

NSF Award 1126004: Transforming Cross-National Theory and Research through International Research Collaboratives

PIs: Valerie Hans, David Engel, Sally Merry, Masayuki Murayama, and Barbara Yngvesson

Final Report to the National Science Foundation

This award funded networks of researchers, or International Research Collaboratives (IRCs). The concept of the IRC was developed by the Law and Society Association (LSA) for an earlier International Conference (Berlin 2007, Building Transnational Sociolegal Scholarship: Established Problems in New Contexts, NSF award #0647809). IRCs have proved to be a highly successful mechanism for bringing scholars together from low, middle, and high income countries (as classified by the World Bank) for a specific research project that leads directly to a defined scholarly product to advance sociolegal theory, methodology, and policy. Scholarly products have included articles, journal issues, books, conferences, and collaborative research projects.

The scientific rationale for IRCs is considerable. Over the last two decades, social science scholarship on law and legal systems has focused more intensively on understanding the effects of globalization on law and social life. Sociolegal scholarship has explored transnational religious movements, economic crises, immigration issues, global environmental transformations, changing gender roles, human rights, transitional justice, and the interface of international legal regimes with local law and practice. As issues such as these become more central to sociolegal scholarship and more important for US scholars seeking to understand the global role of the US, scientific collaboration across national borders and regional divisions is becoming more significant. Collaboration is critical for developing scientifically sound transnational and international sociolegal research.

The IRC Development Process

We begin by describing the procedures by which the LSA encouraged groups of international scholars to develop IRCs. As we describe in this final report, these groups were diverse in membership, active in developing international and collaborative sessions, and astonishingly productive in terms of collaborative research, writing, and publication. Thus, other groups interested in generating successful scientific collaborations across geographic or disciplinary lines may find the model useful.

To jump-start the development of IRCs, an Advance Planning Committee for the 2012 International Conference on Law and Society in Honolulu issued a Call for IRC Proposals for Honolulu in 2010. The LSA committed up to \$40,000 of its own funds for the IRC initiative. At the same time, LSA members Valerie Hans, PI, and CoPIs David Engel, Sally Merry, Masayuki Murayama, and Barbara Yngvesson began work on a proposal to NSF.

In 2010, a subcommittee chaired by Masayuki Murayama was formed to review IRC proposals. Thirty-eight IRC proposals were submitted. Thirty were accepted as meeting the criteria for Honolulu: a well-defined and high quality research agenda, participants from a minimum of two different countries, and at least one participant from a low or middle income country. These IRCs were encouraged to hold lead-up or planning sessions for Honolulu at the 2011 LSA Annual Meeting in San Francisco, and LSA allocated some of its committed funds to bring IRC participants to San Francisco.

Upon receiving confirmation of this NSF award in the late summer of 2011, the IRC Committee reformed, co-chaired by PI Hans and CoPI Murayama. They requested the Organizers of the thirty IRCs to update their earlier proposals and participant funding requests for Honolulu.

Ultimately, 25 IRCs submitted detailed requests to fund the travel of 99 low and middle income country scholars. Five of the original 30 IRCs did not ask for travel funding, because there was no scholar who fit the requirements and who was in need, or because the IRC decided against organizing a session at the Honolulu meeting.

Committee members read each of the IRC funding requests, and assessed them in terms of the overall quality of the IRC project as well as significance of the applicant's role on the panel, the geographical diversity, and financial needs of participants. Many of the IRCs were judged to be of very high quality, and the IRC committee had submissions from more high priority participants than could be fully funded by the combined NSF and LSA resources.

The primary aim in allocating funding was to get the largest number possible of the IRC high priority scholars to the Hawaii meeting. The committee made the decision to award the full amounts for the estimated airfare, ground travel, and visa costs for the top priority scholars for each IRC. The number offered funding depended on IRC requests and IRC quality as assessed by the IRC Committee. However, to stretch the funding dollars as much as possible to cover the neediest individuals and the scholars who were most central to the IRC projects, the committee awarded only partial funding of the requested amount for other conference expenses such as lodging and per diem expenses.

Using this approach, funding was granted to 72 scholars from 20 low and middle income nations. In the final week just prior to the conference, there were 8 late withdrawals (3 with visa or travel issues, 5 with illness or serious family illness which prevented their attendance). Given the difficulty of finding a substitute and making international travel arrangements within days of the conference, it was not possible to replace these participants. Thus, 64 scholars received funding. The Staff at the LSA office assisted participants with visa, flight and accommodation arrangements, and handled all reimbursements for travel expenses.

Both men and women were well-represented among the funded applicants (31 women scholars and 33 men scholars). Given the location in Hawai'i, many funded scholars came from South, Southeast, and Northeast Asia (29 scholars). Others came from diverse countries in Latin America (22 scholars); Africa (9); and Eastern Europe (4 scholars).

Here is a list of the funded participants' countries of origin, along with the number of awardees for each country.

Argentina - 5
Armenia - 1
Bangladesh - 2
Bolivia - 1
Brazil - 7
Chile - 3
China - 9
Colombia - 4
Costa Rica - 1
Georgia - 1
Ghana - 1
India - 10
Malaysia - 2
Mexico - 1
Philippines - 3
Russia - 1
South Africa - 7
Thailand - 3
Turkey - 1
Uganda - 1

Impact of the IRCs at the International Conference on Law and Society

The presence of the IRC groups and the sessions they organized were a great contribution to the conference in Honolulu, and the conference was in turn a rich experience for the participants. The IRC groups organized a total of 65 sessions involving hundreds of conference participants.

Following here is a list of the IRC-sponsored sessions at the conference in Honolulu:

Public Interest Practitioners in Asia: Explorations and Comparisons--Part 1 (Sponsored by IRC01 Reflective Practitioner)
Public Interest Practitioners in Asia: Explorations and Comparisons--Part 2 (Sponsored by IRC01 Reflective Practitioner)
The Public's Confidence in Courts and Legal System: A Comparative Approach (Sponsored by IRC03 Public Opinion and Courts)
Dispute Resolution in China (Sponsored by IRC04 Law and Globalization: Chinese Experience in Comparative Perspective)
Judicial Reform in China (Sponsored by IRC04 Law and Globalization: Chinese Experience in Comparative Perspective)
Legal Consciousness and Legal Culture in China (Sponsored by IRC04 Law and Globalization: Chinese Experience in Comparative Perspective)
Legal Profession in China (Sponsored by IRC04 Law and Globalization: Chinese Experience in Comparative Perspective)

Gender and Judicial Education 01 (Sponsored by CRN32 Gender and Judging, IRC05 Gender and Judicial Education, and IRC08 Legal Education)

Gender and Judicial Education 02 (Sponsored by CRN32 Gender and Judging, IRC05 Gender and Judicial Education, and IRC08 Legal Education)

Gender and Judicial Education 03 (Sponsored by CRN32 Gender and Judging, IRC05 Gender and Judicial Education, and IRC08 Legal Education)

Roundtable - Immigration Law from Below: Migration, Legal Pluralism, and Human Rights in the Global South (co spon CRN02)

State Actors and International Law: Factors that Influence the Fate of Asylum-Seekers (Sponsored by CRN02 and IRC06 Citizenship and Immigration and CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Collective Labor Law and Worker Participation (Sponsored by CRN08 Labor Rights and IRC07 Globalization, Transnational, and Domestic Labor Governance)

Labor Governance at the Intersection Among Global, Transnational, and National Levels (Sponsored by CRN08 Labor Rights and IRC07 Globalization, Transnational, and Domestic Labor Governance)

Foreign Models for Labor Governance and for Labor Transitions (Sponsored by CRN08 Labor Rights and IRC07 Globalization, Transnational, and Domestic Labor Governance)

Regulating Decent Work for Domestic Workers: Critical Reflections (Sponsored by CRN08 Labor Rights and IRC07 Globalization, Transnational, and Domestic Labor Governance)

Vulnerabilities, Disabilities, and Labor Transitions: Comparative Perspectives (Sponsored by CRN08 Labor Rights and IRC07) Globalization, Transnational, and Domestic Labor Governance)

Legal Education: Learning to Think Like a Lawyer: Meanings and Methodological Approaches (Sponsored by IRC08 Legal Education)

Legal Education: Legal Training and Its Issues: New Practices and New Ideologies? (Sponsored by IRC08 Legal Education)

New Developments in Japan's Saiban-in System (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making and CRN33 East Asian Law and Society)

Iconic Jury Trials (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)

Juries and Mixed Courts in Europe (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)

New Developments in Lay Participation in Law (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)

Participation on Juries (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Law)

Roundtable--The Role of Professionals in Lay Tribunals (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Systems)

The Role of Courts in the Regulatory State of the South (Sponsored by IRC10 Regulatory State, Global South)

Environmental Lawfare 01: Impact (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human Development)

Environmental Lawfare 02: Strategies (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human Development)

Economic and Social Rights: Compliance and Courts (IRC (IRC12 Assessing Economic and Social Rights Compliance)

Regional Human Rights Systems in Socio-Legal Perspective (IRC13 Regional Human Rights)

From Soft to Hard Law: Exploring the Role of Transnational Business CSR Standards (Sponsored by CRN05 Regulatory Governance and CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

The Settlement of Transnational Legal Orders and their Impact (Sponsored by CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Transnational Rights and Rule of Law Construction (Sponsored by CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Roundtable--The Role of Institutions in Shaping International Law (CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Transnational Legal Orders in Investment and Trade Law (CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Transnational Regulatory Orders (Sponsored by CRN36 and IRC14 Transnational Legal Orders)

Intersex between Sex and Gender, or Beyond? How Go Beyond? (Sponsored by IRC15 Intersex Between Sex and Gender? Or Beyond?)

From Cape Town to Kabul (Sponsored by IRC17 Gender Equality)

Violence against Women: Collaborative Research Models (Sponsored by IRC17 Gender Equality)

Politics, Society, Economy, and Laws in East Asia (IRC18 Socio-Political-Economic Developments and the Legal Systems in East Asia)

The Socio-Political-Economic Developments and the Legal/Quasi-Legal Professions in East Asia (cosponsor CRN 33)

Cross National Comparison of Gender in Professional Legal Work and Work Life Balance (IRC19 Women in Legal Practice)

Gendering the Legal Profession: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives (IRC19 Women in Legal Practice)

Greening the Economy or Economizing the Green? (Sponsored by CRN05 Regulatory Governance and IRC20 Financial and Climate Crises)

Questioning the Capacity to Regulate Competing Risks? (Sponsored by CRN05 Regulatory Governance and IRC20 Financial and Climate Crises)

The Quest for Alternative Rationalities of Governance (Sponsored by CRN05 Regulatory Governance and IRC20 Financial and Climate Crises)

Comparative Perspectives on Household Debt and Insolvency 01 (Sponsored by IRC21 Comparative and International Perspectives on Regulation of Household Credit, Debt, and Insolvency)

Comparative Perspectives on Household Debt and Insolvency 02 (Sponsored by IRC21 Comparative and International Perspectives on Regulation of Household Credit, Debt, and Insolvency)

Comparative Perspectives on Household Debt and Insolvency 03 (Sponsored by IRC21 Comparative and International Perspectives on Regulation of Household Credit, Debt, and Insolvency)

Comparative Perspectives on Household Debt and Insolvency 04 (Sponsored by IRC21 Comparative and International Perspectives on Regulation of Household Credit, Debt, and Insolvency)

Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution 01: Theoretical and Methodological Frameworks for Judicial Dispute Resolution (Sponsored by IRC22 Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution)

Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution 02: Country Studies, Critiques, Issues, and Strategies for Future Work (Sponsored by IRC22 Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution)

Religious Diversity, Legal Pluralism, and Social Conflict 01 (IRC24 Religious Diversity, Sovereignty, and Legal Pluralism)

Religious Diversity, Legal Pluralism, and Social Conflict 02 (IRC24 Religious Diversity, Sovereignty, and Legal Pluralism)

Indicators of Law and Law of Indicators (Sponsored by IRC25 Indicators and Global Governance)

The Politics of Indicators: Contestation and Resistance (Sponsored by IRC25 Indicators and Global Governance)

The Politics of Indicators: Knowledge Production (Sponsored by IRC25 Indicators and Global Governance)

The Political Economy of Class Actions: A Convergence of Public and Private Action (IRC26 Collective Litigation)

The Economics of Class Actions: Litigation Financing, Entrepreneurial Lawyering, and High States Defense)

Roundtable--Today's Politics of Settler Colonialism (Sponsored by IRC27 Racism, Colonialism, and Law: Excavations, Operations and Iterations)

Security, Expendability, and State Power (Sponsored by IRC27 Racism, Colonialism, and Law: Excavations, Operations, and Iterations)

Whose Humanity? On Global Violence and Extra-Legal Limits of Collective Existence in the 21st Century (Sponsored by IRC27 Racism, Colonialism and Law: Excavations, Operations and Iterations)

Governing Dissent during Humanitarian Crisis (Sponsored by IRC29 Legal Mobilization during Humanitarian Crises)

Refugees, Hosts, and the Struggles to Integrate (Sponsored by IRC29 Legal Mobilization during Humanitarian Crises)

Implementation and Impact of Social and Economic Rights (Sponsored by IRC30 Social Rights)

FINDINGS

Because of the nature of this NSF grant, it is not a project that will generate research findings such as those that would be produced by a funded research project. Instead, it leads to the exchange of ideas across countries and disciplinary boundaries, the development of new collaborations, the generation of research plans, and publications. Nonetheless, a review of the individual IRC reports about their activities, and reports from funded participants, show that the IRC model has already generated a substantial amount of new collaborative research and publication. Even though it is early to be able to assess the full scientific and scholarly impact of the IRCs, it is impressive to read about the tremendous number of joint collaborative research and publication efforts that are now underway and that are directly attributable to the IRC funding. For example:

1. For the Reflective practitioner project – Social Justice Lawyers in Comparative Perspective IRC, the University of Wisconsin International Law Journal will sponsor a symposium based on the IRC on April 12 2013 and will publish the papers in the Journal in 2013.

2. The Transnational Legal Orders IRC members have published one book and plan another based on the papers presented: Transnational Legal Ordering and State Change (Cambridge, 2013), at http://www.cambridge.org/us/knowledge/isbn/item6895521/?site_locale=en_US. The second book, Transnational Legal Orders, is currently under review at a publisher.
3. Women in Legal Practice: Local and Global Perspectives IRC put together a special symposium issue for the Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies, published in 2013 as part of Volume 20, Issue 2 and entitled "Comparative Perspectives on Gender and Lawyering."
4. Tania Sourdin and Archie Zariski, co-organizers of the International Perspectives on Judicial Dispute Resolution, coedited a collected volume of papers that has been published arising out of the work of its members: The Multi-Tasking Judge: Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution, <http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/the-multi-tasking-judge-comparative-judicial-dispute-resolution-ebook/productdetail/116254>.
5. The Religious Diversity, Sovereignty, and Legal Pluralism IRC has a book contract with Springer for the edited book 'The Sociology of Shari'a: Case Studies from Around the World' (edited by A. Possamai, J. Richardson and B. Turner).
6. Papers by members of the Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making IRC were published in a special symposium on Comparative Jury Systems, 86 Chicago-Kent Law Review 449 (2011).
7. Work of the Indicators and Global Governance IRC members will culminate in a volume examining the production, use and effects of indicators in developing countries and emerging economies. The manuscript, Measuring Development, Corruption, and the Rule of Law: The Production and Use of Indicators for Global Governance, is now completed and will be submitted for publication in July 2013.

It is remarkable to see this level of scientific scholarship already published or soon to be published, given the short time period since the beginning of the NSF grant.

