuela Biffi/ Laura Hein & Tim Chapman



EFRJ WORKING GROUPS

PARALLEL DIALOGUES

FRI 25/6

14-16h

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

RESTORATIVE SCHOOLS

Restorative practices are now found in schools across the world. The contribution of the EFRJ's recently established Restorative Schools Working Group will be two sessions operating in tandem. The workshops will be of particular benefit to those with an interest in education/educational policy, social work, law or sociology, yet all attendees are welcome with an interest bringing innovation to the society through its most fundamental institutions, the schools. Session A is for people new to the work in schools. It is aimed at offering a relational experience for participants, modelling the proactive element of restorative practices in schools that may distinguish it from a more responsive justice approach in other spaces. This session would be ideal for anyone new to restorative theory, or those who have experience in an associated field (for example, restorative justice in the criminal sphere). Session B is for those with a more experience of working with restorative practice in schools. The session will explore key themes and challenges to the use of restorative approaches in schools. Both sessions will include illuminating conversation, demonstration of practical restorative approaches and the introduction to an emerging development in education.

On behalf of the EFRJ Working Group on Restorative Schools: Honorata Czajkowska (PL), Nina Wroldsen (NO), Michelle Stowe (IE), Belinda Hopkins (UK), Richard Rhodes (UK), Nino Shatberashvili (GE). **EFRJ team: Bálint Juhász & Maia Chochua**

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

This panel includes two presentations followed by a discussion.

1. Piloting Restorative Approaches to Wildlife crimes in South Africa.

The Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT), under WWF South Africa's Khetha programme, supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), is piloting a project to apply RJ approaches to wildlife crimes. The presentation provides context to wildlife crimes in South Africa, the key activities and objectives of the pilot project and draft case studies of the application of RJ to wildlife crimes.

1. Victims' Voice in Environmental Harm: The Artistic Approach of Restorative Justice in the case of Minamata disease in Japan.

This presentation explores non-verbal ways of expressing the victims' voice through the practice of an artistic approach to restorative justice focusing on post-disaster art activities by victims of Minamata neurological disease. As financial compensation alone cannot heal these wounds, in the 1990s a group of disease patients set up the Hongan no Kai, dealing with spiritual issues through dance, theatre and stone sculpture.

On behalf of the EFRJ Working Group on Environmental Justice: Ashleigh Dore (ZA), Mike Batley (ZA), Orika Komatsubara (JP), Julia Barjau (EFRJ), Ivo Aertsen (BE), Chiara Perini (IT).
EFRJ team: Julia Barjau & Brunilda Pali



PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PARALLEL SESSIONS

TUE 22/6

10-12h

THESE LIVE TWO HOUR (120 MIN) PARALLEL SESSIONS ARE DIVIDED AMONG DIFFERENT AUTHORS, MATCHED (AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE) BY THE CONTENTS OF THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS. EACH SESSION INCLUDES 2 OR 3 CONTRIBUTIONS, EITHER PAPER PRESENTATIONS FOLLOWED BY A Q&A OR DIALOGUES FOR INTERACTIVE DISCUSSIONS WITH CO-AUTHORS AND/OR WITH THE AUDIENCE.

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

1. Restorative justice to rethink the temporality of transition in Chile (Marit de Haan, BE) - 30'
 2. Restorative Justice in Post-Conflict Croatia & Bosnia-Herzegovina (Adriana Michilli, IT) - 30'
 3. Genocide, legal pluralism and traditional justice systems: lessons from Rwanda (Pietro Sullo, UK) - 30'
- EFRJ team: Laura Hein & Petra Masopust Šachová*

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

1. Restorative Cities in Lombardy: Como and Lecco (Elisa Roncoroni, Cristina Vasilescu, Bruna Dighera, IT) - 50'
 2. Restorative Practices in Self-Organized Communities on the City's Edge: a Poetic Account (Di Ponti, DK) - 50'
- EFRJ team: Edit Törzs & Patrizia Patrizi*

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 3

1. Restorative Detention: The Restorative Potential of Custody? (Katherine Doolin, NZ) - 30'
 2. Innovative RJ practices for prisons (Claudia Christen-Schneider, Branka Peuraka, CH-HR) - 30'
 3. From self-restoration to restoration towards the victim in prison (Angele Geerts, Liebrechts, NL) - 30'
- EFRJ team: Silvia Randazzo & Bart Claes*

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 4

1. Restorative Justice Practices within forensic mental health facilities (Mariette van Denderen, Michiel van der Wolf, Sarah Cooper, James Tapp, Finlay Wood, NL-UK) - 50'
 2. Care and restorative justice: a new narrative (Christa Pelikan, Brunilda Pali, AT-BE) - 50'
- EFRJ team: Julia Barjau & Annemieke Wolthuis*



PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PARALLEL SESSIONS

WED 23/6

17-19h

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

1. Intergenerational genocide legacies, cycles of violence, and peacebuilding (Annemiek Richters, RW) - 50'
2. Restoring Culture: Return and Restitution of Cultural Property (Claudia Mazzucato, Arianna Visconti, Alessandro Chechi, IT) - 50'

EFRJ team: Emanuela Biffi & Patrizia Patrizi

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

1. Learning from restorative school experiences: a social mechanism approach (Cristina Vasilescu, Gaia Giombelli, IT) - 50'
2. Developing a 'basic and brief' restorative justice education (Ian Marder, Lindsey Pointer, UK-US) - 50'

EFRJ team: Julia Barjau & Maia Chochua

TWO DIALOGUES & ONE PRESENTATION

VIRTUAL ROOM 3

1. Justice beyond legal borders: the use of restorative justice in civil- and administrative cases (Iris Becx, Nieke Elbers, Antony Pemberton, NL) - 40'
2. Increasing restorative processes and practices in Finnish prison context (Arja Konttila, Riikka Hiitela, FI) - 40'
3. Sustainable resolution of criminal conflicts (Silvina Alonso, Gabriel Fava, AR) - 30'

EFRJ team: Silvia Randazzo & Katerina Soulou



PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PARALLEL SESSIONS

THU 24/6

17-19h

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

1. Restorative justice for Campus-based Sexual Misconduct: Findings from Early Adapters (Sheila McMahon, Kaaren Williamsen, USA) - 30'
2. Restorative justice in historical abuse of children in Spanish catholic schools (Alberto Olalde, ES) - 30'
3. About structural violence and restorative justice (Petronella Boonen, BR) - 30'

EFRJ team: Edit Törzs & Annemieke Wolthuis

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

1. Proximity to Crime: The Capacity and Potential of Community Justice Committees (Michelle Funk, Travis Blaine, CA) - 50'
2. Is There a Place for Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System? (Elena Belonogova, Lyudmila Karnozova, Anton Konovalov, Natalia Putintseva, Rimma Chirkina, Olga Kiseleva, RU) - 50'

EFRJ team: Emanuela Biffi/ Malini Laxminarayan & Maia Chochua

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 3

1. The position of victims during enforcement of prison sentence (Andrea Vogelsberger, NL) - 30'
2. Removing Boundaries in RJ Institutions: Creating Space for Ex-Prisoner Leadership (Allely Albert, UK) - 30'

EFRJ team: Laura Hein & Bart Claes

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 4

1. Introducing a General Alternative Measures Program for Adults in Quebec (Vicky Brassard, Alexandre Béland Ouellette, CA) - 30'
2. The positive project as a reconstructed narrative of the offence (Stefaan Viaene, Ruben Vandersteen, Ibe Coeck, BE) - 30'
3. Undoing crime by (un)doing time: A second chance for victims and offenders (Hendrik Kaptein, NL) - 30'

