



Plenary speakers at 'Up Against the Nation States of Feminist Legal Theory' June 2006: from left to right Margaret Davies, Ratna Kapur and Ziba Mir-Hosseini.

## Welcome by Ruth Fletcher



As we look forward to welcoming participants to Gender Unbound in July, I'm reminded that one of the key pleasures of CentreLGS is its international network. At a time in global history when cultural stigma is doing so much damage, CentreLGS members and friends should take heart from our little successes (and learn from our mistakes) in trying to make feminist gender and sexuality research a site of mutual support and learning across locations, disciplines, perspectives and types of expertise. Over the last year, CentreLGS has listened to Zillah Eisenstein criticise the deployment of gender and sexuality in support of imperial militarist agendas in the US, worked with Canadian colleagues at the

Centre for Feminist Legal Studies, UBC and Indian colleagues at the Tata Institute, Mumbai in planning and organising collaborative research events, and learned from a dozen visiting fellows from different parts of the world.

*continued*

### Contents

- 1 Welcome by Ruth Fletcher
- 3 News
- 4 Upcoming Events
- 4 Sexuality and Judicial Diversity: An Interview with Les Moran
- 8 Past Events - 2006
- 9 Spotlight on...
- 11 Visitors to the Centre
- 12 Contacts.

Working internationally in this way has helped advance our intersectional critiques and interdisciplinary methods as we apply renewed energy to explaining the premises of our work and how exactly we identify raced, classed and able-bodied gender and sexuality in the moment and place of our investigation. The Encountering Human Rights conference in January 2007 created an international and interdisciplinary space for anti-poverty activists, legal practitioners working on asylum, and researchers of gendered violence and reproductive rights, among others, to progress creative thinking about practical and scholarly interventions in the field of law, gender and sexuality. This event and initiatives such as Centre responses to public consultations on legal reform, have sought to respond critically to the desire to make the public impact of our research transparent and to integrate the lessons of non-university based collaboration into our research activities.

One of CentreLGS's research challenges has been the integration of these approaches and perspectives into the clusters of governance and regulation, law and culture and healthcare and bioethics. Governance and regulation has responded to this challenge by seeking to think through the contribution of materialist and

governmentality literatures to issues of sexed citizenship and gendered intimate relations. Law and culture has promoted our understanding of media and story-telling in shaping our expectations of legal responses to diverse and changing selves. Healthcare and bioethics has encouraged enquiry into the value of intersectional gendered embodiment as constituted through the legal regulation of bodily interventions. All three clusters have contributed to the investigation of how and why embodied selves are governed to gendered and sexual ends through the integration of humanities methodologies into critical socio-legal and theoretically informed doctrinal approaches in interdisciplinary legal scholarship.

But all of this activity takes a lot of work, often against institutional pressures which stress and strain us even as we enjoy collaboration. Producing reflective research which addresses parochialism and unconscious biases is always an ongoing challenge, but one which we try to tackle in the international and interdisciplinary space that is CentreLGS. So to those members and advisors who had the imagination and commitment to bring CentreLGS into being, and to all those who have sustained and energised our research network, a special thank you.

*Ruth Fletcher*

CentreLGS welcomes the following new phd students: Rohee Gupta, Robert James, Kokila Konasinghe, Peter McTigue (Keele), Suhraiya Jivraj, Madhumanti Mukherjee, Sarah Lambie (Kent), and Daniela Nadj (Westminster).

# News

Here is a summary of our latest news. You can find more information on our website: [www.kent.ac.uk/clgs/](http://www.kent.ac.uk/clgs/).

## ● CentreLGS welcomes Helen Muggeridge and Penny Bernard

We're extremely pleased that Helen Muggeridge has joined us as Centre co-ordinator whilst Anisa de Jong is away on adoption leave. Helen can be contacted at [H.Muggeridge@kent.ac.uk](mailto:H.Muggeridge@kent.ac.uk).

