Dogs, Pigs and Children: Changing Laws in Colonial Britain

Centre for the Study of Colonialism, Empire and International Law and a partner event of Minding Animals International

SOAS, University of London, Thursday 12th – Friday 13th September 2013

The intention behind this workshop is to bring together scholars interested in various aspects of British colonial history to discuss how jurisprudence relating to animals and children reflect changing attitudes in Britain and its colonies. We will be engaging with the ways in which laws on, inter alia, livestock; hunting; sacrificial practices; bestiality; conservation; slaughterhouses; pets; criminal liability and child labour reflect shifting conceptions of the minds and roles of animals and children. By focusing on this often neglected legal and colonial history, we hope to shed light on questions relating to how developments in one jurisdiction may have influenced another; how they reorganized domestic and urban spaces; how they reshaped familial relationships; how legal discourses of rights and welfare tracked those of seduction and deprivation, and how the modern ‘human’ is constituted against the ‘animal’ and the ‘child’.
Programme

Thursday 12th September (Room B111, Brunei Gallery)

9.30-10am: Participant Registration. Coffee and pastries will be provided.

10am: Opening Address

Matthew Craven, Dean of the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences and Director of the Centre for the Study of Colonialism, Empire and International Law

10.15-11am: Marc Trabsky, ‘A Miasma of Dead Animals in Nineteenth Century Melbourne’

This paper will examine how the place of the slaughterhouse emerged in the city of Melbourne as a medical, legal and moral problem in the nineteenth century. Councillors, legislators and journalists all expressed solicitude during the early days of settlement that the presence of abattoirs and butchers in the colonial city was deleterious to the health of its inhabitants. In an application of miasma theory, which conceived of the vapours emanating from animal corpses a source of moral turpitude, the slaughterhouse was also represented as a scene of criminal seduction and the location of potential degeneration of civilised colonial society.

In response to the growing fear of poisoned air and moral corruption, particularly the perversion of children, legislators and councillors regulated the place of the slaughterhouse in the city. However, the process of quarantining the meat trades from other commercial ventures entailed the establishment of the slaughterhouse as a public institution. That is to say the legislation enacted to regulate the location of wholesale meat markets in or around the city represented those places as institutions serving a civic purpose. In this paper I will suggest that the slaughterhouse emerged in the nineteenth century as a public institution in response to a real and imagined contagion of the violence of dead animals. In addition, I will argue that the institutionalisation of practices of animal slaughter cultivated a lawful relationship between the living and the dead, humans and animals. The legal regulation of the place of the slaughterhouse reorganised urban space but also attempted to maintain a tension between the violence of animal slaughter and the futurity of colonial society.

Discussants: Connal Parsley and Shaun McVeigh
11-11.15am: Morning tea will be served.

11.15am-12pm: Vanja Hamzić, ‘The (Un)Conscious Pariah: Canine and Gender Outcasts of the British Raj’

In the post-1857 colonial era, the Indian social and legal landscape underwent a seismic shift, caused by an evermore direct and forceful British rule in many spheres of life, including human-animal and gender relations. This paper provides a brief analysis of this shift through the prism of colonial control of both human and canine pariahs in the Raj, which was fraught with conflicts, debates and moral crises.

Since early colonial times, the word *pariah* in the English language has come to denote any person or animal that is generally despised or avoided. It is derived from the *paraiyar* (sing. *Paraiyan*), a low-caste group found in the southernmost part of the Indian subcontinent, which probably owes its name to the Tamil word for a drum (*parai*). For British colonial masters, however, the word pariah was applicable to the whole of the Indian lowest castes, human outcasts in general, and, curiously perhaps, to India’s street dogs.

Both dogs and humans of the colony deemed astray of Victorian propriety were subject to the changing tides of colonial rule. Abhorred and pitied at the same time, these outcasts were the basis for much of the prevalent civilisatory discourse, which lamented the cruelty of the native in dealing with such ‘aberrations’ while ultimately seeking to do away with them altogether. In 1869, the first Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals for Bengal was passed, which was later extended to all of India. Two years later, the notorious Criminal Tribes Act was enacted, which included, in Part II, the category of ‘eunuch’.

With the help of Hannah Arendt’s concept of ‘the conscious pariah’, this paper revisits these two significant pieces of colonial legislation and their effects on the lifeworlds of the human gender-variant and the canine pariah of India.

Discussants: William G. Clarence Smith and Rahul Rao

12-2pm: Lunch will be served.