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT: ACTIVITIES & SCHOLARSHIP OF THE IRCS

Post-conference reports from the IRC Organizers and from the funded participants themselves paint an informative picture of the multiple ways in which the IRCs promoted training and development, not just of the participants from low and moderate income countries who received funding, but also of US scholars and scholars from other nations who benefited.

IRC organizers and participants were asked to describe and assess their activities and panels; how important to the success of the project was the grant funding that enabled participation; their accomplishments to date; and what they plan to accomplish in the future in terms of research, other collaborative activities, planned articles, books or other publications.

As the comments below illustrate, a major benefit of the NSF funding was the increasing ability of US scholars to interact with scholars from other parts of the world who often cannot afford to attend meetings in the US. As the Indicators and Global Governance IRC organizers Sally Merry, Benedict Kingsbury,

Kevin Davis describe the impact of their IRC member who received NSF funding, recipient Maria Angelica Prada: “Maria’s presence at the LSA, and particular her study on the effects of World Bank indicators in Colombia, helped the IRC refine research questions, develop hypotheses for further testing, compare observations and findings, all of which allows the IRC to develop richer insights on the way global indicators work in a variety of countries and contexts.”

Many funded participants described the advantages to them of making contacts from other scholars around the world working on the similar problems. Consider the value of NSF funding for Gender Equality, Governance and Citizenship participant South African professor Sindiso Mnisi Weeks, who outlined some of the tangible consequences: “Since the meeting, I have been invited to contribute to a book edited by more senior colleagues who attended the conference. My chapter contribution draws heavily on the research paper I presented at the conference and the questions and feedback I received in response to it. It also provides a useful foundation upon which to build the subsequent work that I am doing.... I was also introduced to an editor of a book series with whom I have since been in conversation about the possibility of turning my PhD thesis into a book and having it published as part of this series.” Likewise, Indicators and Global Governance IRC member and NSF-funded recipient Maria Angelica Prada received valuable feedback during her conference presentation and related workshop. She revised her paper based on the comments she received and was able to present it again at the 8th Viterbo Global Administrative Law Seminar on “Indicators in Global Governance: Legal Dimensions”, where she was awarded a prize for the best paper.

By bringing scholars from countries that usually cannot afford to send scholars to international meetings, the NSF funding enabled US scholars as well as others attending these meetings to see the global implications of their scholarship and to rethink their own approaches. As the Citizenship and Migration IRC organizer Doris Marie Provine explained: “The two NSF/LSA sponsored scholars were essential to our discussion of cross-national effects of immigration. Our guest from the Philippines described pressures on sending countries when they try to protect their migrating citizens.... This issue of nations negotiating protection for their migrating nationals is a rare element in discussions of migration policy in the United States. We tend to focus on the problems of receiving countries. Our guest from Mexico provided a helpful perspective on the position of Chiapas in international migration. This border area is a site of transit for immigrants, but also a site of settlement, and more recently, a site of return. The problems of integration and re-integration are quite severe.... both speakers provided the audience with additional perspectives on the immigration process, perspectives drawn from experiences far away from the United States.”

Similarly, the members of the IRC on Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making benefited from presentations by scholars from Georgia and Russia who provided an important analysis of challenges experienced by these two countries during the implementation of the Anglo-American jury model in legal systems based predominantly on inquisitorial legal traditions. In turn, information about the US jury system that Argentine professor Edmundo Hendler gathered in Hawaii was included in his report to the Ministry of Justice of Buenos Aires Province, for the implementation of jury trials to be enacted in that province. Giorgi Meladze from the country of Georgia wrote that his participation at the conference was important, and assisted him in efforts to develop a research project to study the implementation of that country’s new jury system.

Since the funded scholars were included in ongoing research collaboratives, the benefits to the US scholars who belong to the IRCs are substantial, since they have developed a basis for sustained work together in the future. The reports below (lightly edited to improve readability) provide ample evidence about these benefits and the prospects for collaborations in innovative scientific research.

DETAILED IRC REPORTS

1. Reflective Practitioner Project: Social Justice Lawyers in Comparative Perspective

Louise Trubek, organizer

Co-organizers:

Scott Cummings, School of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, cummings@law.ucla.edu.

Frank Munger, New York Law School, fmunger@nyls.edu.

Louise Trubek, School of Law, University of Wisconsin, Madison, lgrubek@wisc.edu.

The goal of the 2012 IRC is to produce a publication with unique practitioner narratives, scholars' overviews of the legal profession and public interest practice in the Asian region, and analysis of themes developed from the practitioner narratives. The decision to focus on Asian practitioners was based on two conclusions by the co-organizers. First, far less is known about public interest law in Asia and far less has been published this topic. Second, our search for participants revealed that there are many public interest practitioners with a wide range of interesting and important knowledge about law practice for the public interest which will provide rich material for description and analysis by law and society scholars. At the June 2011 San Francisco meetings the IRC, with the help of LSA funding, The Asia Foundation and personal donations, brought together thirteen Asian practitioners and scholars from ten different Asian societies plus the United States. Based on the conversations and papers presented at the 2011 meeting, the goal of the Reflective Practitioner Project remains to explore the forms and strategies of public interest law practice in Asian and comparative perspective. We are developing a framework for evaluating the role of indigenous history, experience, and institutions. Recognizing that globalization is neither new nor one-way, the framework will also contextualize transnational influences in a local as well as international historical perspective.

The IRC consists of the organizers and the authors of the papers. All fifteen authors participated in Hawaii writing about public interest practice in twelve Asian societies. We are very pleased that the grants obtained by Law and Society Association provided substantial funding for the Asian participants. We also received substantial support from the East Asian Legal Studies Center at the University of Wisconsin Law School. The staff of Law and Society administered the allocated Law and Society funding as well as the substantial funding we received from the EALSC at the University of Wisconsin.

All the participants presented papers at the two panels we held and also participated in the business session we organized. The attendance was excellent at the panels.

We sponsored Session 1, Thursday June 7 8:15-10:00am, Session 2, Thursday June 7 12:30-2:15, We also sponsored a business session and a dinner.

The panels were well-attended and the organizers were able to make contacts for future coordination with several of the audience at the panels. The business meeting was very successful in linking the presentations together, facilitating the individual papers and also framing the overall publication.

Our IRC is based on the participation of Asian practitioners and scholars. Without the funding, the project could not have occurred, so the funding was critical. In addition, by obtaining the LSA and NSF funding, we were able to obtain matching University of Wisconsin law school funding so that all the collaborators were able to come to Hawaii. We were able to provide two well-attended panels. In addition the

organizers met with the authors to review the papers and provide feedback. The presence of the authors also enabled interaction among all the participants. We were particularly pleased that a lawyer from Burma was able to attend. Several of the papers will provide unique information on social justice lawyering in Asian countries.

The meeting with all of the participants enabled the project to create a positive connection among the participants and with the organizers. We were also able to discuss the formalities of the publication and share ideas for the overall framework. In addition, we met other scholars from the area who are interested in continuing the projects post publication. We are particularly interested in locating an Asian base for the topic of social change lawyering in Asia.

The University of Wisconsin International Law Journal will sponsor a symposium based on the IRC on April 12 2013 and will publish the papers in the Journal in 2013. The Journal is fundraising so that many of the participants will be able to attend the Symposium. In addition the organizers will write and publish an essay in the volume that will provide theoretical and historical context. That essay will be presented at Fordham Law School as part of a series on Global Legal Profession in February 2013.

3. Public Opinion and the Courts

Kristina Galstyan, organizer

The International Research Collaborative (IRC) / Collaborative Research Network (CRN) on Public Opinion and the Courts is aimed at studying public opinion of justice systems in different countries, legal traditions, and different regimes and in historical context. It also tackles how society influences legal practice and law and how legal practice influences the society. It examines the public opinion of courts, the people's perception of judges, as well as prosecutors and lawyers as an ingredient of democracy and rule of law. It has a strong comparative angle: different countries and different regions face very different as well as very similar problems and ways of addressing these. Activities aimed at raising the public trust in courts are often part of law reform projects. Therefore the IRC / CRN addresses the issues of rule of law reforms in a comparative light and attempts to give recommendations.

The IRC / CRN was formed in 2000 under the auspices of the Law and Society Association, and has sponsored panels during the 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2006 and 2007 Annual Meetings. After a break (due to lack of funding), the IRC / CRN reconvened during the 2012 Meeting. The IRC / CRN organized one session during the 2012 Meeting.

The IRC / CRN applied to LSA for funding for both 2011 and 2012 Meetings. No grants were received for the 2011 Annual Meeting [although interest in presenting during the 2011 meeting was received from six scholars].

For the 2012 International Meeting the following scholars were awarded grants to attend the conference: Codru Vrabie (Romania), Kristina Galstyan (Armenia), Anuradha Parasar (India) and Leyla Pervizat (Turkey). Partial award was granted to Meenakshi Sharma (India). Thanks to the generous funding three scholars (Kristina Galstyan, Anuradha Parasar and Meenakshi Sharma) were able to attend the International Meeting and present their research to the conference attendees. The list of scholars who were awarded grants is attached.

There were two last minute withdrawals (Codru Vrabie – difficulty to find an American flag carrier flight as required by the grant; and Leyla Pervizat – due to death of family member). Both notified [us](#) about their withdrawal.

As part of the 2012 International Meeting in Honolulu, IRC / CRN on Public Opinion and the Courts sponsored the following session” "The Public’s Confidence in Courts and Legal System: A Comparative Approach" (Session 1408, June 5, 2012, 14:30 – 16:15).

Most of the IRC / CRN members are from lower or middle income countries. Grant award were instrumental in making it possible for the scholars to participate in the Annual Meeting and present their research. During the 2012 Annual Meeting all the participants of the IRC / CRN panel were grant recipients.

An important feature of the IRC / CRN is that it allows its members suggesting individual research or joint research projects, including studies on regional or inter-regional levels, or general comparative research. The IRC / CRN has a strong comparative and cross-border perspective and it is vital having scholars from various parts of the world and different countries and legal traditions.

The session aimed to address the issue of correlation of justice systems and the public in different societies and in different time-frames, and discuss the society’s role is in making independent justice systems and the “third branch’s” role is in building and sustaining a democratic and civil society.

Though due to last-minute withdrawals in the end the sessions focused mostly on the Indian scenario of social transformation, the session was very interactive with a lot of questions, interactions, comments and discussion as well as recommendations for further expanded research and practical implications of the surveys presented.

The following papers were presented during the session: “Constitutional Commitments and Social Transformation: The Indian Scenario. Part A (Constitutional Commitments and Reforms)” (Anuradha Parasar) and “Constitutional Commitments and Social Transformation: The Indian Scenario. Part B (findings of the empirical research and recommendations)” (Meenakshi Sharma). Certainly if not the last-minute withdrawals, the session would have offered two more presentations. The session was organized and chaired by Kristina Galstyan.

The IRC / CRN members also met to discuss continued research plans. In particular the IRC explores a possibility of organizing a seminar on Public Opinion of the justice system, where possible under the auspices of the LSA.

Continue research, expand the scope and bring into the loop more social processes and examine the public's opinion regarding various socio-legal processes and how this in its turn can have an effect on justice systems and legal regulation.

Comparative study in terms of globalization and mobility of population. Draw comparison between countries and regions from the point of view of their democratic and political values. Ideally come up with a joint publication / web posting.

A concrete follow up step would be exploring possibilities seminar on IRC topic (hosting the latter at their university was the suggestion of the IRC members from India) as well as for sessions at the next Annual Meetings.

Anuradha Parasar, participant

I participated as paper presenter and shared my research. I participated in all the sessions and discussed issues and also posed questions. Hawaii Conference gave me a good opportunity to

1. Network and upgrade knowledge, skills & competence with research.
2. Got opportunity to meet other professors working in in the area of Sociology and Law as related and as well as other areas.
3. Learned and explored the research areas & interest of other academicians who are working in the field of Sociology & Law.
4. Had a good discussion with International Scholars about Indian Society/ Indian Legal Scenario/ other topic of interest during informal sessions
5. Also got opportunities to explore possibilities of collaborative research/ organizing Conference.
6. From Hawaii conference I brought back home the laurels to academic & professional achievements at personal end, to my home Institution NIIT University and to my home country, India, by participating and representing India in such a grand prestigious Conference.

Participation in the conference has brought in immense benefit to my career ladder. International exposure becomes strong. It will help all through my life in academic growth. A good number of people at the international level know about the area I'm working in, due to Hawaii conference. Relations with others, whom I knew got further, rejuvenated by meeting them again in the above conference. Good intellectual benefit achieved is the best output as in such short span of conference duration came across studies, finding, researches of other intellectual in face to face situation.

All others with whom I interacted I made them interested in my research activities and with many of them I'm still in touch and we are exploring possibilities for collaborative research and participation. Also all others in the IRC were quite keen and willing to visit my institution to see what all experimentation we are doing at India and in near future they plan to visit us. My IRC added further to the knowledge resource and also opened up new agenda and avenues for us for future research, quite keen to work on collaborative activities.

4. Law and Globalization: Chinese Experience in Comparative Perspective

Hou Meng, participant

I submitted the paper of empirical research on petitions relating to lawsuits in China, and had a presentation in the panel of legal consciousness and legal culture in China. Also, I attended and discussed in some other panels. I'm excited that there are so many scholars from different disciplines and different counties. I found much more interesting inter-discipline research.

I'm inspired to boost my research in the future, because I found many excellent scholars and their works much than before I attended the conference. It widened my field of vision and provided me more chance to learn useful knowledge, especially the positive research method. It's organized well and it is very useful for many scholars to communicate.

I have discussed these issues with others. In the following year, I will finish my research, including the changes of petitions of Chinese courts, the changes of political and legal commission of China, the impact of legal education to legal profession in China, etc. I will find suitable collaborators from my IRC.

I am also the managing editor of Law and Social Sciences of China. Some members of my IRC have been invited to be the guest editor in the past of some volumes. Carl Minzner, an expert in Chinese law, and the

member of my IRC, will be the guest editor of special issue “Chinese Law on U.S. Experts’ View”, *Law and Social Sciences*, 2013.

Hongqi Wu, participant

I am so happy to have a opportunity to express my appreciation for the support of IRC and NSF. During the conference in Hawaii, I make one lecture on the large law firm in China and attend the discussion of five panels which were on the legal ethics, criminal justice and so on. This experience in Hawaii is and will be making very great effects to my research and professional development. Firstly, my lecture in the panel had received many helpful reviews which broadened my research on the legal profession in China. John Flood, who is a professor of law and sociology in the University of Westminster, had made a very good review to my lecture and help me to accomplish my article greatly. Secondly, during the conference, I made regular contact with many researchers and discussed the possibility of collaboration in the future. For example, I am making a research plan about the legal market in China with Sida Liu who is a member of your IRC, we plan to make a field research in Beijing and publish some articles. In a word, the experience in the conference in Hawaii had deeply changed my research direction in law school and encouraged to use the method of sociology to research the law problems in China.

5. Gender and Judicial Education

Ulrike Schultz and Brettel Dawson:

Gender and judicial education is a very salient issue which is gaining in momentum. We had had a first go at the subject at our workshop in Onati on Gender and Judging in 2009. For the past years it has been mainly a subject for developing countries, now there is a growing awareness that also the countries with a well established judiciary have to deal with it. Therefore we had vivid discussions on the importance of educating judges in gender issues, how to do it, where and when to do it, in Honolulu.

As we had colleagues from the four corners of the world we had a truly global discussion in a number of conference sessions.