EFRJ team: Silvia Randazzo & Lars Otto Justad



PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PARALLEL SESSIONS

FRI 25/6

10-12h

PRESENTATIONS

VIRTUAL ROOM 1

1. The applicability of the RJ approach in case of domestic violence incidents (Gabor Hera, Dori Szego, HU) - 30'
2. Human Rights and Family's Honor. Lessons from Restorative Justice Practices (Clara Rigoni, DE) - 30'
3. RJ in drug addiction - narratives, dreams and expectations (Alexia Stourati, GR) - 30'

EFRJ team: Emanuela Biffi/ Malini Laxminarayan & Annemieke Wolthuis

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 2

1. Restorative Storytelling (Nicola Preston, UK) - 50'
2. Philosophy towards Restorative Justice. Two signposts from the Italian debate (Federico Reggio, IT) - 50'

EFRJ team: Julia Barjau & Katerina Soulou

DIALOGUES

VIRTUAL ROOM 3

1. Project 'Samenspraak' on restorative dialogue groups (Joke De Clercq, Hilde Vanlommel, BE) - 50'
2. How to reduce the distance between prisoners and society in times of social distancing and with physical walls between them? (Evert Kampert, Manon van Dooren, NL) - 50'

EFRJ team: Balint Juhasz & Lars Otto Justad



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 22/6 10-12H ROOM 1

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE TO RETHINK THE TEMPORALITY OF TRANSITION IN CHILE

Marit de Haan, BE – Doctoral researcher at Ghent University

This presentation proposes an alternative framework to think about temporalities in transition, building on insights from the RJ field. Almost as soon as post-conflict studies became a prominent field of study, the notion of 'post' was problematized for implying a clean break between times of war and times of peace. The field of transitional justice has been more careful in assuming such a clean break, proposing a more elongated understanding of how change unfolds in societies emerging from conflict. However, also transitional justice has been criticized for its short-term orientation, focus on 'quick fixes' and its assumption of linear progress towards a liberal ideal. Scholars have argued that a more complex and multi-layered understanding of temporalities is needed that better accommodates the temporal messiness of transitions, including their overlapping temporalities, non-linearity, ongoingness, and circularity. These critiques, however, have not yet resulted in a systematic proposal for rethinking transitional temporalities. Some of the most paradigmatic cases of 'finished' transitional justice processes today seem to raise questions on whether transitions can be understood as delimited in time. Chile is one such case. Considering the expressed needs of victims of human rights violations committed during the military dictatorship and the demands of protesters today suggests that, indeed, the past continues to bear upon the present and the transition is far from 'over'. The case of Chile illustrates some of the complex temporal dynamics of transition and demonstrate what a different temporal lens could mean for such cases of un/finished transition. The proposed conceptual framework challenges transitional justice interventions to embrace multi-layeredness and multi-directionality, in order to be fully responsive to victims' experiences, realities, and understandings of time.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN POST-CONFLICT CROATIA & BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

Adriana Michilli, IT – PhD Fellow at the University of Padua, Human Rights Centre

This presentation focuses on the application of RJ to the post-conflict societies of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina. It argues that while there are social indicators reflecting the need for RJ, it is not the only viable solution for peacebuilding. The theoretical framework uses criminological theories on RJ, its application to mass-crimes as well as perspectives from transitional justice to best under its role in furthering societal peace in the wake of a war. Other sociological theories are also integrated in order to best understand if variant forms of noxious collective memory norms and negative peace processes have been impairing the success rate such RJ programs within the host country societies. Following 45 interviews with two samples including international experts on RJ and civil society, the results of the study indicate that there is space for RJ, yet it is preferred through a hybrid approach (whereby tenets of retributive justice such as trials are intersected in tandem with other RJ instruments). In specific, truth and reconciliation commissions and commissions of inquiry and reparations were outlined as the tertiary measures stated by both samples possessing the capacity to effectuate sustainable peacebuilding efforts within the countries. The findings of this study contribute to nuanced discussions in the field of criminology currently researching the enhanced benefits of utilizing hybrid models when dealing with justice for war crimes and other forms of gross human rights violations.

GENOCIDE, LEGAL PLURALISM AND TRADITIONAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS: LESSONS FROM RWANDA

Pietro Sullo, UK – Reader in international law at Brunel University in London (as from Sept. 2021)

Experiments with post-genocide justice are frequently characterized by extensive impunity, retributive approaches, poor focus on victims' needs and a lack creative restorative solutions. The challenges that genocide has posed for societies willing to cope with its legacy are summarized by Hannah Arendt who argued that radical evil 'exploded the limits of the law'. Later, Giorgio Agamben has confirmed this trend by highlighting that 'it has taken almost half a century to understand that the law did not exhaust the problem [of Auschwitz], but rather that very problem was so enormous as to call into question the law itself, dragging it to its own ruin'. Hence, criminal justice has not been able to address the multitude of challenges genocide and the mass victimization it implies poses. The starting point of my research is Mark Drumbl's idea that because 'every genocide is unique', context-sensitive responses to genocide should be searched, without exclusively relying on perpetrator-focused solutions. Post-genocide Rwanda has provided the possibility to test Drumbl's theory thanks to an experiment centered on legal pluralism characterized by community-based courts called Inkiko Gacaca. The latter were marked by the presence of lay elected judges, lack of defence lawyer, extensive dialogue opportunities for victim and perpetrator and the direct involvement of local communities in the attempt to deal with the genocide. Relying both on doctrinal and field research in Rwanda, I discuss lessons learnt drawn from the gacaca experiment useful for contexts where the adoption of traditional, culturally rooted and/or informal justice patterns may lead to more inclusive and victim-focused restorative solutions.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 22/6 10-12H ROOM 2

RESTORATIVE CITIES IN LOMBARDY: COMO AND LECCO

Elisa Roncoroni, IT – Social educator in the cooperative Lotta

Cristina Vasilescu, IT – Researcher and public policy evaluator at the Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale

Bruna Dighera, IT – Psychologist and psychotherapist from Lecco Restorative City

This session discusses two experiences of restorative justice implemented in the region Lombardy (Italy), particularly in the towns of Como and Lecco: ConTatto project, implemented in the province of Como, and The Unnamed, implemented in the province of Lecco. The two projects aim to promote a restorative community, by increasing awareness on, providing training on and delivering restorative justice interventions in various settings (neighbourhoods, schools, local social services, justice institutions). Both projects are implemented through public-private partnerships between local actors (e.g. judicial offices, lawyers, prison and rehabilitation services, municipalities, schools, volunteering associations and other not for profit organisations, churches and citizens) and foresee citizens' active participation in the design and delivery of restorative justice interventions. The two projects use various restorative tools and practices (e.g. circles, restorative corners, restorative libraries, intermediary bodies, community restorative justice dialogues, restorative stories), some of which will be presented and discussed during the dialogue.

RESTORATIVE PRACTICES IN SELF-ORGANIZED COMMUNITIES ON THE CITY'S EDGE: A POETIC ACCOUNT

Di Ponti, DK – Activist, social worker and circle facilitator

This testimonial is a personal account of engaging in, struggling with and facilitating restorative practices and principles (mainly inspired by restorative circles) in political, radical, dissident grassroots communities in and around Copenhagen. In a poetic and performed reading, Di will tell about the Restorative Practices on the City's Edge in the free-town Christiania, the activist community center Folkets Hus, the boat-squat Peace Harbor, and the environmental and cultural countryside factory Makværket. "I will tell how we hold onto dialogue even in the face of drug-dealer threats, upper-class angry neighbors, working-class scared neighbors, eviction, autocratic lawyers and internal negotiations of relational borders for all genders, colors, educations, nationalities and ages. I will tell about the restorative resources in place, the straightforwardness and the general assemblies that create a community-wide dialogue in Christiania; the dedication to a flat structure and an openness to very diverse activist groups at Folkets Hus; the nothing-left-to-lose strength of clear-minded and collaborative (even with 'arrogant' ministers and the police) outcasts at the Peace Harbor; and the friendship-based builders of huge projects that keep a caring tone and restorative formal structures, year after year, at Makværket. I will tell about our circles, our meetings, our structures, our codes, our languages. I will tell about when all of this works and we thrive, and when we lose ground and need support, to keep the dedication, to keep the dream, and to keep, now and always, on learning how to take care of ourselves and of each other."