2-3pm: Alejandro Lorite Escorihuela, ‘Animals and the Foundations of Liberal Colonialism in John Locke’

As contemporary debates display it, classical liberalism is split on the question of the proper way of relating to animals. Broadly speaking, on the one hand, some would say that social contractualism makes animals into things, out of reach of moral and political consideration. On the other hand, some see welfarism, the concern for the capacities arising out of sentience, as being compatible with, if not demanded by, the liberal sensibility. Locke, both on his own and in dialogue with the
other canonical figures of liberalism, lays out the structure of that undecidable relation, especially as he moves from the First Treatise to the Second Treatise on government. In that movement, which constitutes also a movement from political theology to legal and political theory, Locke highlights two important genealogical features of liberal discourse. The first one is that the omnipresent role of animals in justifying both human society and natural violence echoes the theological foundations of private property and public power in the book of Genesis. The second is that the known association of aspects of animality and the natives of the New World connects then Enlightenment liberalism to the legal construction of Indians or savages, and the basis of imperial expansion in the Scholastics who founded international law.

The examination of Locke’s animal references in imagining the political condition of humans shows original limitations to the path of legal reform concerning animal within the liberal polity, given their centrality is founding the logic of political distinction and exclusion. Further, beyond analogies, Locke’s animals confirms in ideological terms the imperial legal relation as a natural extension of the liberal political space, rather than a historical aberration.

*Discussants: Gina Heathcote and Connal Parsley*

**3-3.15pm: Afternoon tea will be served.**

**3.15-4pm: Piyel Haldar, ‘The Red Balloon’**

Much work has been done on the legislation through which Britain managed to colonize the natural environment of its Empire. Rules regarding hunting, agriculture, mining etc., surrenders peregrine excess to the status of the economically manageable. Industrialization, commerce, colonialization might all be held to account in the silencing of these customs. This form of legislation finds a parallel process in the rules regarding trusteeship of children drawn up in the light of colonial commercial disasters (*Keech v Sandford* 1726). The same forces of commerce and colonization subjected the voice of children to wardship and control. But in doing so they rather dissembled the linguistic capacity of animals and children. From a historical perspective one cannot easily suppose that law has always disavowed the voices of animals or children. The pre-modern history of common law rules regarding rural areas took greater cognizance of local customs. Examples abound.

This paper proposes a methodology based on hermeneutic readings of customs and fables regarding animals and children. Such a project in no way claims to recuperate these voices as calibrations of full subjectivity. Rather the project aims to render these voices as ciphers that reveal laws relation to the linguistic drive, the point at which law attempts to connect to all spheres of life. The main part of this paper will attempt to apply such a methodology to the near silent children’s film *The Red Balloon* (1957).

*Discussants: Stephen Humphreys and Yoriko Otomo*
4-5pm: Erica Burman, ‘Engendering Postcolonial Child/Animal Relations’

Alice’s rescue of the baby-that-turns-into-a-pig also marks the moment of transition in understandings of children and animals, alongside and through Empire, models of the family and industrialisation. This paper draws on the contested crossovers and substitutions of child-animal relations in English history and law to highlight, in particular, how gender relations and women’s social position articulate both emerging technical (scientific) and popular cultural configurations of ‘child’, ‘animal’ and ‘nature’. The emergence of the girlchild as the touchstone of interiority and subjectivity not only underpinned the exclusionary teleology of the ‘great chain of being’, but its paradoxes as well as oppressions still thrive. Some historical and contemporary examples of repetitions and reformulations of child-animals relations, drawn from both cultural and welfare contexts, are explored as indicative of postcolonial political possibilities.

**Discussants:** Rahul Rao and Sarah Keenan

6pm: Dinner at the vegetarian South Indian Restaurant ‘Sagar’ on 17a Percy Street. It is a short walk from SOAS:
Friday 13th September (Room 116 – first floor, main building)

9.30-10am: Coffee and pastries will be provided.

10am-11am: Maneesha Deckha, ‘Welfarist and Imperial: The Contributions of Anti-Cruelty Laws to Civilizational Discourse’

This paper excavates the role British colonial anticruelty statutes played in civilizational thinking both in the metropole and in the colonies, and the residual impact of their early civilizational rationale in contemporary jurisprudence. In doing so, it explores how laws directed at cruelty to animals have helped sustain a discourse of civilization and the ideal human that cuts across and animates hierarchical logics of race, religion, class, and gender. This analysis, then, underscores a different problem with anticruelty laws than what animal law scholars have emphasized. This more familiar critique stresses the inefficacy of these laws in preventing animal suffering, labeling them “welfarist” because of their mandate to regulate animal exploitation rather than prevent it. The analysis adds to this critique pointing out the severe shortcomings of anticruelty laws by focusing on the imperial underpinnings of these welfarist laws.