We have broadened the basis for further work in the field because of the Hawaii meetings. Those present will take back ideas they gained in the sessions to their countries. In the future, we will continue with the subject in the framework of the CRN on Gender and Judging. We plan to put together five of the papers presented to a special issues of the International Journal of the Legal Profession. We have already discussed this with the editor of the journal.

Tapan Mohanty (India):

My IRC that focus on Judicial Education was indeed a catalyst in spreading this frontier area of research in a hitherto least explored dimension of law, judicial system, social context, gender and education. I was in a panel where we presented our perspectives on various dimensions of gender and judicial education in different countries. The comments of discussant and remarks of chairperson was a welcome insight and the questions by participants allowed me revisit my premises and look into finer points of distinction rather closely and as a result my focus has been sharpened. Personally, I feel I contributed to some extent in giving an Indian perspective and provided insight into the researches of others.

I am sure my IRC has achieved a lot in the conference in terms of generating new ideas, sharing information, gaining insights and more importantly establishing a dialogue among the practitioners of the

art in a very congenial yet competitive manner. I am in touch with members of my IRC in developing collaborative research work and sharing our research findings and in the process developing the field.

Maureen Owor, participant

Being present at the Hawaii meetings made a difference to my outlook about sociology of law. I now have a better appreciation of the topic which I gained through interaction and academic discourse with fellow participants.

Participating in the Hawaii meetings has enhanced my professional development. First, by helping broaden my knowledge on socio-legal developments in different countries round the world. Secondly, by creating a friendly environment in which I was able to make new acquaintances with whom I communicate regularly. Finally, chairing a session helped me develop my leadership skills in an academic conference setting.

IRC 5 *Gender and Judicial Education* accomplished two important things. First, the IRC showed that although Gender (and related social context themes) is integrated in judicial education, the neglect of Gender questions in the curricula can scupper efforts to create a gender sensitive judiciary. As a result, the IRC, through the presentation of papers, generated interest in this contemporary area of gender and judicial education.

I plan to continue to collaborate in activities of the IRC (depending on funding). With regards to publication, my IRC is submitting my paper (among other papers) to the *International Journal of the Legal Profession* for publication.

6. Citizenship and Migration

Doris Marie Provine and Leila Kawar, organizers:

In Hawaii the previous IRC work in San Francisco essentially came to fruition. The two NSF/LSA sponsored scholars were essential to our discussion of cross-national effects of immigration. Our guest from the Philippines described pressures on sending countries when they try to protect their migrating citizens. Her discussion was detailed and very informative. This issue of nations negotiating protection for their migrating nationals is a rare element in discussions of migration policy in the United States. We tend to focus on the problems of receiving countries. Our guest from Mexico provided a helpful perspective on the position of Chiapas in international migration. This border area is a site of transit for immigrants, but also a site of settlement, and more recently, a site of return. The problems of integration and re-integration are quite severe. The U.S. policy of attempting to enlist Mexico in preventing immigrants from further south entering either Mexico or the United States has further complicated the situation and offers another theme for investigation. In short, both speakers provided the audience with additional perspectives on the immigration process, perspectives drawn from experiences far away from the United States.

We have widened the conversation about citizenship and immigration that animates our Collaborative Research Network. The IRC, in a real sense, has strengthened the intellectual ambit for the members of the CRN. This group at LSA has about 175 members and is growing. So one could say that the IRC has had direct and indirect effects on all of us.

We are hopeful that the IRC-based relationship with these two scholars will be the foundation for many future collaborations and for a broader sense of the field for everyone involved, either as a participant or as part of the audience. For the immediate future, we are submitting articles for a proposed special issue

of Law & Social Inquiry that is being organized by our CRN on Citizenship and Migration. The plan is to submit a revised version of what we did at LSA for publication there. The long term plan at an individual level may involve scholarly exchange, with a U.S. scholar going to the Philippines and the Mexican scholar who NSF/LSA supported visiting the United States for research.

Professor Martha Rojas Wiesner and I presented a paper in Honolulu, added a co-author from Professor Rojas Wiesner's university (Colegio de la Frontera Sur in Tapachula, Chiapas Mexico), and submitted our work to *Law and Social Inquiry* as part of a symposium on new directions in immigration research. Without the IRC support, Dr. Rojas-Wiesner would not have been able to come to LSA. That support helped us get to know each other's work and develop an idea for a comparative study of legal mobilization at the local level for immigration reform: *Peripheral Matters: The Emergence of Legalized Politics in Local Struggles over Unauthorized Immigration*.

Maruja Asis, participant:

I presented a paper, "The Local is Global: Advocating for Filipino Domestic Workers' Rights at Home and Abroad," Roundtable 1501, "Immigration Law from Below: Migration, Legal Pluralism, and Human Rights in the Global South" (Sponsored by CRN02 Citizenship and Immigration and IRC06 Citizenship and Migration). My paper was a companion piece to Dr Leila Kavar's paper which dealt with the processes and factors that made it possible for the International Labour Organization to advance the Domestic Workers Convention. Dr Kavar invited me to cooperate on this research on the Domestic Workers Convention.

It was the first time for me to attend a Law and Society Conference (with many thanks for the support). I was pleased that the conference featured many panels dedicated to immigration. I attended most of the panels dealing with immigration and the business meeting of Citizenship and Immigration. The conference was interesting to me – although international migration is steeped in legal dimensions, most of my engagements are with other social scientists (economists, sociologists, political scientists, etc), but rarely with legal scholars. The conference exposed me to the distinct perspectives and approaches of legal studies. I also got to meet some scholars, some of whom I plan to communicate with and hopefully to collaborate with in future projects. Dr Kavar also introduced me to her colleagues; we continue to be in touch.

I hope my participation to the roundtable conference had contributed to an appreciation of the advocacy for migrants' rights (particularly domestic workers' rights) as waged in an origin country. Our roundtable's focus on the Global South broadened the geography and the context of the discussion on immigration. We initially thought of producing one paper, but in the end, we came up with two papers (which reflect disciplinary influences and our work contexts).

Dr. Kavar and I have agreed to pursue separate publication plans – her paper was publication-ready at the time of the conference; mine would be strengthened by including more interviews (and at this point, some important developments have taken place). I plan to develop the paper further and to submit it to a journal.

Leila Kavar, participant

NSF support facilitated two international collaborations organized through the Citizenship and Migration IRC. I can update you on the second of these collaborations, between myself and Dr. Maruja Asis (Scalabrini Migration Center, Manila, The Philippines), who was able to travel to attend the LSA meeting thanks to IRC support. In Hawaii, Dr. Asis and I began a potentially very fruitful collaboration centered

on our shared interest in studying the rights of migrant domestic workers. A paper inspired by this collaboration (*Making the Machine Work: Technocratic Engineering of Migrant Rights at the International Labour Organization*) has been submitted to *Law and Social Inquiry* as part of a symposium on "The Politics of Immigration Control." The opportunity for informal conversations at the LSA conference in Hawaii with Dr. Asis also nurtured my interest in further exploring the topic of migrant domestic worker rights, and I will be traveling to Geneva this summer to start an on-sight research at the International Labour Organization.

7. Globalization, Transnational and Domestic Labor Governance

Jianyong Li, participant

First of all, I'd like to express my thanks to the organizer of the Hawaii conference, without your invitation, it will be impossible for me to take part in, and many thanks to Valerie Hans and Masayuki Murayama, co-chairs of the committee for the Program on International Research Collaborative, for having sponsored me to joined conference, without your help, I was unable to take part in the conference.

On the morning of Tuesday, June 5, I attended in the formal protocol and welcome at the Great Lawn, and on the same day just afternoon, I participated in at the panel 1303 as one of four speakers: "Labor Governance at the intersection among global, transnational, and national levels (sponsored by CRN08 labor rights and IRC07 globalization, transnational, and domestic labor governance). My topic for presentation is "Protection of Chinese labor rights and their link to the international labor standards: An assessment of the 2008 Chinese labor contract law, (about 40 people participated), my lecture got quite feedbacks and initiated a lot of discussions.

By the way, I participated in 15 other lectures: the collective labor law and worker participation (1103), Chinese ritual, property, and family litigation (1222), legal education: learning to think like a lawyer (1409), Dispute resolution in China (1508), Dispute resolution: multiple approaches and multiple places (2123), comparative judicial dispute resolution 01 (3112), comparative judicial dispute resolution 02 (3213); judicial reform in China (3307), dispute behavior and resolution in a legalized society 03 (3402), Foreign models for labor governance and for labor transition (sponsored by CRN08 labor rights and IRC07 globalization, transnational and domestic labor governance (3503), Rules, rights and collective action (4104), Legal consciousness and legal culture in China (4207), Changing conceptions of aw and society in American legal thought(4322), Legal profession in Asia (4407), New sociologies of law (4512)

During the Conference time, I joined the dinner with the group scholars' meeting sponsored by Professor Pitman Potter from the University of British Columbia, Canada, and talked about ADR issues over Canada, China, and Japan, and joined the Lunch with the CRN labor group scholars and discussed the labor dispute issues over USA, Canada and China, and also joined the dinner with the group of Chinese scholars and communicated a lot about the issues of Chinese legal system.

Finally, in the evening of the last day for the conference on June 8, I joined the Local reception at the Bishop Museum Lawn sponsored by University of Hawaii Law School. I really enjoy a lot of native rites, singing and dancing with local cultures.

Through joining the above panel lectures and activities, I communicated a lot with friends and scholars from different parts of the world in all fields in which we are interested, indeed, I got a scholarly harvest!

I met many old friends and made many new friends during the conference. Also, I visited the Pearl Harbor, the famous place of the Second World War; The Missouri Battleship brings me into the

unforgettable Second World War! And at that period time, the American people and Chinese had fought with together against Japanese Army's invasion! It is really a fruitful conference for me!

When I returned to my home university, Shanghai university, I briefly introduced my experiences and harvest about my journey to Hawaii, the beautiful place, comfortable weather and kind people, and especially the fruitful conference, my colleagues have shared my experience! The link below is the newsletter:

[http://www.law.shu.edu.cn/Default.aspx?tabid=17684&ctl=Detail&mid=31879&Id=99073&SkinSrc=\[L\]Skins/faxue1/faxue1](http://www.law.shu.edu.cn/Default.aspx?tabid=17684&ctl=Detail&mid=31879&Id=99073&SkinSrc=[L]Skins/faxue1/faxue1)

Also I have taken the new ideology, ideas, concepts, theories and methods into my teaching courses such as <Sociology law law>, <Labor arbitration> and <Constitution> this semester! My graduate students also enjoyed a lot from my courses! I hope, in the near future, to have more chances to take part in the Law and society Conference!

Sergio Gamonal Contreras, participant

I presented a paper titled, "The Protection Principle: Starting Discussion with the South for Global Labor Law." It was presented in a panel on international and comparative labor law, more generally chaired by professor Marley Weiss.

It was highly beneficial because my research is still at an early stage and the opinions of the other participants will help refine my arguments. Getting feedback from an American audience about my paper, which is based on a Latin American perspective of labor law, was particularly useful since we want to influence labor law in the Anglo-American world.

The IRC helped to bring together perspectives and research that normally do not meet and exchange ideas. It was all done in a very collegial environment. Write a book about Latin American labor law with Professor Cesar F. Rosado (Chicago-Kent College of Law) and present it in Law and Society meetings in Boston (2013) and other international meetings.

8. Legal Education

Liora Israel, organizer

Several members of our IRC, notably from A & B country, could not attend the Hawaii conference because of the cost/delay. Nevertheless we were very happy to have Silvina Pezzetta as a funded participant. Our IRC sponsored two sessions and co-sponsored sessions from IRC 05 Gender and Judicial Education and CRN 22 Gender and Judging. As I previously said we were very happy to have S. Pezzetta in our panels, since her research on Argentina fits perfectly with the interests of our group.

The Hawai'i meeting was an exciting and successful event. It was an occasion to strengthen, since San Francisco, ties with other scholars. We were happy to realize that several scholars attended sessions in both meetings. Our IRC became a small but vibrant community of scholars dedicated to the study of legal education. We were very happily surprised by the intensity of exchanges, notably on the point that was at the core of our IRC project, international comparison. Such an achievement would not have been possible without the opportunity given by LSA to create this IRC.

We would like to publish a book, tentatively entitled, "Learning to think like a lawyer in various settings: A comparative approach." The last two LSA meetings, with our IRC sessions, gave us the opportunity to

meet or contact scholars from various countries (Europe, Americas, Asia, South Africa, Australia) interested in such a project.

SESSION 1: LEARNING TO THINK LIKE A LAWYER: MEANINGS AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES (sponsored by CRN28 Realist and Empirical Legal Method)

Tuesday, June 5, 2:30-4:15

Dealing with legal education requires us to consider not only the traditional question of legal cultures, but also the diverse issues involved in different systems of higher education and legal professions. Based on studies of legal training from various countries, this session aims at understanding the meanings that “learning to think like a lawyer” can take in various contexts, and the reasons for those variations. Cross-cultural comparisons will lead to a discussion of the ways in which legal education can be compared among legal systems. Furthermore, the papers share a common point: some of the studies rely on ethnography performed in legal classes. The session will then examine methodological issues raised by this particular approach.

Liora Israël (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris): “From a Seat in the Law School Classroom: Reflections on Participant Observation”

Silvina Pezzeta Andersen (National Board of Scientific and Technical Researches, Santa Fe): “Argentinean legal education. Pedagogic knowledge and legal identity”

Ulrike Schultz (Fernuniversität, Hagen), “Women law professors in Germany and their contribution to Legal German”

Emilie Biland (Laval University, Québec), Rachel Vanneuville (CNRS, Lyon): “Don’t think like a lawyer! The changing role of law in the training of French top officials”

Chair: Carroll Seron (University of California, Irvine): seron@uci.edu

Discussant: Lynn Mather (Buffalo Law School, New York): lmather@buffalo.edu

SESSION 2: LEGAL TRAINING AND ITS ISSUES: NEW PRACTICES AND NEW IDEOLOGIES?

Thursday, June 7, 10:15-12:00

This session will focus on various forms of innovation in legal training. They may relate to new courses, new modes of teaching, or new places and institutions of legal training. By bringing together these different kinds of innovation, the session aims at questioning the conditions that enable new ways of teaching law to emerge and settle down, or not. What are the profiles of those who promote the innovations? How are they welcomed and why? By answering these questions, the papers will enable us to shed light on issues related to legal training (as for instance the impact of training on legal practices), and also on how to think about the social and political role of law.

Hugues Bouthinon-Dumas (ESSEC Business School, Paris): “The role of business schools in the legal training of French elite lawyers”

Antoine Derouet (Centre Maurice Halbwachs, Paris): “Legal training in a French engineering School”

Deborah M. Hussey Freeland (University of San Francisco Law School): “Legal Education in Working with Science and Scientists”

Hélène Zimmermann (Laval University, Québec): “Developing empirical legal research in legal training: A Canadian experience in a civil law school”

Chair/discussant: Rick Abel (UCLA): abel@law.ucla.edu

Silvina A. Pezzetta, participant

Besides my presentation in session 1409 I participated of several sessions and roundtables during the International Conference. The choices were made according to two criteria: my specific research area, legal education, and other topics I’m very interested in like human rights, animal rights and the relation between law and social sciences even if they are not directly connected with legal education. Just to mention three of them, I found very motivating sessions number 3116, Excavating the Truth in the Wake of Human Rights Atrocities, 4314, Animal Law: Theory and Context and 4512, New Sociologies of Law. I would like to add that some of the sessions and roundtables that I have planned to attend were scheduled at the same hour so I could not participate in all of them.