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 22/6 10-12H ROOM 3

RESTORATIVE DETENTION: THE RESTORATIVE POTENTIAL OF CUSTODY?

Katherine Doolin, NZ – Senior Lecturer at the University of Auckland

The presentation examines the extent to which prison is an appropriate and effective 'space' in which restorative processes should be utilised. In assessing the restorative potential of custody, Katherine argues that consideration needs to be given to both micro and macro level issues. At the micro level, the presenter considers the use of restorative justice in prison from the perspectives of victims and offenders, paying particular attention to their vulnerabilities and capacities when participating in restorative processes within the coercive and often oppressive space that prison occupies. Katherine presents findings from a case study of a victim of serious crime who took part in a restorative justice meeting with one of her offenders in prison. Her words help us to explore the motivations of, the gains and risks for, and the impact on, victims who take part in restorative processes in prison and to consider the ways in which the restorativeness of such encounters may be affected by the space in which it takes place – the prison. At the macro level, the presenter raises broader concerns that stem from the seemingly contradictory concepts of 'restorative' and 'detention'. First, there is the inherent political danger in making a custodial sentence seem beneficial running the risk that restorative justice in prison may legitimise, rather than discourage, the use of imprisonment. Secondly, there is the concern that restorative justice initiatives could be subsumed within the coercive and punitive framework of prison, thereby reducing their restorative potential. Drawing on the work of Ben Crewe et al. (2013) on the emotional geography of prison life, consideration is given to whether prison culture overrides and reduces the restorative potential of custody, or whether there are emotional spaces within prison where restorative justice could find sanctuary. The author concludes that by creating the space for restorative detention there is an opportunity to re-imagine and re-shape custody, but that this should only be done where steps have been taken to mitigate the risks to, and provide appropriate support for, victims and offenders taking part in restorative processes in prison; where it can be ensured that processes maintain their restorative potential; and that doing so does not distract from the aim of reducing imprisonment.

INNOVATIVE RJ PRACTICES FOR PRISONS

Claudia Christen-Schneider, CH – President of the Swiss RJ Forum

Branka Peuraka, HR – PhD candidate in Social Work and Social Policy at the University of Zagreb

This In some countries, RJ is introduced and implemented as part of a comprehensive set of policies to reform the criminal justice system and social services. In others, practitioners need to start experimenting and creating new knowledge by implementing pilot projects carried out by institutions open to innovation. Thus, much time often needs to be spent on negotiation, awareness-raising and capacity building within host institutions (prisons or correctional facilities). Without established mechanisms, communication and cooperation are depending on personal relationships of trust established between RJ practitioners and the heads of institutions during this process. Practitioners often work in isolation, without resources for networking and learning from each other, or to join forces in lobbying and policymaking, and therefore unable to maximise the benefits of these new approaches. The experiences from these innovative experiments must first be communicated to the stakeholders and then incorporated into new policies so that they can be used by other practitioners in other institutions. Two cases will be presented to begin the discussion on what we can do about it. Claudia will describe how implementing restorative dialogues between victims and offenders of similar, serious crimes contributed to RJ becoming slowly known and recognized in Swiss prisons. Branka will outline how restorative justice was introduced in a Croatian prison as a form of promoting prisoners' active citizenship. The discussion may lead to new ideas about cooperation and exchange to influence policies and systems in different countries.

FROM SELF-RESTORATION TO RESTORATION TOWARDS THE VICTIM IN PRISON

Angele Geerts, NL – Researcher at the Center of expertise for Public safety and Criminal Justice

Restorative justice practices in prisons focus on (1) restoration of the prisoner (self-restoration), (2) restoration in/with the social network, (3) restoration in/with the victim(s) and (4) restoration towards the community. Self-restoration for the prisoner is the unique process of changing their attitudes, values, feelings, goals, competencies and roles. It is about leading a satisfying and meaningful life despite the limitations the prisoner faces. By focusing on self-restoration, the prisoner is invited to reflect on the consequences of his behaviour, also towards the victim. Professionals in the Dutch Prison of Dordrecht enable prisoners in this process from self-restoration towards restoration of the harm caused to the victim. This discussion focuses on the importance of self-restoration of prisoners as process to restoration towards the victim on the individual level, and a more victim oriented prison and professionals on the structural level. It will address how self-restoration and a victim-oriented approach can be included in the detention plan and reintegration. Also, attention is paid on how professionals can address these topics and work restoratively.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 22/6 10-12H ROOM 4

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES WITHIN FORENSIC MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

Mariette van Denderen, NL – Researcher at the Forensic Psychiatric Centre Dr. S. van Mesdag
Michiel van der Wolf, NL – Professor of forensic psychiatry at Leiden University
Sarah Cooper, UK – Forensic psychologist at Kent and Medway NHS and Social Care Partnership Trust
James Tapp, UK – Teacher at Kingston University and research psychologist at Broadmoor Hospital
Finlay Wood, UK – RJ practitioner in forensic mental health with South London and Maudsley NHS Trust

This discussion is on how restorative justice can be conceived and practiced in forensic mental health settings, focusing on developments in RJ practices in institutions in the Netherlands and the UK. From the Netherlands, two studies from the high security setting Van Mesdag in Groningen will be presented. The first study is an evaluation of the effects of an 8-week victim awareness program for mentally disordered offenders. This program has shown positive effects in prisons and it was adapted for forensic mental health. The evaluation tests if the programme has positive effects on how mentally disordered offenders view and handle their negative emotions, thoughts and experiences, and on their compassion towards themselves and others. In the second study, the authors performed a qualitative evaluation of meetings between mentally disordered offenders and their victim (e.g. what did victim and offender gained from meeting each other, and how did meeting each other helped with coping with the offense?). The results can be used to discuss if and how RJ practices can benefit mentally disordered offenders and their victims.

From the UK, the three initiatives presented take place in different clinics. One from Broadmoor Hospital aimed at building the evidence base on how decisions on RJ practices (RJP) are made about complex cases. The study investigated factors that influence clinical decision making about the use of RJP with forensic patients. The objective was to understand what individual and contextual factors and implicit knowledge forensic mental health professionals used to inform their decision to support a referral for RJP. The second case concerns the approach to introducing, developing and embedding RJP in one large mental health trust in South London, where there is a temporary post for a RJ practitioner within the forensic mental health pathway. This has enabled the service to focus on developing a multi-layered and integrated approach to raising staff and service user awareness of the benefits of RJP and to responding to the growing requests for interventions. The last case from a forensic mental health trust in Kent and Medway is about how restorative practices were embedded into ward culture, with all staff trained and supervised in the delivery of less formalised restorative practices. Findings from a pilot study are shared, revealing the impact of more holistic restorative working within the service.

CARE AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE: A NEW NARRATIVE

Christa Pelikan, AT – Researcher/advisor at the Institute for the Sociology of Law and Criminology in Vienna
Brunilda Pali, BE – Post-doctoral researcher at the KU Leuven Institute for Criminology

The concept of 'care', while being very old, has received particularly attention in the last decades. For example, about half a year ago an exhibition and a series of films in the Architekturzentrum Wien about Critical Care and Sorgetragen drew attention to a worldwide trend of projects based on a 'caring approach' architecture and in urban and rural planning. The close connection of this caring architecture to questions of ecology and to participation becomes immediately evident.