Penny Bernard has also joined us recently to assist with the co-ordination work and it's very nice to have her help. She can be contacted at [PJ.Bernard@kent.ac.uk](mailto:PJ.Bernard@kent.ac.uk).



## ● Thank you to Rosemary Hunter

Thanks very much to Rosemary Hunter (Kent) who stepped in as acting Centre director whilst Davina Cooper was away on research leave. Davina is now back.

## ● Postgraduate Network

Rosie Harding has launched the Centre's Postgraduate and Early Career Network, with its own website: PECANS (see [www.clgs-pecans.org.uk/](http://www.clgs-pecans.org.uk/)). The website contains a directory of members' current work as well as information on how to keep in touch with other early career scholars through the PECANS discussion list.

## ● Consultation Responses

Centre Responses:

In June 2006, Joanne Conaghan (Kent) co-ordinated the Centre's response to the Department for Trade and Industry's proposals to

outlaw discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation in the provision of goods and services. The Centre argued in this response that religious belief should not be accepted as a basis for discrimination on the ground of sexual orientation, but that if exemptions were to be drafted into the new regulations, they should be confined to directly doctrinal activities.

Again, in June 2006, Joanne Conaghan (Kent) co-ordinated the Centre's response to the Interim Report of the Equalities Review, which is investigating the causes of persistent discrimination and inequality in British society. Along with many other bodies, the Centre took issue with the extremely narrow, individualistic and undeveloped view of inequality that the Review put forward and recommended an extensive re-think of the Review's theoretical framework.

In July 2006, Katherine de Gama (Keele) (with assistance from Joanne Conaghan) co-ordinated the Centre's response to a consultation paper issued by the Office for Criminal Justice Reform entitled 'Convicting Rapists and Protecting Victims of Rape – Justice for Victims of Rape'. The Centre argued that the current proposals located rape law within the paradigm of male sexuality rather than the protection of women's sexual autonomy, and that future proposals should go further than relatively minor adjustments to criminal law on evidence and procedure.

*Centre Members' Individual Responses:*

In March 2006, Andrew Francis (Keele) responded to a report issued by the Department for Constitutional Affairs on 'Increasing Diversity in the Legal Profession'. And in December 2006, Rosemary Hunter (Kent) responded to a consultation on 'The Separate Representation of Children' issued by the Department for Constitutional Affairs.

We're very grateful to all those involved in co-ordinating and contributing to the consultation responses. You can find the responses on our website.

## Upcoming Events

**Rights of the Body in Times of War: Professor Rosalind Pollack Petchesky, 11 June 2007.**

Professor Petchesky (City University New York, US) will be speaking at Keele University as part of the Institute of Law, Politics and Justice Public Lecture Series, in collaboration with CentreLGS and the Alternative Globalisations Forum. For further information, please see our website.

**Sexing Reproductive Regulation: Gendering Health and Human Rights, Keele University, 12 June 2007.**

This workshop will focus on the challenges which sexual diversity, intersectionality and globalization pose for feminist analysis, advocacy and activism in the realm of reproductive law and regulation. Please contact Ruth Fletcher (r.fletcher@keele.ac.uk) for further details.

**Gender Unbound: An international, interdisciplinary conference in the area of law, gender and sexuality, Keele University, 9-11 July 2007.**

This three day conference will explore the intersections between gender and sexuality, as well as how other social relations (for example race and disability) impact and are shaped by these forms of oppression. The conference will also include some sessions in non-traditional format. We're delighted to announce the following plenary speakers for this event:

- **Hazel Carby** (Yale, US): 'Brown Babies: The Birth of Britain as a Racialized State, 1942-1948'
- **Sander Gilman** (Emory, US): 'Whose Body is it Any Way? Hermaphrodites, Gays and Jews in N.O. Body's Germany'
- **Rosemary Hennessy** (Rice University, Houston, US): 'Feminized Labor in Deregulated Capitalism: Jeans, Justice and International Solidarity'
- **Carol Smart** (University of Manchester, UK): 'Memory, Law, and the Socio-Politics of Family Secrets'
- **Sylvia Tamale** (Makerere University, Uganda): 'The Paradoxes of Prostitution and Sexuality in Modern-Day Uganda'.