As my first international experience as a participant in an international conference I must say that it was an outstanding opportunity to gain perspective on my academic work and how it can be improved. The International Conference on Law and Society was an event where I could meet scholars from all over the world that are working on topics that in my own country are sometimes dismissed as marginal by the traditional legal scholars. It also gave me the opportunity to listen to well-known scholars and to see them to interact with other scholars and students in what I found a very collaborative ambience. I think this was very different from my country where academic events are highly competitive situations where the youngest students and professors feel uncomfortable at times.

As for the impact on my career, I believe that one of the main effects is that I feel myself more enthusiastic about my own work because I could observe that many others are working in areas and with methodologies that are different from the more traditional ones. Furthermore, my Argentinean colleagues value the achievement of participating in such an important event and this means recognition to my work.

After my presentation I was congratulated by the chair and discussant of the panel what made me feel very glad. And some of the attendants wanted to know more about the Argentinean case, especially Latin American attendants. I received also positive comments from my colleagues of the session, Liora Israël and Rachel Vanneville. Then I’m satisfied, considering this was my first time, with my presentation but I’m also completely aware that I must improve some of the aspects of my empirical work. In fact, the preparation of the presentation for this meeting, and the feedback I had, made me re think about the weakness of my work and how I must adjust the methods I’m using. I think that my contribution was to show some aspects of legal education and research in Argentina, and that this description was well received by the public.

Even if it is true that internet allows having access to almost any of the works of the scholars you could be interested in, using internet cannot replace the personal encounter with them. Furthermore, the possibility to ask questions and to interact, and to receive comments, is also encouraging. Last but not least, it is possible to know a lot of colleagues in a very short period of time and to establish new academic relationships.

I was invited to participate in a collective book about legal education after my presentation and also to apply to go to France with the support of one of my panel colleagues. But both are still projects. I would

like to write a paper about the conference with some of the scholars I've met but I couldn't contact with any of them yet.

9. Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making

Valerie Hans, organizer

Sanja Kutnjak Ivkovich, organizer

Nikolai Kovalev, organizer

Takeshi Nishimura, organizer

Our IRC 09: Lay Participation in Legal Systems has about 50 members. However, not all members attend each Law and Society Annual Meeting. According to our count, we had about three dozen scholars from various countries participating in the IRC activities. Maria Bergoglio, Giorgi Chkheidze, Edmundo Hendler, and Alexander Smirnov were the funded participants.

The 2012 Law and Society Annual Meeting was very productive for our IRC. First, our IRC was successful in putting together six panels and a business meeting. In addition, we organized the traditional IRC dinner to provide a more informal forum for scholars from around the world who are interested in lay participation in law. About 30 people attended the event.

All of these activities provided for a lively exchange of ideas and an intense sharing of knowledge about lay participation. We consider this ability to communicate and exchange the ideas about lay participation, both during formal events (e.g., panels, IRC business meeting) and informal ones (e.g., IRC dinner) as one the key achievements.

More specifically, our IRC sponsored six panels at the 2012 International Law and Society meeting:

- 1) New Developments in Japan's Saiban-in System (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making and CRN33 East Asian Law and Society)
- 2) Iconic Jury Trials (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)
- 3) Juries and Mixed Courts in Europe (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)
- 4) New Developments in Lay Participation in Law (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making)
- 5) Participation on Juries (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Law)
- 6) Roundtable--The Role of Professionals in Lay Tribunals (Sponsored by IRC09 Lay Participation in Legal Systems)

In addition, we also held an IRC business meeting with 10 participants. We discussed a variety of topics, including the possibility of collaborating on a set of Wikipedia entries for world jury systems, member Nancy Marder's Justice John Paul Stevens Jury Center (<http://www.kentlaw.iit.edu/institutes-centers/jury-center>), ideas for expanding our IRC web page, http://www.lawschool.cornell.edu/research/lay_participation_in_law/), the possibility of small conferences in Spain or elsewhere organized around lay participation themes, and ideas for next year's

panels. Following the conference, Marder, Hans, Bulnes, and Thaman teamed up to develop a Onati conference proposal, which was approved and funded by the Onati International Institute for the Sociology of Law. The conference will take place in June 2014.

We discussed the use of social media tools for communication between members of our IRC09. As the result of this discussion, Nikolai Kovalev created a Facebook page dedicated to our group. There are 10 inaugural members, and we hope to invite more members in the near future <https://www.facebook.com/groups/429023737131543/>. Finally, we hosted a highly successful group dinner that allowed for more informal networking and discussion.

Participation of the four grant recipients at the meeting was quite valuable for our IRC. Our four grant recipients (Maria Bergoglio, Giorg Chkheidze, Edmundo Hendler, Alexander Smirnov) came from countries which have recently introduced lay participation or have engaged in public debates pushing for their introduction (Argentina, Georgia). They are an interdisciplinary group of people whose divergent professional experiences significantly contributed to the IRC discussions, both during the formal ones (e.g., panels) and the informal ones (e.g., IRC dinner). The presence of these scholars made the discussions more intense and in-depth. For example, by discussing why and how to implement the jury into the Argentinean legal system, prominent scholars of lay participation had to think about the fundamental issues of jury research, both theoretical and methodological. The discussion centered on the issues such as the key characteristics of the jury system, benefits of its introduction, and the potential obstacles to its successful operation. Presentations by scholars from Georgia and Russia provided an important analysis of challenges experienced by these two countries during the implementation of the Anglo-American jury model in the legal system based predominantly on inquisitorial legal traditions.

Thanks to the NSF and LSA travel funding, we were able to bring together scholars from different parts of the world who do not routinely attend the Law & Society Association's annual meeting. Several participants coming from the countries which either have recently introduced lay participation (e.g., Japan and Georgia) or are engaged in a debate on whether to introduce lay participation (e.g., Argentina) commented on the importance of this sharing and the wealth of expertise and knowledge available at the conference. In addition, this exchange of ideas, particularly about what works and what does not work, equipped them with an additional knowledge and empowered them to be more persuasive in the discussions on these issues in their home countries.

A number of our IRC members' conference papers were published in a special issue on Comparative Jury Systems in volume 86 of the Chicago-Kent Law Review.

Edmundo Hendler, participant

There are now in Argentina various works in progress in order to the implementation of jury trials. Immediately after I came back from Honolulu I was invited as adviser to a meeting at the Ministry of Justice with members of the office for Criminal Policy that are in charge of preparing a draft project for the enactment of trial by jury all over the country. I commented there – and it was helpful for the work done at the meeting – the experience of other countries that have recently implemented or are in the way of implementing lay participation. This information was gathered through the different sessions and meetings of the IRC.

I have had new opportunities to use the information gathered at the IRC sessions. The Ministry of Justice of Buenos Aires Province (the largest province in Argentina) asked for my opinion on another draft project for the implementation of jury trials to be enacted in that province. I have answered in a written memorandum, taking advantage of the helpful information gathered at Honolulu.

I have also participated in different meetings at the Buenos Aires University (Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires) and at the La Plata University (Universidad Nacional de La Plata) dedicated to the same subject matter: lay participation in criminal trials. I am invited to lecture in some special meeting organized by the Judiciary of the City of Buenos Aires (to be held at the Universidad del Salvador on October 15th), and have prepared an article to be published in a special issue of a Review edited by the Ministry of Justice of the Federal Government.

Maria Ines Bergoglio, participant

I participated in IRC09, Lay Participation in Legal Decision Making. During the Honolulu meeting, the group organized six sessions, where thirty six papers were given. There was also a round table session, on the role of professionals in jury trials. Personally, I presented my paper Legitimacy of the Judicial System and Lay Participation in Judicial Decision-Making Processes in Córdoba, Argentina in session 2116 - Enhancing Fairness through Lay Participation. I attended all the possible sessions (there were some schedule conflicts), as well as the Business Meeting of the group.

For a researcher interested in Lay Participation in the Justice Administration, as it is my case, a Law & Society meeting is very significant, since there is no other academic event gathering so many people working in this field. Moreover, the geographical origins of the attendees is really diverse, since the IRC includes people from Europe, Asia, Australia, North and South America. The discussions between researchers coming from countries with a solid jury tradition, and others from nations where lay participation has been recently introduced are, therefore, really enriching.

It should be clear that my travel to Hawaii would not have been possible without the IRC economic support. I understand that my participation, as well as the contribution from other researchers in the same situation, helps to develop true comparative approaches, where it is possible to assess the influence of the social, political and economic context on lay participation systems.

The participation of academics from universities unable to fund their trips is also useful to advance methodological discussions. Since the research conducted in different parts of the world is subject to different conditions it is possible to contrast the effects of different techniques in data collecting, as well as in data analysis.

Being present in Hawaii made a great difference for my research. Attending the discussions allowed me to identify – or confirm – which are the main problems and theoretical frames in the field, showing me different paths to frame my research and interpret my own data. Presenting and discussing my results in such a diverse forum allowed me to receive specialized comments and critiques of my paper, which provided very useful insights on my own work.

During the Hawaii meeting, my IRC advanced in methodological discussions, which are central to engage on collaborative research. I have had the opportunity to strengthen previous contacts in this area, as well as create new links to other colleagues working in similar areas all over the world, which is always a very productive area in which to engage in future collaborations. For example, I have had the chance to contact a researcher from Southwest University of Finance and Economics of China with whom we are considering the possibility of producing some joint articles.

I would like to take this occasion to thank my IRC for the support received, which is central, not only for the continuity of my research work, but also for the orientation of young researchers in my team.

Aleksandr Smirnov, participant

The information I received in IRC09, Lay Participation in Legal Systems encouraged me and Sergei Kovalev to prepare an article on the natural law in the determination of the types of cases that are most appropriate for the output and capabilities of the jury.

In addition, I participated in a conference in Germany (Bavaria, Regensburg, Institute of East European Law, 27 September - 1 October, this year), where I was able, based on the knowledge I had received in Honolulu, to defend against the German opponents the advantages of adversarial system and court jury. Given that the main subject of this Conference was to win the sympathies of legislators and legal scholars from Central Asia in the transformation of their criminal procedure, my efforts, I would like to believe have direct practical significance.

Giorgi Meladze, participant

I participated in Law and Society Annual Conference organized in Honolulu to present brief study on Jury system in Georgia. I have to mention that would it not be supported by conference organizers I could not participate in this very interesting and significant event. I presented my paper and also attended some other presentations, met interesting people and exchanged contacts.

There are some efforts in Georgia to implement first steps of the jury reform and my participation and exchange of the ideas was of a great importance for making stronger connections with academic community in favor of the system.

After the conference I had opportunity to speak with representatives of the Judiciary and the Ministry of Justice. We reached agreement to start monitoring system in action and elaborate design for the study. I would like to thank the organizers who made it possible for me to participate in this significant event and meet all interesting and influential academicians in the field.

10. Understanding the Rise of the Regulatory State in the Global South

Rene Uruena, participant

Presenter at the panel: The Role of Courts in the Regulatory State of the South (Sponsored by IRC10 Regulatory State, Global South) 4209. Chair of the panel: Eat, Drink, Think: Trade in Its "Glocal" Context (Friday June 8, 4:30pm to 6:15pm)

Grant recipients are young academics engaged with the question of expertise and independence in regulation, underscoring the role of the judiciary and human rights in this apparently technical undertaking. This is a wide subject area, and presence of the grant recipients allowed crystalizing prior conversations among them, specifically by giving a distinct identity to sub-altern regulatory studies - a welcome addition to a field that is completely dominated by orthodox economic thought, as is the case of regulation in India and Latin America. Their presence thus served as the basis for defining with clarity the field of study to which IRC members will contribute, and identifying the core of the community of scholars that will engage with that that work.

The IRC defined the Role of Courts in the Regulatory State of the South as the field of study, and possible future case studies. It strengthened the links between scholars who live in separate continents (North America, Latin America and South East Asia) who hardly meet in person. This helped define the substantive aspects to be highlighted in further funding applications for Role of Courts in the Regulatory State of the South.

The panel showed that courts seem to have a rather active role in the design and implementation of the regulatory state in developing countries, as opposed to their comparatively passive role in regulation design in the Global North, where courts sometimes find themselves sidelined by either strong social welfare programs that empower the executive branch, or by self-imposed judicial deference to the technical expertise held by independent regulators.

The IRC will work towards an edited volume, most likely focused on case studies of public utilities regulators in Latin America (particularly Brazil and Colombia), seeking to answer questions about the regulatory role played by courts, the relationship between courts and independent regulatory agencies, and the role of courts in transnational regulation. The IRC's goal is to publish that volume in English, Spanish and Portuguese, at least in English and one of the other two languages.

11. Environmental Rights and Human Development: What happens when courts become involved in managing environmental conflicts?

Bruce Wilson, organizer

The panels are listed below. We had a wonderful exchange of ideas, with funded attendance by scholar/practitioners Reyes Mendy (Chile), Ryan (Argentina) and Perez Castellón (Bolivia). Unfortunately Susanti (Indonesia) and Dugard (South Africa) could not attend after all, in spite of the generous funding assistance. Dugard sent her paper anyway, and we had one of her collaborators present it. The panels were well attended, in spite of early scheduling for the first one. More importantly perhaps, their presence at the meeting allowed the three mentioned above to have extensive meetings with people whose work they had read. At least two of them wrote especially to say that the meeting was exceptionally helpful in developing their research further. Judging from audience response, I think what they brought to the conference was also crucial – first hand experience and reflections on processes of social transformation through legal tactics. The meeting furthered our efforts to develop collaborative research projects and renewed our determination to continue working on this important topic.

Environmental Lawfare 01: Impact (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human Development) 3105

Thu, Jun 7 - 8:15am - 10:00am Building/Room: HHV, TBA05

Environmental Lawfare 01: Impact (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human Development) 3105

Session Participants:

Chair/Discussant: Cesar Rodriguez-Garavito (University of the Andes) cerogara@gmail.com
The Use of Social Law Fare For and Against “Progressive Goals”: Litigating Water Rights in Peru
*Camila Gianella (U of Berge/Michelsen Institute)

Institutional and Policies Effects of Twenty Years of Environmental Litigation: Chile 1990-2010

*Francisca Reyes Mendy (Pontificia Universidad Católica)

Policy Change and Environmental Litigation in Argentina

*Daniel E Ryan (Universidad de Palermo)

Litigating Environmental Rights: A Theoretical Framework

Bruce M. Wilson (University of Central Florida), *Daniel M. Brinks (University of Texas), Siri ZZ WD
DNA Gloppen (University of Bergen)

Abstract:

Law is now at the core of most important political and social struggles. Legal actors and strategies are expanding in social and political significance, and rights and law are at the center of efforts by local and global actors to promote the public good and to preserve sectoral privileges, to pursue progressive ends and to resist all change. Moreover, climate change, environmental degradation, and the increasing demand for potable water have made environmental and water-related disputes some of the most important and contentious struggles in politics.

This is the first of two IRC-sponsored panels that explore the diverse strategies in which rights and legal institutions figure prominently, are adopted intentionally and used strategically in struggles around environmental rights, with the aim of helping catalyze social transformation and human development.

The panel focuses on the impact of environmental lawfare. It includes a theoretical framework for studying impact, as well as three papers on diverse experiences with environmental lawfare in Latin America. The authors – academics, lawyers and activists from the region – bring data on and experience with the conflicts addressed in the papers. Their papers analyze the effects of environmental litigation in Chile, Argentina and Peru, three countries with very diverse experiences and three different outcomes. Putting them together in one panel should help both the authors and the audience gain a more systematic, comparative understanding of the conditions under which environmental litigation can have a significant impact on policy and policy outcomes.