Another way of thinking about care is in terms of a socio-economic category, both as it relates to production and reproduction. Especially interesting is the relationships between material provision and care in the context of family and maintenance law, especially the relations of dependency that they create. In 'Contradiction of Capital and Care' (2016), Nancy Fraser presented an analysis of the more recent developments that come under the name of the 'crisis of care', which should also be taken into consideration when talking about the heightened importance of care.

In fact, care is close and kin to RJ. Starting from Christopher Marshall's editorial 'Justice as Care' in the International Journal of Restorative justice, and Carol Gilligan's 'Ethics of Care', the authors will unpack the multiple intersections of this concept and RJ. By resorting to the concept of 'recognition' used by Jessica Benjamin they put forward the idea that 'care' emanates from recognition. Since recognition – according to Benjamin's thinking – contains also the prospect of overcoming the opposition between master and slave, it may be possible in this way also arrive at the goal of repelling domination.

The dialogue would like to tease out the meanings of this for the relationship of care and RJ. Two aspects in particular blend together: 1. care as an attitude that can be used as a guideline for the construction and for the delivery of restorative justice, 2. part of a 'restorative outcome' consider the re-establishment of living and working conditions that allow for the provision of care – without creating additional dependency.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 23/6 17-19H ROOM 1

INTERGENERATIONAL GENOCIDE LEGACIES, CYCLES OF VIOLENCE AND PEACEBUILDING

Annemiek Richters, RW – Emeritus professor at Leiden University Medical Center

How are 'the generations after' marked by the genocide their (grand)parents experienced as either survivors or perpetrators and how does that generation respond to the memories transmitted to them at family, community and national level in terms of either peacebuilders or potential trouble-makers? What can be done to achieve a process of 'remembering forwards' that contributes to breaking through cycles of violence and restoring the future? These themes will be discussed with reference to post-genocide Rwanda where the government installed a range of transitional justice mechanisms aimed at the social reconstruction of society, including country-wide community justice courts to halt the impunity that had played a mediating role in previous episodes of violence, a wide range of memorialization activities, and initiatives specifically aimed at trauma healing and reconciliation. Young people are considered as the generation per excellence to take responsibility to secure peace and are engaged accordingly in a range of activities to prepare them for this task. However, they may get genocide memories transmitted in the familial sphere that provoke a pro-violent instead of reconciliatory attitude among them. One of the objectives of community-based sociotherapy Rwanda, to be considered as a psychosocial peacebuilding program, is to redirect this kind of transmission. The relevance of such program will be illustrated with research findings and through reference to intergenerational legacies of genocide and other forms of mass violence exercised elsewhere in the world in the recent and distant past, for example in Belgium, the Ottoman Empire, Indonesia, Cambodia, Bosnia and Syria.

RESTORING CULTURE: RETURN AND RESTITUTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY

Arianna Visconti, IT – Assistant Professor of Criminal Law / Law & Arts in the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Alessandro Chechi, CH – Senior Researcher at the University of Geneva

Claudia Mazzucato, IT – Associate Professor of Criminal Law in the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore

Restoring culture beyond borders, including the frontiers of history, memory, ethnicity and the dividing lines created by collective violence, dictatorships, oppression. This, in brief, is the core topic proposed for this discussion. Issues of return, restitution and repatriation of cultural objects are becoming more and more relevant in the political agenda of States and international organizations. Recent initiatives such as the French Savoy-Sarr Report on African Art Restitution highlight the repatriation of cultural property 'unjustly' taken away from its country of origin as a way to restore not only cultural heritage which were looted under colonial occupation or in wartime, but also cultural, political, economic and social relationships between peoples. From a 'traditional' legal perspective, however, restitution requests pose 'thorny' issues, due to the many problems related to differences in national legal frameworks and changes in law through time, difficulties in gathering evidence, lack of active legitimation to give back or of passive legitimation to receive, time limitations, etc. Thus, interested parties have been referring more and more to Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) as a way to find 'creative' solutions to complex questions. But, particularly in all cases where old conflicts are in the background, simple ADR will not be able to address deep cultural, identity, historical and political issues. The need for a cross-pollination between ADR and Restorative Justice approaches will be explored in this Session, paving the way to new developments in the settlement of international cultural heritage disputes and reconciliation of long-standing 'cultural' conflicts.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 23/6 17-19H ROOM 2

LEARNING FROM RESTORATIVE SCHOOL EXPERIENCES: A SOCIAL MECHANISM APPROACH

Cristina Vasilescu, IT – Researcher and public policy evaluator at the Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale

Gaia Giombelli, IT – Researcher at the Istituto per la Ricerca Sociale

Restorative justice encompasses non-punitive and relation-centred processes that bring people together to address and repair harm through dialogue and mutual agreement. RJ has been used in various settings to provide solutions to complex problems. In educational settings, RJ approaches have received an increasing interest due to their potential for addressing climate, culture and safety aspects. RJ practices in schools have been used extensively in Northern America, UK, Australia, New Zealand and Northern Europe. Drawing on the review of the evaluation literature of RJ practices in schools, the authors reflect on social mechanisms that favour the effectiveness of their design and implementation in educational settings. The paper will focus on a particular type of mechanisms, i.e. those triggering lasting changes in actors' behaviours (e.g., sticks and carrots, reputation, bandwagon, peer pressure, etc.), and refer to the mechanism approach. This approach has been used to reconstruct the linkages between the complex elements composing a public intervention (actors, intervention features, processes) and its context, providing learning on what works in policymaking, for whom and under which circumstances. The goal of this approach is to provide policymakers with learning from secondary experiences, allowing for 'disciplined and ingenious extrapolation of practices from source to 'target sites'' (Barzelay, 2007). The adoption of this approach will allow the authors to unveil the 'black box' of RJ practices in schools to enhance knowledge on how to build effective restorative schools.

DEVELOPING A 'BASIC AND BRIEF' RESTORATIVE JUSTICE EDUCATION

Ian Marder, IE – Lecturer in criminology at Maynooth University

Lindsey Pointer, US – Assistant Director of the National Center on Restorative Justice at Vermont Law School

Restorative justice is increasingly taught to students of law, criminology and other fields at universities worldwide. However, most students still do not receive instruction in restorative justice, and its scholars seldom collaborate in relation to their university teaching. This session aims to enhance RJ education by discussing the optimal purpose and content of a two-hour introduction to restorative justice. This discussion will build on recent developments, including a series of roundtables organised by Dr. Ian Marder and UNODC in 2020, a 2020 book on teaching and training in restorative justice by Dr. Lindsey Pointer, and a proposal by Prof. David Wexler for a 'basic and brief' education in therapeutic jurisprudence that can be delivered by non-experts. The insights shared by dialogue participants will be used to create a 2-hour introduction to restorative justice session that will be freely distributed, and that can be delivered by non-experts.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 23/6 17-19H ROOM 3

JUSTICE BEYOND LEGAL BORDERS: THE USE OF RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN CIVIL- AND ADMINISTRATIVE CASES

Iris Becx, NL – PhD candidate at VU University Amsterdam and NSCR

Nieke Elbers, NL – Postdoctoral researcher at the VU University Amsterdam and NSCR

Antony Pemberton, BE – Professor of restorative justice at the KU Leuven Institute of Criminology

As both research and practice have shown, RJ is not only applicable in the context of crime. Three presenters will venture into the use of RJ in civil law and administrative law in the Netherlands. First, Nieke will present the results of a study looking into the extent in which RJ can be applied outside civil law and administrative law in the Netherlands. A literature study was conducted and 11 interviews with professionals have been held. According to the interviewees, RJ is desirable in civil and administrative law, as RJ addresses immaterial needs of litigants, which more traditional legal procedures do not. Several practical cases, code of conducts and initiatives will be discussed. Second, Iris will tie into the use of RJ in a civil law context, in general, and on the topic of motor vehicle accidents, in specific. She will elaborate on the theoretical notions on the use of RJ in civil law by discussing the theory of therapeutic justice and the Comprehensive Law Movement. Furthermore, she will discuss several initiatives promoting RJ for victims and offenders in motor vehicle accidents in The Netherlands. One of the initiatives is 'Contact', an online platform with podcasts, in which victims and offenders talk about their experiences with having contact with the other person. These podcasts aim to encourage both victims and offenders of motor vehicle accidents to connect with each other with the purpose to restore harm and conflict. Third, Antony will address the use of RJ after a medical incident. A medical incident, calamity or error, is a victimizing experience, not only for the involved patient and their family, but also for the responsible health care professional. In the Netherlands, patients and health care professionals are encouraged to participate in an independent dispute resolution procedure to (re)establish the dialogue between patient and health care after a medical incident. Such dispute resolution procedure is aimed to be restorative. The experiences of victims and health care professionals in medical dispute cases after participating in a dispute resolution committee meeting will be presented.