Please go to the website or contact

clgsunbound@kent.ac.uk for further details.

## Sexuality and Judicial Diversity: An Interview with Les Moran

Les Moran is Professor of Law at Birkbeck College, London. His well-known monograph *The Homosexual(ity) of Law* (Routledge, 1996) paved the way for studies in the legal construction of homosexuality in the UK. More recently, he has published in the areas of hate crime (*Sexuality and the Politics of Violence and Safety*, Routledge, 2003, with B. Skeggs, P. Tyrer and K. Corteen) and law and film (*Law's Moving Image*, Cavendish, 2004, with I. Christie, E. Sandon and E. Loizidou). In 2006 he edited a collection of readings, *Sexuality and Identity* published by Ashgate as part of its Law and Society Series.

Les Moran's current research focuses on sexual diversity within the judiciary. Judicial diversity is currently an area of considerable government and policy activity. The 2005 Constitutional Reform Act introduced into the Law of England and Wales a statutory obligation to promote judicial diversity. More recently the Department for Constitutional Affairs announced a joint strategy agreed between the Lord Chancellor, the Lord Chief Justice and the Chairman of the Judicial Appointments Commission to bring this statutory objective into operation. Professor Moran's research investigates the absence of sexuality in these debates and policy initiatives. With the use of interviews, he also focuses on the experiences of lesbian and gay members of the judiciary in Australia, England and Wales and South Africa. His early conclusions have been published in: 'Judicial Diversity and the Challenge of Sexuality: Some Preliminary Findings' (2006) *Sydney Law Review* 28(4): 565-598.

Emily Grabham interviewed him over email in March this year. What follows is an excerpt from the longer interview, which will be published soon on the Centre website.

**E: To start with, please could you speak a little bit about how you came to research in this area.**

**LM:** Much of my research to date has focused on a number of contexts, particularly criminal law and criminal justice, in which sexuality in law has worked to exclude subjects from particular rights and citizenship more generally. Several recent law reform initiatives in the UK have made important changes to this state of affairs, advancing formal equality. I began to wonder what the experience might be of those attempting to access these new rights and started to search for literature examining the experience that lesbians and gay men have of getting access to advice on law and of using the courts to enforce rights. There is very little scholarship and empirical work in this area. I began to read the feminist and critical race scholarship to explore what the themes and issues might be in other contexts. One theme focused on the judiciary. In crude terms various reports from the US and Australia having documented experiences and perceptions of prejudice in the legal process singled out the homogeneity of the judiciary, made up almost exclusively of late middle aged, upper middle class white men drawn from a narrow and exclusive social and cultural milieu, as an important part of the problem. In response, greater diversity of the bench, in terms of gender, race and ethnicity, was offered as an important policy and practical objective. While these debates appeared to have had a lower profile in the UK, at the time I began my research a lively debate about judicial diversity and diversity within the legal profession more generally was in full swing. I read these debates with great interest.

As in other jurisdictions gender, race and ethnicity dominated the local debates. There was brief reference to disability but mainly in order to note the lack of data on the issue. Consideration of sexual diversity was notable by its absence. The more I became aware of this resounding silence the more I became intrigued.

The statutory obligation to promote diversity in the 2005 [Constitutional Reform] Act doesn't

identify any particular aspects of diversity so I looked with great interest at the first policy document produced after the Act came into effect relating to judicial diversity. A joint statement made by the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Justice of England and Wales and the Chairman of the Judicial Appointments Commission explained the importance of collecting and monitoring demographic data on the judiciary in general and the judicial appointments process in particular. The argument is that the diversity data will allow the various parties to establish a benchmark and thereafter to monitor progress made towards the statutory objective of 'diversity' in the judiciary. Again, gender, race and ethnicity are all clearly mentioned. Sexual diversity is missing. None of the arguments offered in support of data collection appear to support this exclusion. Why is it missing?