Environmental Lawfare 02: Strategies (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human

Thu, Jun 7 - 12:30pm - 2:15pm Building/Room: HHV, TBA05

Environmental Lawfare 02: Strategies (Sponsored by IRC11 Environmental Rights and Human Development) 3305

Session Participants:

Chair: Daniel M. Brinks (University of Texas) danbrinks@austin.utexas.edu

Rights (Non)Mobilisation in the Context of Acute Environmental Harm in South Africa

*Jackie C. Dugard (University of the Witwatersrand)

Climate Change Lawfare

*Siri Gloppen (University of Bergen)

New Constitutional Actions in Bolivia: Challenges and Opportunities to Prevent and Repair Social and Environmental Damages Caused to Indigenous People

*Ariel Perez Castellon (Independent Scholar)

The Role of Civil Society Organizations in Shaping Environmental Laws and Policies through Litigation and Mobilization in Indonesia

*Bivitri Susanti (Pusat Studi Hukum & Kebijakan)

Discussant: Malcolm S Langford (University of Oslo) malcolm.langford@nchr.uio.no

Abstract:

Law is now at the core of most important political and social struggles. Legal actors and strategies are expanding in social and political significance, and rights and law are at the center of efforts by local and global actors to promote the public good and to preserve sectoral privileges, to pursue progressive ends and to resist all change. Moreover, climate change, environmental degradation, and the increasing demand for potable water have made environmental and water-related disputes some of the most important and contentious struggles in politics.

This panel is the second of two sponsored by an IRC designed to explore the diverse strategies in which rights and legal institutions figure prominently, are adopted intentionally and used strategically in struggles around environmental rights, with the aim of helping catalyze social transformation and human development – what we have called lawfare.

This panel examines diverse rights-based strategies to address environmental challenges in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. It includes a paper that takes a broad comparative view and presents a typology of cases dealing with climate change. Also included in the panels are papers on the role of civil society organizations and rights-based mobilization – or their absence – in addressing environmental harm. The papers have a broad regional scope but all contribute to the joint project – understanding the role of litigation and rights-based approaches in addressing environmental challenges.

Francisca Reyes Mendy, participant

First, it is important to note that this was the first time I had the opportunity to personally attend the annual Law and Society meeting. Last year for personal reasons (I was on my pregnancy last semester) my co-author attended the San Francisco Conference and presented the paper on my behalf.

Being the first time I could actually “be there” I was unsure if the rest of the panels were going to be interesting to me, considering I am a political scientist by training and that my natural “habitat” is the American Political Science Association, APSA. I attended all the Panels related to environmental and human rights and I was delighted to discover a powerful group of researchers from all around the world that worked on the same topics I am interested in. The richness of the Law and Society Association is precisely the diversity of topics and backgrounds. Coming from a country where law associations are “lawyer exclusive” it was a very positive surprise to find such an interesting group of people from Norway, Africa and Latin America working on social rights with real cases to discuss. In summary it was a really great experience to be able to actively participate at the Conference.

This question is in part addressed above. As I said, I was already in contact with part of the researchers of the group (Siri Gloppen, Bruce Wilson and Daniel Brincks) and as such I was familiar with their previous work. But being a panelist with them was a complete different experience. In the first place I could discuss my paper with them and received feedback that was really key to bring the ongoing research to the “next level”. Second, I was able to have a much more complete vision of their ongoing research and how my own work could fit into this new theoretical framework Siri, Bruce and Daniel are working on. In one sentence the bigger contribution for me was to discover to its full extension the body of literature that is the natural framework for my own research.

As a second difference of being present at the Hawaii meeting was to personally meet the other panelists. It was especially interesting to meet Daniel Ryan from Argentina who runs a remarkable environmental ONG that works on topics related to a research project I run with IDB funding so attending the Hawaii meeting also provided a great opportunity to extend my research network in Latin America.

As I said, the Hawaii meeting allowed me to personally know a powerful group of scholars who work and environmental and social rights and the role Courts play in obtaining them, finding a sound theoretical “home” to continue to develop my own research. This is important as I was reaching a point where I had gathered a number of original data relating the Chilean experience to use Courts to defend citizen environmental rights but was having difficulties to find the right literature to frame my conclusions. Looking at the other side, I hope to have been able to contribute to the rest of the IRC members by providing a well documented case study to test some of their work hypothesis.

Regarding the future, I sincerely hope my IRC group stays running in good health as they are working a new and in my opinion, groundbreaking and comprehensive theoretical framework that would help a number of researchers around the world to better tackle this “social/environmental rights/role Courts” big issue.

I am committed to take my current research to publication and for such goal I have engaged the review of D. Ryan and D. Brick, two of my co-panelists as the IRC meeting. Finally I would like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Law and Society Association, and the National Research Foundation for providing the necessary funding for scholars like me to attend the meeting. Without your support I could not have done it, missing a great chance to improve my ongoing research.

Ariel Perez Castellon, participant

It has been a great experience to participate at Law & Society International Conference at Honolulu. This was my first attendance to a North American academic conference. I enjoyed a lot the interdisciplinary scope of many of the researches and presentations, it was also remarkable the quality and diversity of the researches. As a Latin American professor, it was very useful for me to interact with other Latin American scholars, as well as with other professors of Southern countries.

I wrote a paper especially for the Hawaii Conference: “New constitutional actions in Bolivia: Challenges and opportunities to prevent and repair social and environmental damages caused to Indigenous People”. I presented the paper on the “3305 Environmental Lawfare 02” Panel.

The scholars and their researches have given me very important inputs regarding the importance of the judicial system in the enforcement and exercise of human rights, especially collective rights. Since at Bolivia we are just beginning to use constitutional actions to enforce collective rights (as indigenous peoples rights, or environmental rights), I learned a lot from the comparative experiences presented at the Conference, especially from Latin American countries. In addition, in my professional career, as a public interest lawyer and researcher, I am starting to explore possibilities to support public interest litigation within Bolivia.

Regarding my impacts on other scholars, I think have contributed to clarify information on the political context of Bolivia, its achievements and challenges, also regarding the limitations on the enforcement of the Bolivian Constitution. In addition, within Bolivia, I have shared the paper I wrote for the Conference, with almost a hundred civil society organizations, public interest activists and Bolivian citizens. The paper will be published in the Latin American Journal on Environmental Law, published in Lima, Perú (DAR, Universidad San Marcos de Perú).

In July 2012, a scholar I met in the Hawaii Conference, from the Getulio Vargas Foundation, invited me to participate in an international research on governance and corruption within countries of South America. At the present, I am working on this research, gathering information regarding Bolivian corruption cases.

Thank you very much for supporting my participation within the Hawaii Conference, I look forward to attending in the Boston Conference in 2013. Please let me know if I can be of any help with regards of any information or help you need from Bolivia.

Daniel Ryan, participant

I was invited by Daniel Brinks (University of Texas at Austin) and Siri Gloppen (University of Bergen) to be part of the panel Environmental Lawfare 01, which was sponsored by IRC 11, Environmental Rights

and Development. In that panel, I presented a paper called Policy Change and Environmental Litigation in Argentina.

The participation at the 2012 LSA Conference and more specifically in the activities of the IRC 11 was very relevant for me for two main reasons:

First, it allowed me to build network connections with scholars working on similar issues (environmental rights and judicialization) in different parts of the world. In my case, I have the chance to share the panel with scholars from South Africa, Colombia, Norway and Chile. It was an extremely rich experience.

As a scholar trying to develop an academic career in Argentina, I have to stress the importance of having the chance to attend this type of international conferences. It allows me to have the chance to stay updated about the theoretical debates and research agendas, as well as to share my research and to learn about the work of other scholars around the world.

Second, my presentation at the Hawaii meeting had an impact on the paper that I was working on. Before the conference, my research paper was addressing a local audience in Argentina (scholars and practitioners in the field on environmental rights and politics in Argentina), and the focus of the paper was on the empirical results of my analysis. The presentation of the paper at the Hawaii conference “forced” me to further develop the theoretical context and to place my empirical results about the Argentinean cases on a more comparative perspective and in relationship with the comparative literature on courts and social change.

In relation to potential future work with other members of my panel and IRC 11, I have collaborated and I am collaborating with Dan Brinks, Siri Glopen and Bruce Wilson (who were the organizers of the panel in which I participated) in submitting a grant proposal to fund a research Project about environmental litigation in Latin America.

Once again, I want to thank the support of the LSA and the Program on International Research Collaborative that provides me with financial support to attend the 2012 Conference.

12. Assessing Economic and Social Rights Compliance: Experiences, Challenges, and Methodologies

Daniel Wang, participant

I was invited to present my research on the economic and policy impacts of the judicial protection of the right to health. That was an improved and updated version of the paper I presented a year before in San Francisco.

It allowed me to exchange ideas with colleagues that are working on the same field. It was very important to receive their feedback, comments and criticisms. I think my paper had a good impact on the audience. After the presentation, people came to me to ask for the electronic version of the paper and to ask for advice concerning their own research. Participating in the conference was really good to make my work better and better known.

We decided we should keep in touch and try to publish some of the papers in the same journal since our works are really connected.

Octavio Ferraz, organizer

The presence of the grant recipients funded by NSF and LSA was crucial, since our panel had 3 grant recipients and two non-grant recipients, that is, the majority of members in the panel were grant recipients and their papers were crucial for the panel. Moreover, their papers instigated most of the discussion and attracted a reasonably large audience.

The IRC contributed to the improvement of an international dialogue on the still new issue of social rights implementation and, perhaps most importantly, allowed young researchers from Brazil and Colombia who are working in these issues in their doctorates to present their work, establish a dialogue among themselves and with more experienced academics, from whom they received invaluable feedback.

Each of the members plan to publish the papers presented in the meeting in academic journals after incorporating the feedback received in both San Francisco and Honolulu.

13. Regional Human Rights: The Americas in Comparative and Contextual Perspective

Alexandra Huneus, organizer

Participants were: Judith Schönsteiner, Human Rights Center, Diego Portales University, Chile (funded), Oscar Parra, Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Costa Rica/Colombia (funded), Rachel Cichowski, University of Washington, United States, Ariel Dulitzky, University of Texas at Austin, United States, Alexandra Huneus, University of Wisconsin-Madison, United States

Our IRC had two main activities during the 2012 meeting: we sponsored a paper panel, Regional Human Rights Systems in Socio-Legal Perspective 3106, with the participation of Rachel Cichowski, Ariel Dulitzky, Alexandra Huneus, Oscar Parra, and Judith Schönsteiner. The panel was well-attended, and yielded an interesting discussion; we held a work meeting, during which we discussed our future projects in common.

The NSF/LSA funding brought the co-coordinator of the IRC to Hawaii, who would otherwise not been able to participate. In that sense, her presence was crucial for the development of the panel sponsored by the IRC (she convened it and was the commentator), and for the planning of future activities (see below). She also deepened the contact with the IRC on Transnational Legal Orders, presenting a paper in a session sponsored by that IRC.

In terms of advancing the discussion of a conceptual approach to studying the impact of regional human rights tribunals' decisions, developed initially by Alexandra Huneus, one of the IRC coordinators, the grants were decisive in permitting debate and exchange. In a panel presentation, Oscar Parra (grant recipient) applied Huneus' approach to Colombia and other countries in the region, asking for different actors' reactions to decisions by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The paper was commented by Judith Schönsteiner (co-coordinator of the IRC and also funded by a grant), and in turn, she took up the approach in a presentation at the Max Planck Institute for Public and International Law in Heidelberg, Germany, using it for analysis of the Chilean case. This direct interaction among scholars funded by the LSA/NSF grant, with the respective products associated, would not have been possible without the grant, as neither of them would have been able to participate in the Hawaii conference by other means.

Had there not been two members of the IRC receiving grant funding, the IRC activities would not have taken place, as about 50% of its members come from middle-income countries, and were unable to fund their travel and participation on their own.

Through the Hawai'i meeting we were able to accomplish three things: First, we were able to share our current research on topics of common inquiry. This is important both so that we are able to build from

each other's work, and learn from each other, as we open the field of socio-legal inquiry into the Inter-American Court (in comparative perspective); second, we were able to set our priorities as a working group, and make plans for moving forward. As further explained below, it is our intention to publish a group of our papers in the *Wisconsin International Law Journal*; third, we were able to meet in person, and further strengthen our ties in order to move forward with more scholarly projects in the future.

We plan a collective publication in a special issue of the *Wisconsin International Law Journal*, with contributions from IRC members and related researchers working on socio-legal analysis of regional human rights systems. The board of editors has expressed interest in our proposal for a symposium and special issue. We also plan to submit an application for the FORD/LASA research grant (2013) in order to be able to meet again next year, and begin work towards an edited volume.

Oscar Parra-Vera, participant

Our IRC had two main activities during the 2012 meeting.

I participated in the paper panel, Regional Human Rights Systems in Socio-Legal Perspective 3106, with Rachel Cichowski, Ariel Dulitzky, Alexandra Huneus and Judith Schonsteiner.

Second, I held a work meeting, during which I discussed my future projects and I exchanged ideas and opinions with other members of the IRC.

In terms of advancing the discussion of a conceptual approach to studying impact of regional human rights tribunals' decisions, developed initially by Alexandra Huneus, one of the IRC coordinators, the grant was decisive in permitting debate and exchange. In my panel presentation I applied Huneus' approach to Colombia and other countries in the region, asking for different actors' reactions to decisions by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The paper was commented by Judith Schönsteiner (co-coordinator of the IRC and also funded by a grant).

I took up the approach in three important presentations or activities during the last year. All of them were related to the ICR:

- First, I did presentation at the National Autonomous University of México (UNAM), in a meeting titled "*El concepto de ius constitutionale commune como dimensión de la investigación*" (the concept of common constitutional law as a dimension of the research), organized by the Max Planck Institute for Public and International Law and the Institute of Juridical Research of the UNAM (September, 2012).
- "Some Ideas about Legitimacy of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, Impact and Domestic Enforcement of its Decisions". *The Doctrine and Practice of the Inter-American Human Rights System. Winter 2013 Course*, organized by Harvard Law School, San José, January 22, 2013.
- Likewise, I used the ideas exchanged during the panel and the meeting in an article titled "The Inter-American System of Human Rights and "Institutional Resistance" in the Domestic Level: Some possible examples in Guatemala, Colombia, México and Uruguay" that will be presented for a law review this year (2013). This product would not have been possible without the grant.

On the other hand, I would like to highlight that in the work meeting celebrated during the Hawaii's Conference, I presented some current discussions regarding recent scholarship about the implementation of decisions of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

Through the Hawai'i meeting I have the opportunity to discuss my research regarding socio-legal inquiry into the Inter-American Court (in comparative perspective). During the meeting we began a discussion about the possibility to publish a group of our papers in the *Wisconsin International Law Journal*.

14. Transnational Legal Orders

Gregory Shaffer, organizer

Our IRC concerned the formation and operation of “Transnational Legal Orders.” This project investigates how international and domestic law are increasingly intermeshed, and what implications this raises for legal ordering. The funded participants were:

Valentina Delich, Argentina

Maira Machado, Brazil

James Nedumpara, India

The activities we sponsored were the following seven panels:

From Soft to Hard Law: Exploring the Role of Transnational Business CSR Standards

Errol E. Meidinger, SUNY, Buffalo

Chair/Discussant

Radu G. Mares, Lunds University

The Hardening of the “Protect, Respect, Remedy” Framework: Legal Implications of Corporate Due Diligence

Michelle Pautz, University of Dayton,

Amy Bryce Hoflund, University of Nebraska, Omaha and Richard Hyde, University of Nottingham

One HACCP, Two Approaches: Experiences with and Perceptions of the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points Food Safety Management Systems in the US and the EU

Kaisa Sorsa, Turku University of Applied Sciences

Regulating Global Value Chains: Examining CSR and Proactive Law

Kernaghan Webb, Ryerson University

Custom and International CSR Standards: The Evolving Story

Roundtable—The Role of Institutions in Shaping International Law

The session focused on the role of international institutions, such as intergovernmental organizations and informal coordinating committees, in influencing the formation and interpretation of international law.