INCREASING RESTORATIVE PROCESSES AND PRACTICES IN FINNISH PRISON CONTEXT

Arja Konttila, FI – Senior coordinator and expert in restorative practices in the Criminal Sanctions Agency

Riikka Hiitela, FI – Mediation advisor and deputy director in Länsi-Uusimaa Mediation Office

This presentation shares the experiences and challenges of establishing the practices of the Finnish project 'RJ in Serious Crimes'. The practices of the project are as followed: 1. Restorative dialogue (between the victim or relatives and the offender; between offenders and their family members; between offenders); 2. Establish restorative wards in prisons. The project was launched in 2013 at the initiative of the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Social Affairs and Health. Since 2019, the project has been implemented and funded in cooperation with the Criminal Sanctions Agency and Vuolle Settlement. Prisons have been informed about the possibility to take part in these restorative processes and restorative coordinators have been trained for every prison and community sanctions offices. Two restorative prison wards have been established, in 2016 and 2020. About 180 initiatives have been received and over 70 encounters have been taken place. The documentary 'Eye to Eye' (available in the exhibition room), by awarded producer and filmmaker John Webster, visualizes the meaning of these restorative processes and dialogues, i.e. 'to unlock the trauma and begin the process of grieving', as the family members of the victims have said after meeting the offender.

SUSTAINABLE RESOLUTION OF CRIMINAL CONFLICTS

Silvina Alonso, AR – Lawyer at the University of Buenos Aires

Gabriel Fava, AR – Professor at the Law School of University of Buenos Aires

A sustainable resolution to crime intends to educate the individuals involved in playing a role in transforming their conflict. Indeed, crime is not only a violation of the criminal legal system but a much more complex and multi-dimensional phenomenon involving the victim, the perpetrator and the community. This vision makes it possible to introduce new tools for a transformative resolution that does not exhaust itself in the mere imposition of a penalty. The adoption of a sustainable conflict resolution is to be integrated with a socio-restorative perspective. The resolution of criminal conflicts focuses on each specific case and its different variables, inviting a closer look at the individual features of each party. One of the tools that allow such integral approach is the use of 'conflict mapping', which is an analytical task of getting close to the disruptive scenario, like using a magnifying glass on an image to observe the smallest details. Other important elements are the resilience, the impermanence principle and the transformation of the conflicts. The study of the context of each conflict, its actors, particularities and an approach through the design of a matrix covers four temporal axes: retrospective, passive, projective and sustainable.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 24/6 17-19H ROOM 1

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FOR CAMPUS-BASED SEXUAL MISCONDUCT: FINDINGS FROM EARLY ADAPTERS

Sheila McMahon, US – Assistant Professor at the Barry University School of Social Work in Miami Shores
Kaaren Williamsen, US – Director of the Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Center, University of Michigan

In the U.S., complex laws that govern the adjudication of campus sexual misconduct cases have changed and now allow for restorative justice as a tool for responding to this form of violence. Thus, this qualitative study reports on feedback from 8 early adapters of the use of RJ to address incidents of sexual harms on campuses. These RJ leaders share insights about the conditions needed for implementation, implementation challenges, best practices, and recommendations for campuses considering adoption of RJ for sexual misconduct cases. These insights also raise key considerations about the role of restorative justice in the context of quasi-judicial campus conduct policies that rely on the carceral state for legitimacy. RJ implementers may find themselves struggling to implement a 'power-with' process in a 'power-over' structure that challenges, limits, or actively obstructs the healing and empowerment foci of restorative justice processes. The authors seek feedback from European counterparts regarding strategies to resist co-optation and create meaningful support and accountability for RJ participants in the aftermath of sexual harms.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN HISTORICAL ABUSE OF CHILDREN IN SPANISH CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Alberto Olalde, ES – Lecturer of Social Work at the University of Basque Country

Five years ago, Alberto began to facilitate RJ processes in victimization related to historical abuse (sexual, power, consciousness) of children in Spanish Catholic Schools. In terms of numbers, the experience is too small (nine processes) but qualitatively it is great and deep. Victims have started to talk for the first time many years later (around 40), they feel that they need to talk, express their pain, recover a sense of justice, and feel 'repaired' not exclusively with economical compensation. They often want to confront perpetrators directly and ask them to recognize the pain they caused or they want to talk to different people about what happened (teachers, school directors, priests, representatives of the catholic order) This humble experience is value-based and endeavors to embrace different restorative outcomes. We wonder, what is a good restorative outcome? What are the needs of the victims? What type of narratives do the victims express? What criteria are important for facilitators when preparing the restorative processes? What kind of connection must be made between therapy and restorative practice? Alberto will try to reflect and give answers to these questions.

ABOUT STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Petronella Boonen, BR – Project coordinator at the Center for Human Right and Education in São Paulo

This presentation will highlight crucial points to develop and implement restorative justice in countries with excessive incarceration rates, structural inequality, and violence, such as Brazil. A possible way to deal with these matters is to bring restorative practices inside courts and interact with a broader network of the criminal and communitarian systems. This approach suggests drawing attention to the underlying structures which perpetuates the violence. This must be addressed since the very first meeting with victims, accused and their communities. New questions are needed to be created to enable the stakeholders to reflect critically upon their social environment, history, personal and social traumas, as well as the dominant thinking about race, class and gender which make us socially blind and conformed to the mainstream status quo. By extending the restorative approach, the restorative responses will also be enlarged and in the near future, overcome some of the structural violence.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 24/6 17-19H ROOM 2

PROXIMITY TO CRIME: THE CAPACITY AND POTENTIAL OF COMMUNITY JUSTICE COMMITTEES

Michelle Funk, CA – Restorative justice facilitator and trained mediator

Travis Blaine, CA – Facilitator for interpersonal conflict resolution and mediation skills

In Manitoba, Community Justice Committees (CJCs) have been utilized since the 1970's. Committee members are volunteers that receive referrals from Police and Crown Attorneys for crimes that occur in their communities. The government provides funding, however committee members are given a lot of latitude when deciding how cases are handled. Committees are connected to, yet work quite independently from the traditional justice system. CJCs answer two major challenges that exist in Canada's criminal justice system: the considerable time between when the crime occurs, and the offender is sentenced and; the proximity of Court to the offender and the victim(s) involved. CJCs are ideally used for groups of people and areas typically underserved by the traditional criminal justice system including: rural areas; economically challenged areas; and areas with newcomers who come with different languages, culture and values. Covid-19 has magnified the need for CJCs, as travel restrictions have been implemented, as well as participation in Court proceedings has been limited. CJCs have been able to continue operating, with proper safety measures, as they operate within their Community, with local volunteers, and have more flexible availability. Facilitators in this dialogue session will provide a brief description of how CJCs are utilized in their area and then pose questions to the audience that are designed to get the participants thinking about the feasibility of setting up CJCs in their area (e.g. What current funding opportunities for justice/restorative justice are available in your region? Is there a gap in your local criminal justice system that CJCs can help fill? Which specific communities/criminal offences can CJCs be best utilized for in your area? Can CJCs increase the efficiency and effectiveness of your local criminal justice system? Being mindful of restorative principles, brainstorm the benefits of CJCs for victims, offenders and communities).