The paper discusses the emergence of anticruelty statutes in the common law and their impact in reinforcing the civilizing mission with respect to both domestic and colonial populations through a legislative purpose that can be properly understood only by reference to race, religious, class, and gender dynamics. The paper then suggests how the civilizing purposes of anticruelty statutes continue to shape contemporary anticruelty jurisprudence in ways that domesticate populations marginalized by race, class, culture, and religion. In tracing the contributions of anticruelty laws to civilization discourses the analysis highlights the selective register by which these laws function, namely, effectively targeting minoritised practices and immunizing majoritarian ones. In highlighting the imperial attributes of welfarist laws the paper seeks to contribute to the literature exploring the intersections between speciesism, colonialism and humanism.

Discussants: Diamond Ashiagbor and Matt Craven

11.15am: Morning tea will be served.

11.15am-12pm: Matilda Arvidsson, “Beloved Father”, “Darling Mother”: Race, Purity and the Divine Duty – Pedagogy as a Continuation of War in Gertrude Bell’s Mesopotamian Writings’

“Darling Mother […] I’m most exceedingly well and deeply interested in my job. I feel at times rather like the Creator about the middle of the week. He must have wondered what it was going to be like, as I do.”
In the wake of World War I Great Britain pursued its first occupation, 1914–1920, of present day Iraq, then Mesopotamia (two more were to come: 1941–1945 and 2003–2004); this was the birth of Iraq as a nation state under the tutelage of British administration. The occupation was pursued in close proximity to the codification of international law of belligerent occupation – the adoption of the Hague Regulation of 1907. The newly adopted treaty aimed at preserving ‘status quo’ during occupation: social, political and legislative reforms were outlawed or made permissible only as an exemption. A coalescence of International Humanitarian Law and colonial administration, the administration of the occupation of Mesopotamia targeted specific strategic areas: private and public property, taxation, the judiciary, healthcare, and education. Whereas private and public property, taxation and the judiciary were regulated by the Hague Regulation of 1907 and healthcare regulated by the laws of war, education was not. Indeed, it is not until 1949 that the maintenance of institutions for the care and education of children becomes one of (few) explicit duties of an occupying Power (IV Geneva Convention 1949, article 50, first paragraph). Even so, educating Iraqi children was one of the core preoccupations of the administrators of Mesopotamia: special attention put on the proper education of the instructors, and in particular the language of instruction: English.

In my paper I draw on the letters, diaries, official reports and creative writing of Gertrude Bell – colonial explorer, cartographer, archeologist, and one of the key persons in the administration of the occupation, 1914–1920. I do so in order to trace the making of the child during the occupation of Mesopotamia a synecdoche for the new world – the future to come. The future to come involves the embodiment of a break with history (subjugation to Ottoman Turkish rule, the religious and customary fabric of the old society); it necessitates a reconstruction of the subject. By invoking race and purity, and by the means of pedagogy, the child in this respect becomes a figure of imagination and desire for the administrators: it becomes the surface for a continuation of war by means of pedagogy.

Discussants: Gina Heathcote and Catriona Drew

12-2pm: Lunch will be served.

2-2.45pm: Margot Michel, ‘The Shift from Object of Protection to Subject of Rights – Thoughts on Parallels and Differences in Animal Protection Legislation and Legal Status of Children’

Children and domestic animals share a common fate insofar as they are dependent on their caregivers to a degree unknown to adult persons. As they are part of the personal sphere of their caregivers and as this personal sphere usually is harshly protected from state interventions in a liberal society, it proved to be very challenging to establish legal norms to protect their needs and welfare and the
impacts of these norms remain controversial until the present day. To explicitly include animals’ and children’ needs into the law required a paradigm shift in the law and a relativisation of law’s main rationale, “personhood”. The deeper insight and acknowledgment of the fact that children and animals were not only “property” of parents and owners, but individuals with their own entitlements led to their inclusion in the realm of law without conceptualizing them as persons in the first place, but as objects of protection. This conceptualization as more or less passive entities that must be protected, but have no rights of their own, was challenged in the last decades. The claim that children and animals have to be perceived as beings with rights and entitlements has become a more substantial argument in the past decades. But even with this similarity, their legal paths have parted – which is, at least in part, owed to the different ethical theories underlying their conceptualization by law:

The beginnings of animal protection legislation in Britain around 1820 had a big impact on continental Europe. In Germany, Austria, Switzerland for example, animal protection legislation followed Britain’s lead and adopted the core concepts of these laws, in particular the concept of prohibiting “unnecessary suffering” and – later on – the aim to guarantee animals’ welfare. However, the underlying ethical theory, utilitarianism, was a concept otherwise unknown to continental Europe’s legal tradition. As utilitarianism does not protect interests in an absolute way, but allows for their violation when this violation appears to produce more good than harm, it seemed to be particularly appropriate to protect animals’ interests without producing undesired side-effects – for example the question, if humans are entitled to exploit animals at all. However, from the standpoint of legal theory it has been repeatedly shown that current animal-protection laws contain, at least in part, a rights approach. According to Fischer, they comprise at very least a “tacit admission of some minimal rights of animals which are to be observed” – an admission that is admittedly not thought through to its logical conclusion. The argument goes like this: When animal protection laws protect animals for their own sake and not for the sake of humans, then this implicates that humans have certain duties when dealing with animals – for example the duty to not inflict unnecessary suffering. As animal protection laws protect animals for their own sake, these duties are owed directly to animals. Therefore, humans have direct obligations to animals, which means that the law treats animals de facto as subjects, not only as objects. And when it is correct that rights are a correlate of duties, then animals do have de facto positive rights here and now. Although these «rights» are so limited and weak under the current conception that we are reluctant to apply the term «right» at all, the concept of animal rights is not something completely unknown to how animals are perceived by law, but would result from the so-called ethical animal protection principle as a logical consequence.

On the other hand, the question whether children have rights and entitlements of their own was from the very first treated as a deontological one. This means that it is clear that when children have rights – and they do so only if they are perceived as separate entities from their parents – then these rights must not be infringed upon simply for the benefits of others. Rights act as trumps, which means that a rightsholder has a legally enforceable claim that his or her right has to be respected.
It is from this starting point that the UN convention on the rights of the child was born, which has influenced in a very profound manner legal child protection and all judicial proceedings involving children. As children are perceived as rights holders, a solution had to be found to the question who would enforce childrens’ rights. Nowadays, in Switzerland, children often have a proxy of their own when their interests are at stake, for example in a divorce of their parents.

Discussants: Victoria Ridler and Vanja Hamzić

2.45-3pm: Afternoon tea will be served.

3pm: Keynote Address

Shaun McVeigh, ‘A Jurisprudent’s Dog’

This paper circulates around the curious lack of animal companionship found in the office of the jurisprudent. It is possible for a philosopher to write philosophy in relation to a cat or a dog. There is also a possibility for a posthumanist to engage with forms of animal life and with question of being or becoming animal. However, this does not seem to be so clearly the case for the jurisprudent - one who cares for the conduct of law. The humanist philosopher might draw on a philosophy of life in order to understanding their sense of relationship to animal life (whether their own or not). The humanist jurisprudent struggles to do the same. The two contexts in which I want to investigate the responsibilities of the office of jurisprudent shaped around the difficulties of expressing animal life in a living law and the burial of humans and animals. In this paper I would like to hold the engagements of law at the level of those who have responsibilities to engage in lawful relations.

The limits explored in this paper are set by the ways in the office of jurisprudent is understood. I take this limit, as might others, as being concerned with finding some point of acknowledgement that brings humans and animals into some form of lawful and ethical relation. The ethical relation, although it might not necessarily closely touch jurisprudents, would involve the acknowledgement of common understanding and a way of responding with humanity to animals. The jurisprudential relation considers a number of human relations with animals that might bring into relation the honouring of the dead and the honouring of law.

4pm: Closing Remarks

Yoriko Otomo
Biographies

Matilda Arvidsson

Matilda Arvidsson is a Doctoral Candidate at the Faculty of Law, Lund University. Her research interests include issues of international law - in particular theory and history of international law, international humanitarian law, and international law of belligerent occupation - theory of law, Islamic law, political theology, psychoanalysis, ethics, materiality of law, and law/poetry.

Diamond Ashiagbor

Diamond Ashiagbor joined SOAS in September 2010 as Professor of Labour Law, having previously been a Reader in Law at University College London. She is a graduate of the University of Oxford and has a PhD from the European University Institute.