The roundtable focused especially on how the characteristics of specific types of institutions affect both the participatory role of that institution and the content of the legal regime itself.

Douglas Sylvester, Arizona State University, Chair

Aaron Fellmeth, Arizona State University,

David Gartner, Arizona State University

and Katerina Linos, University of California, Berkeley

Participants

The Settlement of Transnational Legal Orders and their Impact

Benedict Kingsbury, New York University, Chair

Paulette Lloyd, Indiana University

Framing and Transnational Legal Organization: The Case of Human Trafficking

Maira R. Machado, Direito GV

From “Treatment of Prisoners” to “Severe Overcrowding”: A Transnational Legal Order to Regulate Prison Systems

Leigh A. Payne, University of Oxford

A Justice Paradox? The Anti-Impunity TLO and Its Impact

Gregory Shaffer, University of Minnesota

and Terence C. Halliday, American Bar

Foundation Transnational Legal Orders: A Framework Paper

Sally E. Merry, New York University

Discussant

Transnational Legal Orders in Investment and Trade Law

Gregory Shaffer, University of Minnesota, Chair

Jason Cross, University of Michigan and

Sergio Puig, Stanford University

Expertise and Legitimacy in International Investment Law: Governing Access to Investor-State Arbitration

Laura V. Delich, FLACSO, Argentina

The Impact of the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Transnational Legal Order on Developing Countries

James J. Nedumpara, Jindal Global University

The Construction of Indian Capacity for WTO and WTO Dispute Settlement

David Schneiderman, University of Toronto

The Global Regime of Investor Rights: A Return to the Standards of Civilized Justice?

Judith Schoensteiner, Universidad Diego Portales

Access to Justice for Third Parties in Large Investment Projects in Chile

Melissa Waters, Washington University

Discussant

State Actors and International Law: Factors that Influence the Fate of Asylum-Seekers

Audrey Macklin, University of Toronto, Chair/Discussant

Michael J Churgin, University of Texas

What Is the True Face of Canadian Convention Refugee Adjudication?

Denise Gilman, University of Texas, Austin
Human Rights Law and the Asylum Detention Factory in the United States

Stephen Meili, University of Minnesota
Do Human Rights Laws Help Asylum Seekers? A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States

Philip G. Schrag, Georgetown University
Asylum Adjudication by the Department of Homeland Security

Transnational Regulatory Orders

Jothie Rajah, American Bar Association/National U of Singapore, Chair

Ayelet Berman, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva
The Formation, Institutionalization, and Impact of TLOs in the Medical Products Field

Lorenzo Casini, University of Rome, Sapienza
Sports Law: A Global Legal Order?

Holly Jarman, SUNY, Albany
Coordinating Transnational Legal Orders: Building a Bridge between Trade and Health

Transnational Rights and Rule of Law Construction

Terence C. Halliday, American Bar Foundation, Chair

Ole Hammerslev, University of Southern Denmark
Implementation of EU Law through Legal Education and Training: Making a Transnational Legal Order Work in Practice

Katerina Linos, University of California, Berkeley
Soft Law at Work: International Standards and the Design of National Human Rights Institutions

Mikael R. Madsen, University of Copenhagen
The European Human Rights Regime as Transnational Legal Order: Explaining an Evolution

Jothie Rajah, American Bar Association/National U of Singapore
Transnational Legal Ordering through Rule of Law Discourse

Leigh A. Payne, University of Oxford
Discussant

The three individuals from these three developing countries would not have had the funding to participate. Because they were able to participate we were able to incorporate views on transnational legal ordering from scholars from these countries. Given the impacts of transnational legal ordering in developing countries it is very important to both help support scholarship within these countries on these questions.

The IRC is helping to define a collective research project on the formation and impact of transnational legal orders. It is quite important for understanding law in our current context.

The IRC will publish two books from a number of the papers presented. The first book is entitled *Transnational Legal Ordering and State Change* (forthcoming Cambridge University Press 2013). Maira Machado's work will appear in that volume. The second book is in progress, entitled *Transnational Legal Orders*.

James Nedumpara's work will be published in a separate project of which Gregory Shaffer is a part, concerning the impact of the World Trade Organization in developing countries.

Valentina Delich directs a center of sociolegal work in Buenos Aires concerning international law. Her center will follow up on the issues we are covering.

We are submitting a book manuscript to Cambridge University Press entitled *Transnational Legal Orders* and have been in contact with the CUP editor.

We have organized follow up panels for the LSA Boston meeting in 2013.

James Nedumpara, participant

I participated in the 2012 International Conference on Law and Society organized at Honolulu, Hawai'i, USA. I presented a paper in the session on *Transnational Legal Orders in Investment and Trade Law* (Session 3405) which was sponsored by CRN 36 and IRC 14. The transnational legal order (TLO) project was aimed at evaluating and comparing the differences in the structure and coherence of "transnational legal orders" on change within states in three domains: human rights law, trade/regulatory law, and private business law. The project, in short, examined how the features and attributes of transnational legal orders can influence the degree of national conformity to global legal norms and the extent of sovereign adaptation to supra-national normative processes and compulsions.

Session 3405 discussed the interaction of international, regional and national courts in transnational legal orders. My paper which was entitled "The Constriction of Indian Capacity for WTO and WTO Dispute Settlement" discussed the various approaches to trade related capacity building in India and how India's engagement with WTO negotiation and dispute settlement processes has affected domestic changes and vice versa. The paper was an attempt to trace the efforts made at augmenting trade related capacity in India over the last sixty years, i.e. from the early days of the GATT to the WTO.

The TLO panel discussed the issue in three general domains, namely (1) business law; (2) human rights law; (3) trade and regulatory law. It was an immense learning experience for me to understand the focus of contemporary research on transnational legal ordering in these fields. It was extremely helpful for me to attend the various sessions on TLO organized at LSA, 2012 and to understand the scholarship developing in this field. At a personal level, it was helpful for me to understand the importance and application of socio-legal research in American legal studies—a privilege which is not always available in India where I come from. On the other hand, my paper on trade related capacity building in India was informative for other participants who were curious to learn about the experience of an emerging developing country in implementing WTO norms at the domestic level and also appreciating India's role in influencing the norm setting process within the WTO.

The IRC accomplished its major objective in the Hawai'i meeting by attracting a group of acknowledged experts in different fields to present papers and comment on the development of transnational legal norms. Most of the papers were at an advanced level and displayed extraordinary scholarship. In addition, most of the papers were borne out of collaborative efforts which contributed to their richness.

I am involved in this TLO project with Professor Gregory Shaffer from Minnesota Law School. We intend to include the final paper in an edited book on Globalisation of Law in Emerging Economies.. I am particularly grateful for the IRC grant without which I would not have been able to travel to Honolulu and present my paper.

Maira Rocha Machado, participant

The 2012 international conference on Law and Society was an extraordinary opportunity to (1) discuss the research I've been developing with a quite diverse audience; (2) meet a number of scholars from different countries and theoretical backgrounds; (3) strength my understanding of how a large scale and very successful conference functions to contribute to the organization and promotion of collective debate in Brazil. More specifically:

In Honolulu, I presented a paper on "prison overcrowding and the transnational legal order to regulate the use of imprisonment" in a panel in which other scholars discussed very cross-related topics as amnesties and human trafficking. As I got the chance to read the papers in advance, it was possible to incorporate their arguments to my presentation and therefore add a couple of very specific issues to the debate. Also, thanks to this panel, I had the chance to receive very useful comments by our chair Benedict Kingsbury.

As far as the opportunity of meeting different people, theoretical and methodological perspectives, this year I've decided to follow not only the panels organized by the transnational legal order CRN but also the ones related to the discussion of "impunity" and "imprisonment". Besides the several panels I had the chance to attend, the conference was particularly useful to meet and catch up with my Latin American colleagues who I barely only meet at the LSA environment. It is also important to mention, in this regard, that I was looking for a researcher from Bolivia to join a research project on corruption in Latin America. After weeks of contacting people through email without success, coffee breaks and lunch at Honolulu were enough to find the right person.

Finally, this year I also had the opportunity to attend the 2013 program committee meeting. Besides the joy of meeting several professors to take part at the construction of the next conference, I am particularly enthusiastic about this great chance to better understand how LSA conferences are organized, how the topics are defined, how the papers are allocated in panels, and what is the rationale behind all that. This knowledge is being particularly useful to the organization of the "National Meeting of Empirical Legal Research" (EPED – Encontro Nacional de Pesquisa Empírica em Direito) that I've been working on with a group of Brazilian scholars that organized a network on the topic. (REED – Rede de estudos empíricos em Direito: www.reed.org).

17. Gender Equality, Governance and Citizenship

Sindiso Mnisi Weeks, participant

I am grateful for the opportunity to attend the Law and Society Association international conference in Hawai'i in 2012 as part of IRC 17. The conference provided such a rich experience both in terms of the sessions' contents and networking opportunities. The IRC organisers were incredibly encouraging and supportive, and were instrumental in the establishment of meaningful professional connections between people with similar interests by facilitating meeting opportunities and making introductions. Since the meeting, I have been invited to contribute to a book edited by more senior colleagues who attended the conference. My chapter contribution draws heavily on the research paper I presented at the conference and the questions and feedback I received in response to it. It also provides a useful foundation upon which to build the subsequent work that I am doing that expands on the same research topic and which I trust will become a book. At the conference, I was also introduced to an editor of a book series with

whom I have since been in conversation about the possibility of turning my PhD thesis into a book and having it published as part of this series. Thus, attending the conference was of great benefit to me and I am very grateful for the sponsorship that enabled me to attend.

18. Socio-Political-Economic Developments and the Legal Systems in East Asia

Kay-Wah Chan, organizer

This IRC aims at investigating the interactions between social, political and/or economic developments and the legal systems in East Asia.

It has organized one panel at the annual meeting of the Law and Society Association held in San Francisco in 2011. Panelists included the two co-organizers (Young-hao Jung, Chonbuk National University, South Korea and Kay-Wah Chan, Macquarie University, Australia) and members from Australia, Japan and Macau.

For the 2012 International Conference on Law and Society held in Honolulu, Hawaii, this IRC has organized two panels, which include participants from South Korea, Australia, Japan, China, Macau, Taiwan, and Singapore. They are as follows:

1. Politics, Society, Economy, and Laws in East Asia

a. Chair: Kay-Wah Chan

b. Discussant: Wen-Chen Chang (National Taiwan University, Taiwan) (invited guest discussant; non-IRC18 member)

c. Panelists:

i. Mary Ip (University of New South Wales, Australia) (presenting) and Brenda Marshall (Bond University, Australia (non-presenting and non-attending) – “Evolution of Chinese Consumer Law – Through the Lenses of Product Liability Law and Anti-Monopoly Law”

ii. Young-hao Jung (Chonbuk National University, South Korea) – “The Constitutional Democracy and Korean Socio-Economic Development”

iii. Eugene KB Tan (Singapore Management University, Singapore) – “Taming the Pragmatic Leviathan in Post-Colonial Constitutional Design”

iv. Wei-Hua Wu (Taiwan Miaoli District Court, Taiwan) – “Marriage Fraud in Taiwan”

2. The Socio-Political-Economic Developments and the Legal/Quasi-Legal Professionals in East Asia

a. Chair: Young-hao Jung

b. Discussant: Yoshitaka Wada (Waseda University, Japan) (invited guest discussant; non-IRC18 member)

c. Panelists:

- i. Kay-Wah Chan (Macquarie University, Australia) and Takayuki Ii (Hirosaki University, Japan) (non-presenting) – “Judicial Scriveners in Japan: An Ill-Fated "Legal" Profession”
- ii. Jinhua Cheng (East China University of Political Science & Law, China) and Xin Tang (Beijing Gaohua Securities Ltd, China) – “Structural Determination of Legal Development: The Rise of Full-Time Lawyers in the People's Republic of China”
- iii. Hong Jun Ma (China University of Political Science and Law, China) – “The Way to Realize Legal Credibility: Social Influence of Legal Clinics”
- iv. Denis de Castro Halis (University of Macau, Macau SAR) – “When Do Judges Dissent in Macau? Judicial Dissent in the World’s Gambling Haven”

This IRC project, as mentioned above, investigates the interactions between social, political and/or economic developments and the East Asian legal systems. With China’s rapid economic and social development in the recent decades, it is crucial that this Project includes participants from China. However, many Chinese scholars face financial difficulties in attending international conferences, particularly those held in advanced economies. Financial support is therefore important. NSF and LSA funding has supported IRC18 members Jinhua Cheng and Hong Jun Ma in their participation at the International Conference in Hawaii. Their participation and contributions ensured the inclusion of discussions and investigations on the Chinese legal system. Furthermore, China has seen substantial development in her legal profession in recent years. Professor Cheng’s and Professor Ma’s contributions, both in relation to legal service providers in China, are therefore paramount to the success of the IRC project. Originally, funding had also been approved for another member from China, Gang Yuan (China University of Political Science and Law). However, due to an urgent and unexpected medical reason, Professor Yuan was unable to attend the conference in Hawaii. He however was also invited to submit his paper to be considered for publication (discussed below).

Regarding the role of discussants in the two panels in the Hawaii conference, our IRC has invited two scholars from outside the IRC. They are experts in relation to the respective theme of the two panels. They have provided valuable feedback and comments on the papers, which we trust will be helpful when IRC18 members prepare the polished versions of their papers for publication (discussed below). In addition, the panelists also had fruitful intellectual exchange with the audience. In short, the panels are successful. The Conference has provided us a unique and valuable opportunity to engage in meaningful intellectual exchange not only among IRC members ourselves but also with the discussants and other scholars in the audience.

At an informal group dinner after the panels, IRC members discussed our future plans. It is decided that the two organizers would implement plans for the publication of papers from this IRC in scholarly journal(s), preferably in special issue(s). Subsequent to the Conference, the organizers contacted a peer-reviewed journal for publication of three to five IRC18 papers in a special issue. Members have been invited to submit polished versions of their papers to the organizers by mid-October 2012 for initial review. Three to five relevant and quality papers will be chosen and forwarded to the journal for their normal review process. The organizers hope to see publication of the special issue in 2013. Publication opportunity in another journal, hopefully also in a special issue, will also be sought for the remaining papers of publishable quality.

IRC18 Co-Organizers:

Young-hoa Jung (Chonbuk National University, South Korea)

Kay-Wah Chan (Macquarie University, Australia)

Jinhua Cheng, participant:

I did it very well and attended quite a few panels during the conference.

The most important thing is that I got a large award from the conference organizer so that I could make the trip. Otherwise, it would be impossible for me to present my paper there. In Honolulu, I got the chance to meet old friends and know new ones, many of whom are my potential collaborators in future research.

It was successful.

A group of people from my field are preparing a special issue on law and society in East Asia. Most articles are based on the presentations in Honolulu. Hopefully, it will be a great and interesting volume.

19. Women in Legal Practice: Local and Global Perspectives

Steve Boutcher, organizer

Gender and global legal practice is a very salient issue which is gaining momentum, both academically and for practitioners. Most research on gender and the legal profession has been focused in a national context. The purpose of our IRC is to change that focus by bringing together comparative perspectives on the topic, to create a dialogue. The inclusion of our three funded members was paramount to having the comparative focus we had envisioned for the IRC. The home countries of Swethaa, Xiaonan and Gloria are among the three most significant countries today with regard to globalization and growth for the legal profession. They are the sites of much interest for US and UK law firms that have been leaders in developing global practices and identities, but they also have created regulatory barriers to expansion and direct competition.