IS THERE A PLACE FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM?

Elena Belonogova, Lyudmila Karnozova, Olga Kiseleva, and Anton Konovalov, RU – Members of the Public Center for Legal and Judicial Reform

Rimma Chirkina, RU – Associate Professor of the Moscow State University for Psychology and Education

Natalia Putintseva, RU – Social pedagogue of the Moscow Center for Psychology and Education

Application of RJ in different spheres is effective, and still the majority of the RJ skepticism comes from legal professionals objecting the RJ implementation in criminal justice systems. At the same time criminal justice systems tend to be very responsive to criticism from the RJ point of view: criminal justice perceives RJ ideas as a reduction or a waiver of a penalty in exchange for repairing harm and victim rights protection while neglecting other RJ key characteristics such as stakeholder's participation, dialogue, reaching mutual understanding, healing. Translation into a legal language enables criminal justice authorities to claim that the already existing institutions correspond to the RJ principles. Evidently, this is much more convenient than creating a genuine RJ infrastructure. All this impedes the promotion of the adequate legislation in Russia. In 20 years, in some of the Russian regions, RJ in juvenile cases succeeded to emerge and can become a good prototype for the RJ development in other Russian regions. Absence of the legal framework precludes consolidation and dissemination of such experience in the country. It is clear that the adoption of a law without any effective organisational models will not lead to a positive result. The authors would like to give concrete examples demonstrating the stated problem (including the criticism of the Russian criminal justice authorities presented in their reviews of the recent draft law on reconciliation in criminal matters). RJ has been developing as an alternative response to a crime but criminal justice remains the most challenging area of the RJ realization. This problem tends to overcome the boundaries of one state so the authors would like to discuss its relevance and possible RJ developments in this sphere with the researchers and practitioners from other countries.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 24/6 17-19H ROOM 3

THE POSITION OF VICTIMS DURING ENFORCEMENT OF PRISON SENTENCE

Andrea Vogelsberger, NL – Policy advisor at the Custodial Institutions Agency, Department of Justice & Safety

This presentation will look at recent legislation and development on restorative practices in Dutch prisons regarding the position of the victim during the enforcement of prison sentence. First, it will present the development of victim rights and the position of victims during execution of sentence in the Netherlands and look at restorative activities and practices in Dutch prisons to support prisoners to work on recovery with victims, their social network and society. In the second part of the presentation, participants will be invited to share and exchange experiences and discuss about challenges and dilemmas of practitioners: How do you prepare and facilitate practitioners/professionals? How to deal with taboos? How do you create awareness and confidence of professionals and what are the necessary tools and skills? How to prepare and motivate prisoners and create checks and balances to prevent false motivation?

REMOVING BOUNDARIES IN RJ INSTITUTIONS: CREATING SPACE FOR EX-PRISONER LEADERSHIP

Allely Albert, UK – PhD candidate at the School of Law at Queen's University Belfast

While prisoners and ex-prisoners are often included as participants within restorative settings, they are generally absent from positions of leadership within restorative organizations. Indeed, although RJ literature is rich in research concerning their role as 'offenders' within restorative systems, less is understood about the ramifications of their involvement through management positions. This paper explores models that create space for ex-prisoner leadership, analyzing how such inclusion impacts the larger restorative process. Using examples of community-based RJ in Northern Ireland in particular, the author argues that by transcending barriers to ex-prisoner agency, and including former combatants and ex-prisoners as RJ practitioners, both the micro-dynamics of restorative processes as well as the mechanisms involved in wider societal peacebuilding can be enhanced. Ex-prisoner practitioners provide important functions for their organizations, bringing unique skills and qualifications, presenting a distinct type of credibility, and generating exceptionally supportive environments for restorative encounters. Moreover, their assumption of leadership roles can engender mechanisms contained within self-help ideology that promote desistance and facilitate successful reentry processes. As such, the author contends that incorporating ex-prisoners into leadership positions not only helps provide a place for formerly incarcerated individuals, but that it additionally creates improved settings for restorative processes. Consequently, this research highlights the need for the RJ community to create space for ex-prisoner leadership within restorative institutions so that society may profit from the multilateral benefits of their contributions.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 24/6 17-19H ROOM 4

INTRODUCING A GENERAL ALTERNATIVE MEASURES PROGRAM FOR ADULTS IN QUEBEC

Vicky Brassard, CA – PhD candidate in social work and criminology at Université Laval

Alexandre Béland Ouellette, CA – Master student in criminology at Université Laval

In Canada, since 1996, the creation of an alternative measures program in criminal justice has been authorized by the Criminal Code. It is surprising to note that Quebec, which performs so well in the area of non-judicialization of adolescents, has waited until the end of 2017's summer, when a broad debate is taking place on the foundations of access to law and justice in Quebec, in order to open its General alternative measures program (PMR-G) for adults. This program applies to anyone over the age of 18 charged with a summary conviction offense, provided there is no breach of the integrity of the victims. It began as a pilot project in three judicial districts of Quebec and now extends to the entire province. This presentation will provide a portrait, both descriptive and analytical, of this device from its conceptualization to its operationalization. The general ability of alternative models to fit into the criminal field and to build effective RJ measures will be addressed.

THE POSITIVE PROJECT AS A RECONSTRUCTED NARRATIVE OF THE OFFENCE

Stefaan Viaene, BE – Coordinator at Alba vzw in Flanders

Ruben Vandersteen, BE – Mentor at Alba vzw in Flanders

Ibe Coeck, BE – PhD researcher at the KU Leuven Institute of Criminology

Restoration and responsibility, a swift reaction and involvement of the parents are the main concepts in the new juvenile delinquency act since September 2019 in Flanders. In addition the act introduced a new way of reacting to juvenile delinquency: the positive project. This can be proposed to the young offender by the public prosecutor or judge. These put their trust in the youngsters' capability to effectively respond to the needs and harm caused by the offence. Alba is one of the organizations that facilitates the process – which includes drafting the plan – and execution of a positive project. Its approach is heavily based on RJ principles. This means that it focuses on addressing the needs and damages caused by the offence for all parties involved: this includes not only the youngster, the victim and their respective networks, but also the community and society at large. Together with the youngster, practitioners reflect on what is needed to prevent future offences. Ultimately it is the young person's responsibility to act upon the reflections proposed. This can lead to several intentions, which may include performing community service, making amends with the victim, restoring a trusting relationship with their parents, refocusing on school and tackling drug addiction. Intentions can be defined freely as far as imagination allows. Where possible practitioners include the mediation process. The intentions are deeply embedded in the thus re-constructed narrative of the offence. Well aware that this is a new type of reaction, practitioners have encountered different challenges and questions. One concerns the relation between the positive project and victim-offender mediation. How can they be compatible? To what extent is a combination of both methods desirable? Would this lead to a 'complete' restorative reaction to crime, or is it a way to sidetrack the victim again? What is the place of the other victims (network of the offender, society or communities as a whole)? Are they as important in the equation? What about the role and position of parents? Do they need to be involved mandatorily? Does talking about responsibility require talking about parents? Restoration and prevention of reoffending come under a new tension in this new restorative approach. Are they compatible or is the restorative coat of the positive project just pure recidivism prevention in disguise?