Diamond’s main areas of research interest are labour/employment law; equality and anti-discrimination law; human rights, equality and multiculturalism; EU market integration and ‘new governance’; the law and economics of labour market regulation; labour law, trade and development. Her book The European Employment Strategy: Labour Market Regulation and New Governance, OUP, 2005 (Oxford Monographs on Labour Law) was winner of the 2006 Society of Legal Scholars / Peter Birks Prize for Outstanding Legal Scholarship. Current research projects include a workshop and two journal special issues on economic sociology of law, co-organised with SOAS colleagues Prabha Kotiswaran and Amanda Perry-Kessaris.

Erica Burman

Professor of Education, University of Manchester, author of Deconstructing Developmental Psychology (Routledge 1994, 2008) and Developments: child, image, nation (Routledge, 2008), interested in contests and connections between women and children, with previous projects on intersections between state and interpersonal violence in relation to minoritised women and children. She is also a group analyst.

William G. Clarence-Smith

William G. Clarence-Smith is Professor of the Economic History of Asia and Africa at SOAS, University of London, and chief editor of the Journal of Global History (Cambridge University Press). He has published on the history of horses, mules, donkeys, camels, and elephants around the Indian Ocean, as traded commodities, sources of physical and symbolic power, origins of food and raw materials, and bearers of disease. He is currently undertaking research for a global history of mules since c. 1400.
Matthew Craven

Matthew Craven is Dean of the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences, and Professor of International Law at SOAS. He is a Director of the Centre for the study of Colonialism, Empire and International Law. His many publications on colonialism and international law include the edited collection, *Time, History and International Law* (Martinus Nijhoff Publishers).

Maneesha Dekha

Maneesha Deckha is Associate Professor of Law at the University of Victoria. Her research interests include critical animal law, postcolonial feminist theory, health law and bioethics. Her work has appeared in the *McGill Law Journal*, the *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender*, *Hypatia*, the *Medical Law Review*, *Animal Law*, and *Sexualities* among other publications. She has also contributed to several anthologies relating to feminism, cultural pluralism and health law and policy. She has received grants from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. In 2006, Professor Deckha’s seminar on Animals, Culture and the Law received the U.S. Humane Society's Animal and Society New Course Award. In 2008 she held the Fulbright Visiting Chair in Law and Society at New York University. She is currently completing a book project on feminism, postcolonialism and animal law.

Catriona Drew

Dr Drew specialises in public international law. She teaches an undergraduate course on Public International Law with Special Reference to Asia and Africa in the Department of Law and of course International Law in the Centre for International Studies and Diplomacy.

Luis Eslava

Luis Eslava is a Senior Fellow at the University of Melbourne, and a guest researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law. His research interests are located at the intersection between International Law, Development and Global Governance. To date, his fieldwork and writing have explored the anthropological, political and economic dimensions of today’s global order from a jurisprudential perspective. In his academic work, Luis applies insights from legal and social theory to the lived experience of development in the Third World.

Piyal Haldar

Piyel Haldar (Birkbeck University) works in the broad field of legal history. He is currently working on oral, documentary and visual forms of testimony and their effect on the theatrical transmission and administrative of justice. He lives in a pet free household.
Vanja Hamzić

Dr Vanja Hamzić has recently joined SOAS, University of London, as a Lecturer at the Faculty of Law and Social Sciences. Prior to this post, he has taught at King’s College London and City University London. He has worked as a researcher with various international and civil society organisations in Europe, the Middle East, South Africa, South Asia and South East Asia. Currently, his research is supported by the Institute for Global Law and Policy at the Harvard Law School and the International State Crime Initiative, based at King’s College London.

Vanja’s academic research primarily revolves around the historical, legal and political conditionality of human subjectivity formation in various Muslim-majority contexts, with the principal fieldwork sites in Pakistan and Indonesia. His other interests include legal and social theory, Islamic legal tradition, feminism, human rights, postcolonial studies, global law/governance studies, anthropology, criminology and philosophy. He has published widely in these areas. His most recent book, co-authored with Dr Ziba Mir-Hosseini, is titled Control and Sexuality: The Revival of Zina Laws in Muslim Contexts.

Gina Heathcote

Dr Gina Heathcote lectures in Public International Law and the International Law on the Use of Force at the School of Law, SOAS. Her book, The Law on the Use of Force: a Feminist Analysis, approaches international justifications for the use of force through the lens of feminist interrogations of interpersonal justifications for violence. Gina’s research covers feminist approaches to international law, collective security, and the relationship between gender, violence and law.