We successfully launched our IRC in Hawaii with a range of papers and participants. The meetings in Hawaii will facilitate the growth of this emerging research area. Also, we have arranged to publish more developed versions of the papers presented in Hawaii in a symposium issue of the Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies (Summer 2013), along with a newly written introduction for the papers. Longer term, we plan to expand the research community focused on the IRC topic and hope eventually to produce more published research in a variety of disciplinary outlets and possibly an edited volume.

We have put together a special symposium issue for the Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies. The symposium is scheduled to be published later this summer as part of Volume 20, Issue 2 and is titled "Comparative Perspectives on Gender and Lawyering." I am pasting the table of contents below, which shows that it includes many of the participants from our Honolulu panels.

Introduction

Gabriele Plickert

Why is Gender a form of Diversity? Rising Advantages for Women in Global Indian Law Firms

Swethaa Ballakrishnen

Gender and Global Lawyering: Where are the Women?

Steven A. Boutcher, Carole Silver

The Impact of the Economic Downturn on Women Lawyers in the United States
Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Abigail Kolker

Gender and the Difference Among Brazilian Lawyers and Judges: Public and Private Practice in the Global Periphery
Maria da Gloria Bonelli

Leaving Private Practice: How Organizational Context, Time Pressures, and Structural Inflexibilities Shape Departures from Private Law Practice
Fiona M. Kay, Stacey Alarie, Jones Adjei

Chinese Women in Legal Education
Xiaonan Liu

Women in the Legal Profession, 1970-2010: A Study of the Global Supply of Lawyers
Ethan Michelson

Parenthood Status and Compensation in Law Practice Nancy Reichman, Joyce Sterling

Afterward: A Comparative Look at the Status of Women in the Legal Profession
Carroll Seron

Maria da Gloria Bonelli, participant

My paper was part of the 4506 panel “Gendering the legal profession: Comparative and cross-national perspectives (sponsored by IRC19 Women in the legal practice at the WG03 Women in legal professions). I have attended the panels organized by IRC 19 and WG 03, sections in others subjects and several activities in the schedule of events.

Among the conferences that I have participated in the last two years, the LSA international congress deserves special mention. The quality of the debate and the contribution to a cross-national perspective has been fundamental to improve my research and also to facilitate global comparisons.

I understand that if the group has had a great impact in my work, it goes the other way around, too. An evidence of the positive interaction and mutual influence among the members of the IRC is that we will be publishing our papers together at the Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies.

I have just finished working on a new book related to the paper I have delivered in Honolulu, which I have sent to the publisher, and I also have written an article to a book edited by a Brazilian law school, using information shared by the panelists.

It has been very important to my academic career to participate at the LSA Conferences. The opportunity to be in touch with new research and new approaches on Law and Sociology during these events makes a real difference in my knowledge on legal professions.

20. Financial and Climate Crises: Global Regulatory Responses

Fiona Haines, organizer

Before the conference a wiki site was set up <http://financialandclimatecrises.wikispaces.com/>. This is a members' only wiki and provides a space for all IRC members to contact each other, share work and ideas.

Conference activities included two panels, a drinks get together before the beginning of the conference and a farewell get together and 'where next' discussion after the final session. In addition members met in smaller groups to discuss areas of mutual interest.

The grant recipients formed a sizeable minority of the IRC members participating at the Hawaii conference (3 of the 7 presenters). Their presence was invaluable both in terms of numbers and in terms of the content of their contribution and overall the work of the funded scholars was of critical importance to the overall success of the IRC sessions in Hawaii. They covered well the particular issues in both the sessions discussed at the meeting. Tom Herbstein's paper on the role of insurance in the first session "Greening the Economy or Economizing the Green?" brought into play a critical element exploring the connection between the financial and climate crises making the argument that it is the insurance industry that has the strongest connection to both the financial and climate crises. This work is currently being developed for a book chapter. Tumai Murumbo and Puree Sirasontorn's papers were more applied and fitted well into the applied regulatory framework of their particular session entitled "Questioning the Capacity to Regulate Competing Risks?" The work of all these scholars was of critical importance as they highlighted the issues faced by the global south in their capacity to meet both the demands of the financial and climate crises simultaneously. In addition, Ibironke Odumosu was able to bring to bear a southern perspective and her work on foreign investment directly links to the existing work of Kyla Tienhaara who was also presenting. This allowed these two scholars to develop a collegial relationship through the IRC.

This IRC was notable for its capacity to bring together both senior and junior scholars as well as those from countries not normally well represented at Law and Society meetings. The Hawaii conference was the first time many had met which meant it was an invaluable meeting point and start for a fruitful ongoing discussion.

A major contribution of the IRC was the identification of a broad group of 60 scholars that had common interests. These scholars all have access to the website which can form as a basis for developing their common research interests. It also brought a large number of people into contact with the International Law and Society Associations, a number of whom had not been aware of the activities of the association previously.

The IRC was also organized under the auspices of the Regulation and Governance CRN. The IRC thus provided an innovative way to address the central themes of the IRC and to bring scholars from both within the LSA and outside into contact with the CRN.

There are several initiatives that have arisen out of the IRC. Two IRC members at the Hawaii conference have already published their work (Heather Hughes and David Dreisen) and the other 5 had work in various stages of readiness. All members produced full drafts of papers for the conference and comments were provided on each paper by the IRC organisers (Christine Parker for Panel 1 and Fiona Haines for Panel 2). The papers have now been sent out to IRC members at the Hawaii conference for additional comment as was agreed at the Hawaii meeting. As mentioned above Tom Herbstein's paper is being prepared as a book chapter. The remaining papers will then be placed on the Climate and Environmental Governance Network website at the ANU as working papers. They will then be refined further for publication.

Tom Herbstein, participant

I am a PhD student at the Centre of Criminology, University of Cape Town. I attended the Law & Society Association conference in Honolulu, Hawaii in May 2012, as an IRC and was funded by the conference organisers. I presented a paper entitled 'Managing the socio-ecological risk landscape: an insurance challenge in a session entitled 'Greening the Economy and Economising the Green'. The paper explores the impact climate change is having on global insurance and the potential the industry has to manage this exposure by engaging more proactively in managing the physical drivers of natural hazards in the local landscapes in which they operate.

Post-conference, the connections I made, particular those linked to the session at which I presented, have gained me access to an international research group that is now working towards a special issue or book publication. This is a fantastic opportunity, not only in increasing the review potential for my work but also in furthering the reach of my PhD thesis in general.

Although my paper was at a fairly advanced stage, at the time of presentation in Hawaii, the comments and discussions that it generated have not only helped to strengthen the papers argument, but have provided me with material that takes the focus of my work further.

Overall, the conference was an invaluable opportunity to participate in the global discourse on climate change regulation and one of the most rewarding conferences attended yet. Thank you to the organisers for all their hard work in putting it together and for affording me the opportunity to attend.

Following the conference, I submitted the following book chapter:

- Herbstein, T., Froestad, J. (in press) 'Re-imagining the risk landscape: Insurance, 'climate risk' and the barriers to change', in Tanja A. Börzel and Ralph Hamann (eds). Business contributions to climate change governance in areas of limited statehood. Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.

21. Comparative and International Perspectives on Regulation of Household Credit, Debt and Insolvency

Kanok Jullamon:

Hawaii provides a much more relaxing environment to exchange ideas and discuss scholarly works. It also allows more scholars from Asia-Pacific region to participate. I have made a lot of networking with people who have interest in comparative consumer debts from many countries such as Canada, England, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, Portugal, Spain, etc.

The conference opens the American researchers' eyes and ears to works from their counterparts across the globe.

We have achieved our stated goals.

One future research design with other two members of my IRC is pending – the tentative title is "Culture, Attitudes & Debt." The other researchers are Prof. Robert Lawless and Prof. Antonio Porto.

22. Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution

Archie Zariski, organizer

Ten members of our IRC participated in this conference including Professor Changqing Shi of Yantai University, PRC, who was funded for this purpose. Professor Doina Balahur of Romania was also awarded funding but could not attend due to an increase in travel costs in excess of the funded budget.

Our IRC sponsored one panel at the Law & Society Association Conference in 2011 and two panels at the Hawai'i conference in 2012 as follows:

SESSION TITLE: IRC22 Judicial Dispute Resolution: What Are the Judges Doing? (Sponsored by IRC22 Judicial Dispute Resolution) 2209

SESSION PARTICIPANTS:

Session Organizer: Archie Zariski archiez@athabasca.ca Athabasca University;

Chair: Archie Zariski archiez@athabasca.ca Athabasca University;

Discussant: Tania Sourdin Tania.Sourdin@Monash.edu Monash University.;

The New Judge: The Judge as Conflict Manager

Machteld de Hoon, m.w.dehoon@uvt.nl Tilburg University

Suzan Verberk, s.verberk@frg.eur.nl Erasmus University Rotterdam

The Influence of Judicial Ethics and Rule-of-Law Traditions on Judicial Dispute Resolution Techniques

James Alfini, jalfini@stcl.edu South Texas College of Law

Judicial Dispute Resolution: The Japanese Approach

Eric Feldman, efeldman@law.upenn.edu University of Pennsylvania

What Judges Do: A Comparative Analysis and Proposed Tool for Assessment

Nancy Welsh, nxw10@psu.edu Pennsylvania State University

Donna Stienstra, dstienst@fjc.gov Federal Judicial Center

Bobbi McAdoo, bmcadoo@hamline.edu Hamline University

Inefficiencies in Knowledge Flows Identifying and Expediting the Hearing of Potential Miscarriages of Justice in the Victorian Court of Appeals

John Zeleznikow, john.zeleznikow@vu.edu.au Victoria University

The IRC also sponsored panels at the American Bar Association Section of Dispute Resolution annual meetings in 2011 and 2012 as follows:

April 15, 2011

International Perspectives on the Judicial Role in Settlement

This session will discuss the work of an International Research Collaborative (IRC) in Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution (the work undertaken by Judges to encourage, direct, or engage in settlement processes for civil litigation, including judicial conciliation and mediation). This IRC has been recognized and approved by the Law and Society Association and includes more than twenty five scholars, judges

and practitioners from many countries. Some countries have a long history of judicial involvement in settlements and facilitated discussions and this is viewed as an accepted and important part of the judicial role. In other jurisdictions, there is more discomfort with judicial dispute resolution and the role of a judge may be perceived as more appropriately limited to adjudication. The participants In the IRC are drawn from Asia, North America, Europe, and South Africa.

The session will be highly interactive, consisting of a facilitated discussion among the participants and outreach to the audience. It will cover judicial dispute resolution in a number of countries, including the important question of what sort of responsibility judges have to oversee the work of their delegates, such as magistrate judges, special masters, staff mediators, roster mediators.

Tania Sourdin, Monash University, Australia, Sydney NSW 2001

James Alfini, South Texas College of Law, Houston, TX

Archie Zariski, Athabasca University, Canada, Edmonton, AB, Canada

Donna Stienstra, Federal Judicial Center, Washington DC, DC Nancy Welsh, Penn State University, Carlisle, PA

Wayne Brazil, UC Berkeley School of Law, Berkeley, CA

April 19, 2012

International Perspectives on Judicial Dispute Resolution

This session will discuss and update the work of an International Research Collaborative (IRC) in Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution (the work undertaken by judges to encourage, direct, or engage in settlement processes for civil litigation, including judicial conciliation and mediation). This IRC has been recognized and approved by the Law and Society Association and includes more than twenty five scholars, judges and practitioners from many countries. Some countries have a long history of judicial involvement in settlements and facilitated discussions and this is viewed as an accepted and important part of the judicial role. In other jurisdictions, there is more discomfort with judicial dispute resolution and the role of a judge may be perceived as more appropriately limited to adjudication. The participants In the IRC are drawn from Asia, North America, Europe, and South Africa. The session will be highly interactive, consisting of a facilitated discussion among the participants and outreach to the audience. It will cover judicial dispute resolution in a number of countries, including the important question of what sort of responsibility judges have to oversee the work of their delegates, such as magistrate judges, special masters, staff mediators, roster mediators.

Bobbi McAdoo, Hamline University School of Law, St Paul, MN

Machteld Pel, Pel Mediation, Arnhem, The Netherlands

Donna Stienstra, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, DC

Archie Zariski, Athabasca University, Athbasca, Canada

It was very important that the one grant recipient was able to attend and present as the session highlighted important overarching systemic factors that impact on the extent to which judicial officers undertake this work. The IRC had a number of members from North America, Europe and the Pacific and from

westernized systems but the perspective offered by the Chinese scholar ensured that the perspectives presented were international.

The grant recipient and the broader perspective supported a closer examination by all IRC attendees of the impact of rule of law issues and institutional factors on the process of judging.

The IRC was successful in creating a community of scholars to explore the role of judges using facilitative techniques to resolve disputes. Prior to the IRC being established there was no such community. The community of scholars will continue to meet, share information and extend thinking and writing in this important area.

The Hawaii meetings enabled scholars to meet and discuss their work, refine papers for publication and extend scholarship in this area. The discussions mean that further work will continue in this area. For example, some of the IRC members have developed a survey to be used internationally to support empirical research into the future. The Hawaii meetings supported the development of this work.

The IRC prepared an extensive bibliography and this working document was updated throughout the IRC and the Hawaii meeting provided an important opportunity to discuss and extend this work.

Members of the IRC including the funded participant at the Hawai'i meeting are contributing chapters to a forthcoming book titled "The Multi-Tasking Judge: Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution" to be published by Thomson Reuters in 2013. The Co-Organizers of the IRC are Co-Editors of this collection.

We will be proposing an "Author Meets Reader" session at the 2013 Law & Society Association Annual Conference in relation to this book with judges from a variety of jurisdictions as readers.

Tania Sourdin and Archie Zariski, co-organizers of this IRC, are pleased to advise that a collected volume of papers has been published arising out of the work of its members over the past several years. The book is The Multi-Tasking Judge: Comparative Judicial Dispute Resolution. For more details see:

<http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/the-multi-tasking-judge-comparative-judicial-dispute-resolution-ebook/productdetail/116254> □

24. Religious Diversity, Sovereignty, and Legal Pluralism

James (Jim) Richardson, organizer:

The sessions and individual discussions (which have continued since via email) were focused on future collaborative work together and particularly on the development of a book manuscript which has been completed and is being considered by several major academic presses. The prospectus for that volume is attached for your information. We will be engaged with some of the participants and attendees in other future research and publication efforts as well.

Having the participants from the various countries present at the conference was essential to our continued development of research and collaboration in this area of growing importance – the examination of the way Shari'a develops within both Western and non-western countries. Having the session drew other scholar's attention, and several came to the sessions and are now involved in our network of scholars focused on questions related to the role and impact of Shari'a and on the evolution of Shari'a in contemporary societies. Some of them are also included in the book that has developed out of the two sessions. Thus, not only did Adam and I become acquainted with other scholars in the area of

Shari'a research, but the participants and those others who attended also learned of each other's work, and some are in contact with each other as a result.

As indicated above excellent contacts were made with scholars from around the world, and we intend to maintain those contacts and develop them further. Also, the book proposal that is under consideration was a direct result of the conference and being able to get the scholars from many different countries together in the same room on two different occasions with the sessions we developed.

We already have one book done and under consideration, and there are plans to move forward with other efforts of joint work with some of the scholars who participated or attended. I and Adam are making efforts to continue communicating with the participants, as well as some of those other scholars who attended the sessions. We want to maintain this group and enlarge it, and make efforts to encourage more scholarship in this important area of study.