**E: What are the reasons, do you think, for this gap, given the work done on other forms of inequalities in the judiciary?**

**LM:** The assumption and expectation that sexuality is and should remain largely 'invisible' appears central to the idea that sexuality is different from other strands of diversity. A key factor here is the way 'sexuality' is understood in judicial settings. Most commonly sexuality appears to be associated with 'privacy' and 'intimacy'. I've frequently been told by my interviewees that sexuality is a private matter that is irrelevant to the judicial role and to judicial diversity more generally. The silence I've come across in the policy debates and practical initiatives mirrors this argument.

It is an issue that came up during the course of a 'meeting' (my request for an interview was refused) with one of the senior administrators attached to the Judicial Appointments Commission. The lack of a reference to sexuality in the joint statement mentioned above is not an oversight. There is no intention to gather data on the sexual diversity of the bench. The official position would appear to be that it is essentially a private matter. Sexuality is and ought to remain something that isn't discussed. This seems to lead

to the conclusion that there is no need for benchmarking and monitoring with regard to this aspect of diversity; end of story.

Another dimension of the response to sexuality is the way it gets defined as a reference to 'sexual acts'; the intimate relations of members of the judiciary. Here there is the potential for sexual diversity to get associated with a host of negative associations more relevant to the gutter press than scholarly research and social policy.

The idea of sexuality as a reference to an identity seems to have passed by some lawyers and judges, and most of the policy makers I've met.

Again the more I hear these arguments, the more intrigued I become. The Queer theory scholarship of Lauren Berlant and Michael Warner on heteronormativity offers a brilliant and helpful critique of the way privacy and intimacy work to create the illusion of silence when in fact sexuality is a constant and a very public dimension of the social and political landscape of society in general and the judiciary in particular. A key challenge for me in my research is to identify the social and cultural forms and the institutional contexts in which the sexuality of judges is made public.

This brings me to what I call the *Who's Who* dimension of the research. If you look at the pages of *Who's Who* you will find that most judges have no hesitation in making their sexuality public, or should I say their heterosexuality, a matter of public knowledge. It is done by reference to their marital status. (I know that this may be a label of convenience for some but it is how most judges, if not the overwhelming majority, present their sexuality in public.) This is also a context in which a comparative dimension has been invaluable. Looking at other jurisdictions I've discovered a range of institutional settings, apart from scandals in which the sexuality of the judiciary has been foregrounded, where judges make reference to their sexuality as a matter of routine. For example have a look at the website of the Constitutional Court of South Africa. The biographical notes on

each member of the bench of that court contain information about marital status. I've recently discovered the published proceedings of the swearing in ceremony of new judges of the Supreme Court of New South Wales in Australia. These speeches invariably mention the heterosexual (marital) partners of the new judicial appointees.

**E:** Were the experiences of the judges mediated through other forms of inequality, such as ethnicity and disability, or other factors such as location?

**LM:** Yes, and I've explored these issues in the Sydney Law Review article. Sexuality cannot be treated in isolation: issues of gender, ethnicity, class are all implicated in the experiences I'm capturing in the data. The social, cultural and political context is also key to making sense of the experiences. For example the high profile of several members of the judiciary in South Africa who are 'out' lesbians and gay men is closely connected with the political landscape of post apartheid South Africa. It is also important to take account of the fact that this landscape is constantly shifting. I've been told by several respondents in that jurisdiction that I should not assume that the appointment of an 'out' lesbian or gay man to the bench today would be free from controversy. The politics of judicial appointments is a fast changing phenomenon. There has been something of a conservative turn in South African judicial appointments with an almost exclusive turn to racial and ethnic diversity.