UNDOING CRIME BY (UN)DOING TIME: A SECOND CHANCE FOR VICTIMS AND OFFENDERS

Hendrik Kaptein, NL – Associate professor of jurisprudence at Leiden University

Ask crime victims what they would have liked in the very first place and they will answer: 'I wish it would never have happened to me, to us'. How to give such victims a second chance? In principle by undoing crime, or by restoring victims to their rightful original positions 'as if nothing wrongful was done at all'. This may be feasible in the case of a stolen bike returned and supplemented by suitable compensation for its temporary loss at offender's cost. Thus the offender concerned does after all what he ought to have done from the beginning, though restorative measures generally are rather more costly in several respects (both for offenders and for victims) than doing the right thing from the beginning. This is the basic idea of turning back the clock by restoration of victims' rightful original positions, to be effected by offenders. This is a or even the basic idea of RJ. This holds good for offenders as well, as their action on behalf of restoration of what they did wrong themselves relieves them from burdens of guilt – again 'as if nothing wrong happened'. But all this is easier said than done of course. So many kinds of wrongful harm cannot be undone, or at least not completely so over time. Offenders may be unable to offer suitable compensation themselves, just as victims may be unwilling to deal with 'their' offenders. Public solidarity with crime victims may well imply state compensation for wrongful harm through crime, based in part on the state's liability for not having prevented such harm.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

PRESENTATIONS 25/6 10-12H ROOM 1

THE APPLICABILITY OF THE RJ APPROACH IN CASE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE INCIDENTS

Gabor Hera, HU – Researcher and sociologist at the NKE Doctoral School of Law Enforcement in Budapest

Dori Szego, HU – Researcher and sociologist at the Hungarian Helsinki Committee

This presentation introduces the findings of the IMPRODOVA research program that is designed to provide answers for domestic violence cases in several European countries. The speakers will give an insight into the Hungarian context of institutional responses to DV within the framework of RJ principles, such as acknowledging victimhood and the role of the personal community in restoration. The legal, organizational and human factors affecting the victim, and the different pathways of a case within the local ecosystems of institutional responses will be also presented. Do frontline, institutional responses support the victims' needs and utilize the power of the community? How do the malfunctions of the system result in the re-traumatization of the victims and in the dissolution of the DV victims' personal community bonds? The presentation will illustrate through case examples what are those factors that support an effective outcome of a DV situation, where the victim steps out of the spiral of violence. The final question is: how can RJ approaches in DV help victims to escape violence by empowering them and by giving back the sense of ownership of the situation?

HUMAN RIGHTS AND FAMILY'S HONOR: LESSONS FROM RESTORATIVE JUSTICE PRACTICES

Clara Rigoni, DE – Postdoctoral researcher at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Crime, Security and Law

In the last 20 years, the related phenomena of honor-based violence and forced marriages have received increasing attention at the international and European level. In Europe, strong responses towards this type of violence have been adopted, including legislation and policy actions containing direct references to the concepts of honor, culture, and tradition and ad hoc criminalization targeting forced marriages as a separate offense. Despite this, however, data concerning reporting and prosecution rates for these crimes remain very low. This is due to several reasons, some of which related to family and domestic violence in general, some specifically linked to the characteristics of honor-based violence. A possibility to improve women access to justice is represented by alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, particularly widespread within the communities in which honor-based violence mostly occurs. In Europe, however, the use of such mechanisms, including RJ, is highly discouraged for such cases, mainly for risks concerning safety, power imbalance, discrimination, coercion and secondary victimization. The recently published book by Clara tries to answer the following question: do alternative solutions exist that, when applied to cases of honor-based violence and forced marriages, are capable of avoiding, on the one hand, the shortcomings of criminal law-based responses and, on the other, the problems generally associated with alternative dispute resolution mechanisms? In order to answer this question, case studies from the United Kingdom and Norway are analyzed. Both community-based alternative dispute resolution mechanisms and state-based RJ programs are examined from the perspective of the abovementioned risks and their added value.

RESTORATIVE JUSTICE IN DRUG ADDICTION: NARRATIVES, DREAMS AND EXPECTATIONS

Alexia Stourati, GR – Lawyer, mediator, psychodramatist, MSc candidate in Criminal Law and Addictions

This presentation refers to a research on the needs of adult ex drug addicts and the implementation of restorative encounters in Greece. People in addiction often commit acts of crime as a result of their addiction (e.g. thefts and robberies). In addition to that, members of their families, friends, and/or coworkers are often the people against whom these crimes are committed. These victims do not always report to the police, as they care about the offender and try to protect him/her. Since 2013, the law about drug use in Greece is very therapy-focused, giving lots of opportunities for diversion from the penal system to the offenders, even if they have committed a violent crime, but the consequences of crimes are spread to a wider social circle. So, a law that is therapy-focused, and therefore can put an end to the revolving-door phenomenon, is not easily accepted by the society, as the victims and the society do not feel that justice was done. However, the perspective of RJ implementation could provide a sense of closure and vindication to the victims, and, consequently, diminish the racism and social exclusion against ex-addicts, as well as strengthen social cohesion. But what are the necessary steps for RJ to be implemented in these cases? Through the methodology of in-depth and semi-structured interviews of offenders who were addicted to substances, therapists who have worked with them in the therapy program of KETHEA, as well as lawyers, explored the needs, the attitudes towards RJ, the victim-offender encounters that have taken place unofficially, and the ways in which these identify with RJ practices. Through the work described above, the therapeutic and social difficulties, along with the possible solutions and structures helpful for the implementation of restorative encounters are revealed.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 25/6 10-12H ROOM 2

RESTORATIVE STORYTELLING

Nicola Preston, UK – Senior lecturer at the University of Northampton and adjunct faculty for IIRP

Hannah Arendt (1958–1998), the political theorist and philosopher suggests that 'storytelling reveals meaning without the error of defining it'. Some would argue that storytelling creates, rather than reflects, reality and that people learn from their lives through the stories they tell about them. As adults we are often so deeply influenced by our culture, upbringing and experiences, that the 'scripts' we develop to deal with 'negative affect' can become entrenched. Nicola has seen this throughout her years of practice with the 'labelling' that can begin early, sometimes before birth (child of a drug addict, looked after child, victim, offender). These labels are often perceived as deficits. The restorative questions and framework are a relationally transformational way of helping people to re-interpret and re-narrate lived experiences through the telling of their stories in a safe environment. They provide an explicit communication framework that can be used reactively to guide and support people when relationships have broken down, and proactively to teach others the skills that will help them build and maintain healthy relationships. Dr Brené Brown (University of Houston) says 'When we deny our stories, they define us. When we own our stories, we get to write a brave new ending.' This session will discuss the restorative language that allows participants to take back 'ownership' of their stories and gain a shared understanding around how our own stories impact on others.

PHILOSOPHY TOWARDS RESTORATIVE JUSTICE: TWO SIGNPOSTS FROM THE ITALIAN DEBATE

Federico Reggio, IT – Researcher in philosophy of law at the University of Padova

Neither Giorgio Del Vecchio (1878–1970) nor Francesco Cavalla (1939–) can be properly defined RJ advocates, as both were not involved in the debate on the restorative paradigm. Nevertheless, these two philosophers of law outlined some pioneering philosophical reflections whose similarities with the restorative approach to criminal justice are quite surprising. Del Vecchio passed away before idea of RJ was even thematized but wrote some innovative considerations on the philosophy of punishment right at the end of World War II; Cavalla actively contributed to the Italian debate on philosophy of law in the last 30 years of the XX century, thereby proposing a wholesome rethinking of the theory of punishment that still today offers quite a sound argumentation in favor of reparative approach to the reaction to crime. Along with one of the lines recently developed within the research committee at the European Forum for Restorative Justice (whose purpose is to rediscover the contribution to the debate on RJ of scholars whose works are not internationally well-known due to the lack of English translations), this presentation seeks to introduce some of Del Vecchio and Cavalla's main argumentations to an international audience, thereby underlining how they can possibly reveal important contributions also for the current debate. The purpose of this presentation is, therefore, not merely historical, but seeks to bring to the light some philosophical signposts that might help the RJ movement to consolidate its proposal from a legal-philosophical viewpoint.