We have been able to secure a contract with Springer for the edited book 'The Sociology of Shari'a: Case Studies from Around the World' (edited by A. Possamai, J. Richardson and B. Turner) as an outcome of our IRC activity. The book should come out next year and we will acknowledge the support that we have received from NSF and LSA.

Habibul H. Khondker, participant:

I was invited by the organizers to write a paper for the International Law and Society conference in Hawaii. I was invited to be part of a panel on legal pluralism. As a sociologist interested in cultural pluralism and diversity, I took a keen interest in the topic and sent an abstract to examine the cultural conflicts in Bangladesh over the local interpretation and forcible implementation of Sharia law in rural Bangladesh (a practice known as "shalish" and the role of civil society organizations to challenge and when possible fight these unlawful practices by mobilizing public opinion and using the laws of the land with support from the higher courts.

Participation in the IRC conference gave me an opportunity to meet, interact and exchange ideas of legal scholars and social scientists with a keen interest in legal matters. These scholars came from a large number of countries and were involved in a variety of professions. Participation in this conference changed my perspective about the relationship between law and society. Given the importance of the rule of law, it is important to understand the forces that oppose the universal rule of law. Yet, at the same time there is a place for legal pluralism to address the uniqueness of the contexts in which laws are implemented. In terms of professional development, this conference was very helpful for me.

My presentation was well-received and since my paper exposed some of the unsavory aspects of legal pluralism, it provided a countervailing argument against excessive celebration of legal pluralism. I am sure most of the participants benefitted from this conference as much as I did. There was some discussion following our session of publication of the papers presented as a book. I thought this would be a great idea.

I want to continue with my research on the relationship between laws and society focusing on labor issue and the rights and entitlements of the migrant workers in the future.

I have submitted a version of the paper presented for an electronic publication. I am waiting for the communication from the chair of our session about the revision of the paper and update on publication. I am also planning to submit a research proposal for further research on "shalish" unofficial local justice in Bangladesh (and much of South Asia) by the village elders and religious figures.

On the whole, I would say, Hawaii conference was a huge success. And I remain grateful to the organizers and the funders for their generous support, encouragement and the cordial reception which opened my eyes to new areas of research.

25. Indicators and Global Governance

Sally Merry, Benedict Kingsbury, Kevin Davis, organizers

The IRC is convened by **Kevin Davis**, Beller Family Professor of Business Law, **Benedict Kingsbury**, Murray and Ida Becker Professor of Law, and **Sally Engle Merry**, Professor of Anthropology, all of NYU School of Law. The IRC is coordinated by **Angelina Fisher**, Institute for International Law and Justice Fellow, NYU School of Law.

The focus of this IRC is to explore the various ways that the increasing use of indicators, - numerical representations of countries and rankings of countries, - is reshaping global governance. The project draws together a diverse set of scholars from both the developed and developing world who are working on international as well as national indicators of phenomena such as corruption, the rule of law, freedom, internally displaced people, corporate social responsibility, health, and governance. Through a comparison of the ways that knowledge is produced at the national, regional, and international level, this project traces out the link between the production of knowledge and global legal regulation. It builds on the work of the organizers on international law, global administrative law, the practice of human rights, and law and development.

The IRC held three panels at the Annual Meeting of the Law and Society Association in Honolulu on June 5-8, 2012. The first panel, *The Politics of Indicators: Contestation and Resistance*, examined contestation spurred by different indicators and the impact of social, political and economic context on the impetus for and methods of resistance use to challenge and resist indicators. The panel considered political dissent to corruption Indicator in Postsocialist Albania (**Smoki Musaraj** presented “Audit Cultures and Political Dissent in the Developing World: The Life of a Corruption Indicator in Postsocialist Albania”), Resistance to Rule of Law Indicators in Romania (**Mihaela Serban** presented “Distant Echoes: Resistance to Rule of Law Indicators in Romania”) and politics surrounding the development and use of gender indicators (**Catherine Powell** presented “Gender Indicators as a Tool of Global Governance”).

The second panel, *The Politics of Indicators: Knowledge Production*, examined production of local indicators (**Angelina Fisher** presented “Defining Education: Indicators and Human Rights Discourse”), local impact of global indicators (**Maria Angelica Prada** presented “Development through Data? A Case Study on the World Bank’s Performance Indicators and Its Impact on Development in the Global South”), the relationship between locally- and globally-produced indicators (and their users and producers) and implications of that interaction on the decision-making, institutional structures, and power relations ((**Rene Gerrets** presented “Governing the Road to Eradication: Indicators as Contested Technologies Guiding the Global Fight against Malaria” and **Meg Satterthwaite** presented “Measuring Equal Access to Water and Sanitation: Rights-Sensitive Indicators in the WASH Sector”).

The third panel, *Indicators of Law and Law of Indicators*, considered how the use of indicators in global governance changes the nature of decision-making and the use of law, as well as the role of law in regulating production and use of indicators. (**Debbie Collier** presented “Global Labor Market Indicators: Impact on Labor Laws in South Africa; **Fabiana L. Oliveira** presented “The Justice Indicators and the Impact on Public Policies within the Brazilian Judiciary”; and **Benedict Kingsbury** presented “Relations between Indicators and Law in Global Governance”). In addition to the aforementioned panels, we held a workshop for members of the IRC to consider their work more closely. Professors **Tom Ginsburg** (University of Chicago) and **Terence Halliday** (American Bar Foundation) participated as commentators. The combination of panels and workshop enabled IRC members to deepen their work and consider perspectives from other fields and disciplines. The workshop also provided scholars with guidance on difficult issues of methodology. In addition, participation in the LSA Meeting provided our IRC with opportunity for additional outreach: the panels and the round-table were very well attended and prompted lively discussions.

Work of the IRC members will culminate in a volume examining the production, use and effects of indicators in developing countries and emerging economies. The manuscript was completed in June 2013 and will be submitted for publication in July 2013. The title and table of contents are:

Measuring Development, Corruption, and the Rule of Law: The Production and Use of Indicators for Global Governance

Table of Contents

1. Introduction . 9665 words.

Part I: Measuring the Rule of Law, Corruption , and Good Governance: The Indicators

2. Christopher G. Bradley. “*International Organizations and the Production of Indicators: The Case of Freedom House.*” 11,500 words
3. Rene Uruena. *Indicators and the Law: A case study of the Rule of Law Index.* 9775 words
4. Nikhil Dutta. *Qualitative and Quantitative Conditionality: Accountability in the EU Accession and MCC Processes.* 13,400 words

Part II: Measuring the Rule of Law, Corruption , and Good Governance: The Indicators in Context

5. Mia Serban. *Rule of law indicators as a political technology of power in Romania.* 10,706 words

6. Smoki Musaraj . *Indicators, Global Expertise, and a Local Political Drama: Producing and Deploying Corruption Perception Data in Postsocialist Albania.* 10, 519 words
7. Migai Akech. *Evaluating the Impact of Corruption (Perception) Indicators on Governance Discourses in Kenya.* 14,000 words

Part III: Measuring Development and Corporate Social Responsibility

8. María Angélica Prada Uribe. *The Quest for Measuring Development: the Role of the Indicator Bank.* 16,235 words
9. Debbie Collier and Paul Benjamin. *Measuring labour market efficiency: indicators that fuel an ideological war and undermine social concern and trust in the South African regulatory process.* 14,700 words
10. Galit A. Sarfaty. *Measuring Corporate Accountability through Global Indicators.* 12,000 words

Part II: Conclusions and Further Questions

11. David Nelken. 5000 words

Total: Approximately 126,000 words

Two of our IRC members received grants from the NSF/LSA: Maria Angelica Prada and Migai Akech. Maria received valuable feedback during her presentation at the LSA panels as well as during the workshop. She revised her paper based on the comments she received and was able to present it again at the 8th Viterbo Global Administrative Law Seminar on “Indicators in Global Governance: Legal Dimensions”, where she was awarded a prize for the best paper.

Maria’s presence at the LSA, and particular her study on the effects of World Bank indicators in Colombia, helped the IRC refine research questions, develop hypotheses for further testing, compare observations and findings, all of which allows the IRC to develop richer insights on the way global indicators work in a variety of countries and contexts.

Migai Akech from the University of Nairobi was all set to participate and submitted a very interesting original paper on anti-corruption measures in Kenya, but at the last minute was unable to travel (luckily his travel costs were refundable).

About the IRC

The IRC had started with a group of thirteen relatively junior scholars, about half from developing countries, who are themselves investigating this issue at the national as well as international level. **Migai Akech (Nairobi, Kenya)** is studying the impact in Kenya of the *Corruption Perception Index* and *Bribery Index* produced by Transparency International and examine the use of these indicators in the context of the fight against corruption and institutional reform in Kenya over the last decade. **Jane Anderson (Univ. of Mass/Amherst)** is studying the

emergence, development and politics of a cluster of cultural indicators for indigenous peoples. **Yamini Aiyar (Center for Policy Research, India)** is undertaking a comparative analysis of two distinct approaches to measuring, assessing and tackling corruption in the public sector in India. **Christopher Bradley** is studying the production and use of the *Freedom in the World* index, produced by Freedom House. **Nehal Bhuta (New School University)** is investigating the production, uses and effects of three indexes of state failure: the US Fund for Peace's "State Failure Index", USAID's Index of State Fragility and Instability, and the Center for Systemic Peace/Center for Global Policy's State Fragility Index. **Nikhil Dutta (NYU Law, 2010)** is examining the interplay of indicators and discretion in conditionality in the context of Albanian participation in NATO accession, EU accession, and Millennium Challenge Corporation grant programs. **Rene Gerrets (University of Amsterdam)** is exploring the role of indicators in shaping malaria research and control priorities and efforts with particular focus on the production and use of the indicators in Tanzania. **Luciana Gross Cunha (Fundação Getúlio Vargas, Escola de Direito de São Paulo, Brazil)** is conducting an in-depth study of the justice indicators existing in Brazil and the methodology, aims and impacts of the Brazilian Justice Confidence Index (BJCI), which she and several of her colleagues developed in 2007. **Smoki Musaraj (New School University)** is studying the (mis)translation of global expert knowledge on corruption by a range of local actors in Albania and the politics surrounding the reception of anti-corruption indicators. **Galit Sarfaty's (The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania)** research uses the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) as a case study to examine how the transformation of indicators into international law is altering the nature of global governance. **Mihaela Serban** is studying the construction and use of rule of law indicators in Central and Eastern Europe post-1989 at regional and country levels, focusing on Romania as a country case study. **Rene Urueña (Universidad de Los Andes, Bogota, Colombia)** is exploring the Rule of Law Index, produced by the World Justice Project, as a case study of the rationale behind the supply of indicators in global governance. **Paul Benjamin (Cape Town University)** is studying the impacts of international labor market indicators.

In 2011-12, the IRC expanded to three new scholars: **Maria Angelica Prada Uribe**, Research Fellow, International Law Program, **Universidad de Los Andes (Bogota, Colombia)** who is studying the impact of the World Bank's performance indicators on development in the Global South; **Margaret Satterthwaite**, Professor of Clinical Law (**NYU School of Law**) who is studying rights-sensitive indicators measuring equal access to water and sanitation; and **Debbie Collier**, Professor at the **University of Cape Town Law School**, who is examining the impact of global labor market indicators on labor laws in South Africa.

Maria Angelica Prada, participant

As an IRC Participant, I had the opportunity to participate in several ways in the Hawaii conference. I presented my paper "Development through data? A case study on the World Bank's performance indicators and their impact on development in the Global South" in one of the two panels on Indicators and Global Governance, which took place on Thursday morning. I also had a meeting on Wednesday afternoon with the other participants of the IRC, where we discussed our researches and received very insightful comments about our papers by the organizers of the IRC. Finally, I also had the opportunity to attend other panels in the conference.

For me participating in the Hawaii conference was very important because it allowed me to discuss my research with other fellow researchers that are also interested in studying the existence and importance of new mechanisms of global governance, and which I could not have met under other circumstances. Now I am still in contact with many of the people I met at the Hawaii conference, and we have continued working on collaborative researches. Attending the conference was also important for my professional development because I saw what kind of new ideas are being produced in different institutions of the globe, I learned about very interesting new frameworks of thought that are being developed simultaneously by scholars in different countries.

After presenting my research, both on Wednesday afternoon and Thursday morning, I was approached by several people that were interested in learning more from my research on the use of development indicators. I think the primary impact I had in the IRC was introducing a framework to understand the ideological power struggles underneath the use of scientific quantifiable methods to measure development in States in the Global South, and how the use of such methods by international actors can be understood as an exercise of global public authority. I will continue working on collaborative activities with the other members of our IRC, currently we have started a project funded by the International Development Research Centre on Global Administrative Law.

29. Legal Mobilization during Humanitarian Crises

Samuel Agblorti, participant

In 2010, I joined an International Research Collaborative group organised by Dr. Elizabeth Holzer of the University of Connecticut. The objective was to organise researchers from different parts of the world to conduct individual studies into various aspects of refugee studies towards the 2012 International Conference of the Law and Society Association scheduled in Honolulu, Hawaii. I participated in one of the sessions organised by this group titled: Refugees, Hosts, and the Struggle to Integrate (Sponsored by IRC 29: Legal Mobilisation during Humanitarian Crises). I presented a paper titled: Refugee Integration in Ghana: the host community's perspective.

I am one of those who benefitted from the funding of the National Science Foundation (NSF). I would like to put it on record that I would not have been able to attend this Conference without the funding from National Science Foundation. I hope to work with the NSF in the future.

My presentation generated a lot of debate and various inputs were made. I am currently incorporating those inputs in order to submit it for publication in a peer reviewed journal. In addition, my interaction with other participants has expanded my horizon in terms of the interdisciplinary research which is going on under the ambit of the Law and Society Association.

The IRC has opened a lot of opportunities for me and it is my hope to keep the networks that I have established during the Conference. I look forward to further collaborations towards future Law and Society Conferences.

30. Social Rights

Heinz Klug, organizer

The members of our IRC were: Cesar Rodriguez Garrivito, LaDawn Haglund, Carol Heimer, Tshepo Madlingozi (funded), Jackie Dugard, Heinz Klug.

Without funding support we would not have had participation from Africa since it would have been too expensive for either Jackie Dugard (who was funded but through another IRC) or Tshepo Madlingozi, to attend the Hawaii meeting. As it was we had members of our IRC from Latin America and India who were unable to attend due to cost. We had a very successful panel and have managed to link up the IRC with an additional group of researchers who have been active in the same area of research.

The IRC is hoping to be able to bring together a larger group of our members at next year's LSA Annual Meeting and hope to agree on a new book project at that time. A number of members of the group are presently publishing a book based on the subject matter of the IRC that will be edited by LaDawn Hagland and Robin Stryker.

CONCLUSION

In sum, through this project and a previous, NSF-supported IRC initiative, US law and society scholars have gained a broader, more comparative and international perspective. The effects are already visible in the content of conference presentations and articles in sociolegal journals and scholarly books. The scholarly benefits will surely increase as the collaborations started here further develop and mature. This initiative, and the NSF funding that supported it, has made a substantial contribution to developing a more international emphasis in law and society scholarship for Americans working in this field.

Given the enormous concern with rule of law and the nature of legal institutions globally, such an intellectual development is extremely valuable for the US's position in the world. The National Science Foundation has contributed significantly to the internationalization of the field of sociolegal research. As sociolegal scholars develop their capacity to understand law in a global context, this work facilitates the ability of US academics and policy makers to develop thoughtful and wise approaches to global legal developments.