Different jurisdictions also have different histories with respect to diversity debates. So for example Australia seems to have focused attention primarily on gender. Indigenous issues have had some profile but mainly in relation to the lack of indigenous Australians in the legal profession. Sexuality seems to have had a very low profile. Several factors might be at work. These include a perceived lack of discrimination, the absence of a champion pushing the issue, the presence of a high profile 'out' gay man on the bench of Australia's Supreme Court, the High Court in Canberra, who is both adored and condemned in the mass media

and 12 years of a sexually conservative politics promoted by a right wing Federal government.

**E: I'm aware from Canadian research that some 'minority' judges can become targets for accusations of bias (for example in the Canadian case of RDS). Has this happened in any of the jurisdictions you've researched?**

**LM:** Yes, it is a feature of other jurisdictions too, though the RDS case seems to have been a particularly extreme case. Rosemary Hunter has written a very chilling piece about a senior female judge in Queensland Australia. She was effectively hounded out of office and, if my memory serves me well, imprisoned for a while as the result of a concerted campaign to question her capacity to carry out the judicial role. There has been something of a media campaign against some of the recent appointments of women to the bench of the Supreme Court in the Australian state of Victoria. Justice Michael Kirby of the High Court of Australia was also the subject of false accusations about his sexual behaviour and related misuse of government resources initiated in the Senate of the Australian Parliament by Senator Bill Heffernan. The allegations were finally withdrawn as there was a total lack of substance to them. It was a very nasty incident. It was a very difficult time for Justice Kirby but he survived the incident and his reputation seemed to be enhanced by it.

**E: Leading on from this, do you have any opinion on the debate around the construction of 'judicial truth'? Are you interested in arguments about why the judiciary should be more diverse, and if so, what are your thoughts?**

**LM:** Yes, of course I have but I am aware that there are huge problems in any attempt to isolate the factors that inform the production of any individual judgment or the collective judgments of a particular judge. The life history of the particular judge in question would need to be put in the context of the life histories of all the other judges involved, especially at the appellate court level. The context of the dispute and the impact of the

particular fabrication of the problem before the tribunal are other important factors to be taken into account. Another problem is which cases do you read in an attempt to isolate the impact of difference? To limit the analysis to the 'obvious' cases, for example those involving issues clearly relating to women when considering the impact of gender, or to those cases that have a lesbian or gay context for lesbian and gay members of the bench, is perhaps too obvious and too limiting. What difference does diversity have in relation to tax disputes or cases relating to corporate liability? This aspect of diversity research also tends to focus on the different judge, the woman who is a senior judge or the lesbian or gay man who is a judge, leaving those judges who fall into the 'norm' outside of the scope of inquiry. It is an interesting issue but one that is fraught with problems.

**E: What are the future directions for your research in this area?**

**LM:** I want to pursue two main directions. The first is to continue to generate empirical data on perceptions and experiences of diversity on the bench and within the wider legal profession. The interviews I have done to date are important but small in number. I want to widen the scope, interviewing a more diverse group of judges and doing that in the jurisdictions I have already begun to work in. I also want to expand the research to include Canada and the US. Canada has some of the most progressive laws relating to sexual diversity, but so far as I know diversity debates in relation to the judiciary have not included any discussion of sexual diversity. I'm puzzled by that silence in such a progressive setting. The US is a totally different ball game in part because of the different approaches to judicial appointment found in the US and also because of the extremes of politics ranging from the very progressive to the extreme reactionary sexual politics found in the US.

The second development is a study of what I call 'the cultural lives of the judiciary'. It develops what I described above as the *Who's Who* dimension to

the diversity research. This research seeks to learn about judges by examining representations of judges in the wider culture. I've done some preliminary work on judicial biography and autobiography and I've also just finished an article on images of judges in film and television. Most recently I've been doing a study of judicial portraits. It is a fascinating area. A traditional assumption in portraiture is that the portrait is not just about 'likeness' but is about the truth of the character and personality of the sitter: Judicial portraits pose a particular challenge as judges are meant to leave their individuality, character, personality outside the social role of the judge and the institutional setting of the courtroom in order to dedicate their professional life to the service of the law. Portraitists negotiate this boundary between the social position, the institution of the judge and contemporary ideas about individuality, personality and identity. Through a historical and cross cultural study of judicial portraits I want to examine how portraitists combine character, personality, identity with the image of the institution, the judicial role. My research in Australia suggests that we can learn a lot about changes in perceptions and the expectations we attach to the judicial office and office holders by examining changes in judicial portraiture. It is an exciting project that blurs the distinction between traditional social-legal research and research that explores law through culture.