ABSTRACTS PARTICIPANTS' CONTRIBUTIONS

DIALOGUES 25/6 10-12H ROOM 3

PROJECT 'SAMENSPRAAK' ON RESTORATIVE DIALOGUE GROUPS

Joke De Clercq and Hilde Vanlommel, BE – Senior mediators at Moderator vzw

The session will present and discuss the journey of the Flemish RJ service Moderator in the project 'Samenspraak'. The goal of the project (2018-2020) is to further experiment the use of restorative dialogue groups. These groups are set up as a complementary restorative practice, which is offered to victims and offenders who want to engage in dialogue with the other side, but for whom mediation or conferencing is not possible, feasible or desirable. In Moderator's experience of dialogue groups so far, non-related victims and offenders, and interested citizens meet in more or less 5 sessions during which they have the opportunity to exchange around specific themes like what it means to be a victim or an offender, and concepts such as guilt, loss, responsibility, restoration. Two facilitators guide the sessions. A draft scenario is adapted during the journey according to the expressed needs of the participants and the group dynamics. An initial experiment set up a dialogue group with victims and offenders of different types of offences: traffic offences, sexual abuse in institutions and hate crime/hate speech/violent extremism. For each theme a specific draft scenario is developed in a collaborative effort by professional partners and self-help groups. An external evaluation through qualitative methods is set up to grasp well the experience of participants and facilitators and to learn for the future.

HOW TO REDUCE THE DISTANCE BETWEEN PRISONERS AND SOCIETY IN TIMES OF SOCIAL DISTANCING AND WITH PHYSICAL WALLS BETWEEN THEM?

Evert Kampert, NL – Restorative consultant in the Dutch prisons of Arnhem, Zeist and Nieuwegein

Manon van Dooren, NL – Mediator at Perspectief Herstelbemiddeling (perspective restorative mediation)

Prison walls literally separate inmates and society. With Covid-19 this distance has become even greater; fewer people are allowed in from outside the prison to have contact with them. But when a prisoner is released, he becomes part of this society again. If it was already difficult to find a good place in society before detention, how do we ensure that the detained perpetrator succeeds in finding this good place after his release? What will help his effective re-integration? As a restorative consultant, Evert is involved in the rehabilitation of inmates. An important part of his work consists in organizing the so-called 'Puinruimen' course, in which prisoners participate voluntarily and get to work with themselves to make a clean swap. Towards himself, his social network, towards society and (possible) victims. As a mediator, Manon provides part of the 'Puinruimen' training. She challenges the participants to think about the impact crimes have on victims and how to restore. What can you do? But also: what is in it for you? She has also prepared and guided many contacts between perpetrators (inside prisons) and victims (outside). While prison walls above all emphasize distance, added up with the prevailing social distancing, both, perpetrator and victim, must bridge distance in many ways: figuratively and literally, emotionally and physically. A constructive cooperation between Evert and Manon, recognizing each other's professional space, is key. They will share their own experience and challenge the audience to think along with them.



EXHIBITION ROOM

AVAILABLE ALL WEEK LONG

21-25/6



POSTERS & PAPERS

1. Poster "Restorative family conferences within the Hungarian prisons" (Laura Schmidt, HU)
2. Poster "Resolving family feuds and conflicts in contemporary Cretan mountain villages: Sasmos as restorative justice" (Koumentaki Evangelia, UK)
3. Practice paper "Restorative justice in cases of violent extremism and hate crimes" (EFRJ Working Group on Violent Extremism, p.15: Joakim Hope Soltveit, Lucy Jaffe, Miriam Attias, Graziella Fourez, Ali Gohar, Cheryl Lubin, Roberto Moreno, Emanuela Biffi, Tim Chapman)
4. Paper: Using restorative justice to rethink the temporality of transition in Chile (Marit de Haan, BE, p.21)



FEATURED FILM

The Finnish documentary "Eye to Eye" (John Webster, 2020, 70 min) is available all week long, password protected on Vimeo. It tells the stories of two parents meeting eye to eye with the murderers of their loved ones, and it is reflecting on the meaning of a restorative dialogue when the relatives of the victim meet with the perpetrator. The film will be discussed in one of the parallel sessions by Riikka Hiitela and Arja Konttila, restorative justice practitioners experienced in criminal matters (p.18). [Watch the trailer here!](#)



VIDEOS & AUDIOS

1. Audiofile "Restorative practices in self-organized communities on the city's edge: A poetic account" (Di Ponti, DK, p.17) - 8 min
2. Video "Victims' voice in environmental harm: The artistic approach of restorative justice in the case of Minamata disease in Japan" (Orika Komatsubara, JP, p.16) - 3 min
3. Webinar recordings "Making restorative justice possible" (EFRJ Working Group on Gender-Based Violence: Valentina Bonini, Linda Millington, Janet Clark, Pascale Frank, Marie Keenan, Alexia Stourati) - 120 min
4. Webinar recordings "On a journey towards a restorative school" (EFRJ Working Group on Restorative Schools, p.16: Chris Straker, Belinda Hopkins, Aleksandra Dopierala, Maija Gellin, Nino Shatberashvili, Michelle Stowe) - 85 min
5. Webinar recordings "A restorative city in times of a pandemic" (Bruna Dighera, Paolo Schiavo, Daniela De Francesco, Lucio Farina, Marco Bellotto) - 100 min [ENG/ ITA]
6. Four videos from Lecco Restorative City - Unnamed ways (Franco Lozza & Bruna Dighera, IT, p.17) - 33 min [ENG/ ITA]
7. Videos on the project "Samenspraak" on restorative dialogue groups (Joke Declercq, Hilde Vanlommel, BE, p.20) - available after the presentation [ENG/ NL]



PRACTICALITIES

MORE QUESTIONS?
[READ THE ANSWERS TO THE FAQs!](#)

TIMEZONE

All hours are expressed in CEST (Central European Summer Time - Brussels time)

VIRTUAL PLATFORM

The event takes place on Worksup.com (directing to Zoom Meetings for the interactive live talks). Event attendees can open Worksup on mobile, web or tablet and use full-service functionality in either of them; no downloads needed. Zoom Meetings will open in a new window in the browser. Only registered participants will have access to Worksup: one week prior to the event, participants will be able to login on Worksup, edit their profile for networking and get familiar with the platform (including the 1-to-1 video chat and other networking features). Videorecordings and other materials on Worksup will be available up to 3 months after the event.

REGISTRATIONS

This year, we adopted a form of participatory pricing model: it is up to you to choose the fee that seems fairest to you, based on your possibilities and your desire to contribute. The fee supports the activities of the EFRJ throughout all the year and supports other participants for whom it is financially difficult to participate. If you will attend all the symposium (27 hours & 29 different sessions), each session costs between 4-8 EUR, depending if you are a EFRJ member or not. Indeed, EFRJ members receive a 50% automatic discount on the fee. Videorecordings will be available up to 3 months after the event. More info and registrations here: www.euforumrj.org/en/virtual-symposium-restorative-justice-over-distance

EFRJ TEAM

Programming and symposium coordinator: Emanuela Biffi
Concept: Emanuela Biffi, Brunilda Pali, Tim Chapman
Communications: Bálint Juhász
Exhibition Room: Julia Barjau
Finances: Rik Defrère

CONTACT US

More questions about this event? Some FAQs are answered and made available on the [EFRJ website](#). You can reach the EFRJ team by email (info@euforumrj.org) or by phone or WhatsApp (+32.466.20.91.12) or you can contact directly Emanuela Biffi (emanuela.biffi@euforumrj.org). The EFRJ is also very active on social media: follow the EFRJ (@euforumrj) and this event (#RJoverDistance) to receive updates and share news to your networks.



This event is supported by the European Union

The views presented in this event are the views of the speakers and do not necessarily represent the views of the EFRJ.