Stephen Humphreys

Stephen Humphreys is a Senior Lecturer in International Law. He was formerly Research Director at the International Council on Human Rights Policy in Geneva, and, before that, Senior Officer at the Open Society Institute’s Justice Initiative in New York and Budapest. He has conducted policy work on climate change and in human rights in a variety of fora. His research interests include international legal and critical theory; rule of law; law and development; climate change; the laws of war; and transnational legal processes. He holds a PhD from Cambridge and a Master’s degree in law from SOAS. His publications include Theatre of the Rule of Law (Cambridge University Press, 2010) and the edited volume, Human Rights and Climate Change (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Sarah Keenan

Sarah’s research interests centre around the areas of property, legal geography, post-colonial legal theory and feminist legal theory. She explored each of these areas in her PhD thesis ‘Subversive Property: Law and the Production of Spaces of Belonging’, and she continues to explore these areas in her post-doctoral
work. Coming from a background as a community lawyer and activist, Sarah is interested in using critical theories to explore law in its many and varied forms and to question how law relates to other forms of governance.

**Alejandro Lorite Escorihuela**

Alejandro is an associate professor of law at the American University in Cairo. His current writing projects concern the relationship between political liberalism and the legal status of animals, with a special focus on the international legal system.

**Shaun McVeigh**

Shaun McVeigh teaches and researches at the Law School, University of Melbourne. His current research projects centre around three themes associated with reviving the conduct of lawful relations: the development of accounts of a ‘lawful’ South; the importance of a civil prudence to thinking about the conduct of law (and lawyers); and, the continuing need to take account of the colonial legal inheritance of Australia and Britain.

**Margot Michel**

Margot Michel currently works as a senior research and teaching associate at Zurich University, Law Institute and as a legal practitioner at the Children and Adults Protection Authority of the canton of Zug, Switzerland. Her habilitation project lies in animal law. She was a substitute professor for private law at Zurich University in 2011/2012 and organizer of the international conference on animal law and ethics at Zurich University in July 2012 (Animal Law and Ethics: Reflecting on European, American and Asian Concepts). In her dissertation, she focused on the rights of children in medical treatments. She is a founding member of EGALS (Europgroup for Animal Law Studies). Margot Michel research areas are family law, children’s rights, medical law and animal law. She has published widely in these areas.

**Yoriko Otomo**

Yoriko Otomo is a Lecturer at SOAS, having previously been at Keele University. She is a graduate of the University of Melbourne, where she has taught and completed a PhD, 'Unconditional Life: The Time and Technics of International Law'. Yoriko’s main areas of research interest are animal law, environmental law, international law and legal theory, with her most recent publication being the co-edited book (with Edward Mussawir), *Law and the Question of the Animal* (Routledge).

**Connal Parsley**

Connal Parsley is Lecturer in Law at the Kent Law School. He publishes in the area of overlap between critical legal theory, political theory and visual culture. He is
currently working on a jurisprudential re-reading of Giorgio Agamben, and an English translation of Roberto Esposito's *Categorie dell'impolitico* (1988).

**Rahul Rao**

Rahul Rao is a Lecturer in International Relations in the School of Oriental & African Studies. He has a law degree from the National Law School of India University and a doctorate in international relations from the University of Oxford. He is the author of *Third World Protest: Between Home and the World* (Oxford University Press, 2010).

**Victoria Ridler**

Victoria Ridler is a Lecturer at the School of Law at Birkbeck College, where she is also completing her PhD studies. She holds an M.A. in Legal Studies from Carleton University, Ottawa, and a B.A. in International Development Studies and Political Science from Dalhousie University, Halifax. Victoria has previously taught at Birkbeck College, Westminster University, the University of East London, the University of Reading, and Carleton University specializing in public law, legal methods, and law and society. She has also worked for the United Nations in the field of international development and for the Federal Government of Canada in policy analysis.

**Marc Trabsky**

Marc Trabsky is a Lecturer at the School of Law at La Trobe University. He is also completing a doctoral thesis at the Melbourne Law School. Marc writes in the intersections of legal history, theory and aesthetics. His doctoral thesis offers an institutional account of the dead in law. It questions how the dead dwell in the office of the coroner, but also what the significance is of thinking through law by means of different institutions of the dead.