*Les Moran can be contacted at [L.Moran@bbk.ac.uk](mailto:L.Moran@bbk.ac.uk).*



Justice Yvonne Mokgoro of the Constitutional Court of South Africa giving her plenary talk at the 'Encountering Human Rights' conference at Westminster, January 2007

## Past Events – 2006-2007

### January 2007

The Centre co-hosted an international conference at the University of Westminster entitled **Encountering Human Rights: Gender/Sexuality, Activism and the Promise of Law with Liberty and The Legal Action Group**. This conference provided academics, activists and lawyers with a space in which to think about how human rights law in the UK interacts with issues of gender and sexuality.

### November 2006

The London School of Economics Gender Institute, the School of Law, King's College London and the Centre organised a joint one day workshop with the title **Beyond "Feminism v Multiculturalism": Revisiting the relationship between power, beliefs, identity and values**. The workshop brought together scholars from different academic backgrounds, as well as policy makers and activists, to explore ways of moving beyond the apparent "feminism v multiculturalism" stalemate. It was sponsored by *Social and Legal Studies* and the Centre for European Law at King's College.

### September 2006

The Socio-Legal Studies Association sponsored a one day workshop at Kent, organised by Simone Wong (Kent Law School) on **Domestic Relationships and the Law Commission's**

**Consultation Paper.** Participants at this workshop assessed the implications of the recently published UK Law Commission paper on cohabitation for both same sex and different sex couples.

### August 2006

The Centre got together with the **Centre for Feminist Legal Studies** at the University of British Columbia for a workshop entitled '**Why and How? Theoretical and Methodological Directions in Law, Feminism, Gender and Sexuality**'.

### June 2006

An international conference entitled **Up Against the Nation States of Feminist Legal Theory** took place at Kent. Plenary speakers were Margaret Davies (Flinders, 'Feminism and Flat Law Theory'), Ziba Mir-Hosseini (SOAS, 'Feminism, Shari'a, Muslim Nation-States and the 'War on Terror)'), and Ratna Kapur (Centre for Feminist Legal Research, Delhi, 'Postcolonial Feminism and the 'Empire-in-Law)').

The Centre also held a one-day workshop on **Revisiting Governing from Feminist and Queer Perspectives** at Kent. You can find some of the papers from this workshop on the Centre website. Workshop plenaries were given by Janet Newman (Open University), Judith Squires (Bristol), Mariana Valverde (University of Toronto) and Jon Binnie (Manchester Metropolitan).

### April 2006

#### Politics of Fantasy

## Spotlight on....

In this section, we highlight Centre members' collaborative projects, and members' recent publications.

### Recent and Ongoing Projects

#### Interrogating Embodiment - Ruth Fletcher, Marie Fox, Julie McCandless

We held the second of a series of three workshops within the Healthcare Law and Bioethics Thematic Priority at the University of Kent on 24 and 25 November 2006. 'Interrogating Embodiment' took up some of the themes that had been addressed the previous year at 'Engendering Bioethics' at Keele.

The conference attracted a lot of academics and practitioners from within and outside the Centre, with contributions from the United States and Ireland, as well as the UK. Its focus was interdisciplinary, bringing together lawyers, medics, philosophers and sociologists, which allowed a range of different theoretical perspectives on embodiment to be addressed. A primary aim of the workshop was to root considerations of health, sexuality and gender in the legal and political regulation of the body. To this end, the over-arching conceptual focus of the workshop was embodiment; although various contributions addressed related concepts, such as autonomy, property, harm, rights and commodification. Participants sought to assess the relationship between embodied difference and sexual difference, and to examine the way in which law understands or engages with the concept of the body and body image. Across the two days of the workshop the lived reality of reproductive, HIV+, transabled, circumcised and tattooed bodies was explored, as well as how approaches to embodiment may be impacted by gender, race, poverty and learning disability. Various corporeal practices such as tattooing, cutting, touching, infection, work and movement were explored as the bases for bodily metamorphosis and identity. Some papers addressed how discourses such as



Workshop on 'Islam and it Feminisms' February 2007. From left to right: Discussant Stewart Motha, Speakers Qudzia Mirza and Samia Bano, and workshop organiser Suhraiya Jivraj

risk, harm, commerce and naturalness may be mobilised in discussions of embodiment, while others were more concerned with the employment of novel methodological approaches ranging from the neo-material to those rooted in legal form and from autobiography to performance art.

In due course an annotated bibliography of resources will be available via the Centre's website which we will hope will stimulate future conversations on these issues, while future research workshops in the pipeline on 'Sexing Reproduction Regulation: Gendering Health and Human Rights' (Keele 12 June 2007) and 'Masculinity and Health', (9 November 2007) will seek to adopt a more specific focus on these aspects of embodiment.

#### **Religion and Law Seminar Series – Suhraiya Jivraj**

The issue of religion is re-emerging in the West as one of the key controversial issues of our time: from students and teachers wearing headscarves occupying centre stage within human rights debates, to concerns over the erosion of free speech, for example, during the Danish cartoons affair and most recently Catholic Adoption agencies refusing to place children in lesbian and gay families. Yet despite these developments, the recent increase in recognition and protection of religion in law and policy, has not received the fresh critique or interrogation that perhaps it warrants. Certainly very little discussion emerges outside or beyond the polarised positions of the secular humanists including feminists on the one hand and the 'religious freedom' lobby on the other:

It is towards addressing this gap that the idea of a Religion and Law seminar series was born, (as well as the fact that it's my PhD topic). The aim is to bring together scholars working on these issues to contribute towards filling the space between the two polarised positions and to tackle crucial questions on the proper place of religion in law from a new critical perspective grounded in current socio-political developments. The seminar

series will run over two years leading up to the Lambeth conference which is scheduled to take place at the University of Kent in summer 2008.

As much of the current debates and media attention on religion has been focused on Muslims and Islam the theme of the first workshop was 'Islam and its Feminisms' which took place on Wednesday 7th February at the University of Kent. The speakers were Qudsiya Mirza from the University of East London on 'Interrogating Islamic Equality' and Samia Bano from the University of Reading on 'Islamic Arbitration and the Privatisation of Family Law: Justice under the 'shadow' of law?'. Stewart Motha from the University of Kent acted as discussant facilitating a lively discussion. The next event will be a panel at the 'Gender Unbound' conference at the University of Keele.

#### **Welcome to new PhD Student, Sarah Lambale (Kent)**

We have had several new PhD students starting their doctoral research this year. One is Sarah Lambale, who arrived last



October: Her research draws on Foucauldian governmentality literatures, queer citizenship theory and critical/feminist legal studies and examines the regulatory effects of transgender engagements with human rights and antidiscrimination law in Canada. She says: "At stake in my research is a general concern about the social regulation of bodies and identities, the role of law in producing narratives about sex, gender and sexuality, and the limits of anti-discrimination doctrine in affecting progressive social change." You can contact Sarah on [s1231@kent.ac.uk](mailto:s1231@kent.ac.uk).

## Recent Publications

Here is a selection of recent publications by Centre members:

**Toni Johnson** (Kent): 'Flamers, Flaunting and Permissible Persecution: R.G. (Columbia) v Secretary of State for the Home Department' *Feminist Legal Studies* 2007 Vol 15(1): 99-111.

**Ambreena Manji** (Keele): *The Politics of Land Reform in Africa: From Communal Tenure to Free Markets* 2006 Zed Books.

**Stewart Motha** (Kent) (ed) 'Democracy's Empire: Sovereignty, War and the Constitution of Legal Order' Special Issue of the *Journal of Law and Society* 2007 Vol 34(1).

**Oliver Phillips** (Westminster): *Sexuality and the Politics of Rights in Southern Africa: The Legacy of Venus Monstrosa* 2007 Routledge-Cavendish.

**Nicky Priaulx** (Keele): *The Harm Paradox: Tort Law and the Unwanted Child in an Era of Choice* 2007 Routledge-Cavendish.

**Andrew Sharpe** (Keele): 'Structured Like a Monster: Understanding Human Difference through a Legal Category' *Law and Critique* 2007 Vol 18(2).

**Sally Sheldon** (Kent) and **Richard Collier** (Newcastle) (eds): *Fathers' Rights Activism and Law Reform in Comparative Perspective* 2006 Hart Publishing.

**Michael Thomson** (Keele): *Endowed: Regulating the Male Sexed Body* 2007 Routledge.

## Visitors to CentreLGS

We run two visitor schemes – the Visiting Scholar Scheme, and the Associate Fellow Scheme. You can find further information and details of how to apply on our website.

Visitors to Centre institutions for the academic year 2006-2007 under these schemes are listed below.

**Chris Beasley** (University of Adelaide, Australia), **Davina Bhandar** (Trent University, Canada), **Emma Cunliffe** (University of British Columbia, Canada), **Margaret Davies** (Flinders University, Australia), **Julie Greenberg** (Thomas Jefferson School of Law, US), **Cori Hammers** (Armstrong Atlantic State University, US), **Sari Kouvo** (Rule of Law, Human Rights and Gender Advisor to the EU Special Representative for Afghanistan in Kabul), **Kevät Nousiainen** (University of Helsinki, Finland), **Anu Pylkkänen** (University of Helsinki, Finland), **Melanie Randall** (University of Western Ontario, Canada), **Miriam Smith** (Trent University, Canada), **Antu Sorainen** (Cristina Institute for Women's Studies, University of Helsinki), and **Dean Spade** (Sylvia Rivera Law Project and UCLA/Harvard Law Schools, US).

You can find the names of visitors to the Centre under other schemes (such as Keele Law School, Kent Law School, or British Academy) on the website.

# Contacts

## Newsletter Editor

Emily Grabham – Kent Law School (e.grabham@kent.ac.uk)

## Director

Davina Cooper – Kent Law School (d.s.cooper@kent.ac.uk)

## Associate Director

Rosemary Auchmuty – University of Westminster (auchmur@westminster.ac.uk)

## Associate Director

Ruth Fletcher – Keele Law School (r.fletcher@law.keele.ac.uk)

## Centre Co-ordinator

Anisa De Jong is on adoption leave until January 2008. Helen Muggeridge is centre co-ordinator in the meantime (h.muggeridge@kent.ac.uk)

## Centre address

The AHRC Research Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality  
Kent Law School, Eliot College University of Kent Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NS.

Tel: +44 1227 824474

Fax: +44 1227 827399

E-mail: [centre-lgs@kent.ac.uk](mailto:centre-lgs@kent.ac.uk)

Website: <http://www.kent.ac.uk/clgs/>

## Thematic Co-ordinators

Healthcare and Bioethics: Ruth Fletcher (Keele) and Marie Fox (Keele) (r.fletcher@law.keele.ac.uk)

Cultural Studies: Lieve Gies (Keele) (l.gies@keele.ac.uk) Governance and Regulation: Joanne Conaghan (Kent) (j.a.f.conaghan@kent.ac.uk)

## AHRC

The Arts and Humanities Research Council funds postgraduate training and research in the arts and humanities. It supports research within a huge subject domain from traditional humanities subjects, such as history, modern languages and English literature, to the creative and performing arts. The AHRC makes awards on the basis of academic excellence and is not responsible for the views or research outcomes reached by its award holders.



CLGS is supported by



Arts & Humanities  
Research Council

