

## Contents

Panel 01: Anonymity .....	2
Panel 02: Down by Law: On Legal Seductions and Optimal Injustices .....	3
Panel 03: Law & Tempo .....	4
Panel 04: Grey Zones: Intersecting Spheres of Legality and Illegality .....	5
Panel 05: Migrants, Laws and Im/Mobilities .....	6
Panel 06: Property, Ownership and Legal Pluralism.....	7
Panel 07: Law, forgiveness and the future in fields of transitional justice.....	8
Panel 08: Egalitarianism.....	9
Panel 09: Law, Subjectivity and Intimacy .....	10
Panel 10: 'Living Documents' .....	11
Panel 11: Legal Authority as Cultural Form in Business and Organizations .....	12
Panel 12: The law and its exceptions.....	13
Panel 13: Love and exploitation; the laws of love .....	14
Panel 14: Peri-legal and inter-legal spaces: Action in the gaps .....	15
Panel 15: Spirits of the Law.....	16

## **Panel 01: Anonymity**

*Organisers: Perle Møhl, Dan Hirslund (UCPH)*

The question of anonymity poses itself constantly, albeit sometimes tacitly, to anthropologists in their everyday practices of research and dissemination. It is a recurring theme when studying social media, crime, immigration, health studies, political movements and so on. The law presupposes identification, but in this panel we are interested in those cases where identification is being actively withheld, diffused or displaced.

It is thus not only an ethical and methodological challenge but also a theoretical one. In fact, in most of what we do and study, the flimsy line between private and public, between visibility and invisibility, between transparency and secrecy, between recognition and disguise is at play. Usually, we simply deal with such matters according to "professional ethical guidelines/standards", but the theme of anonymity itself as a social phenomenon also wards for a closer analysis and discussion.

## **Panel 02: Down by Law: On Legal Seductions and Optimal Injustices**

***Organisers: Morten Nielsen (AU), Morten A. Pedersen (UCPH)***

*”What the fuck is wrong with this city? I wonder what it feels like to work in a real police department!”* Jimmy McNulty, Baltimore Police Officer, in Season 3 of *The Wire*

In the acclaimed TV series, law enforcement and public jurisdiction is amoral, incompetent and dysfunctional whereas drug trafficking is portrayed as a tightly run organisation controlled by criminals, who are far from stupid. Here, as elsewhere, law is a seductive fantasy that deceives those lured by its promises of justice while also serving as an engine for producing new and unexpected effects via its void-like absence. The aim of this workshop is to explore the paradoxical effects of the Law's seductively absent core. Might it be, for example, that "law" is a distortion of "justice", and justice a deformation of law, in that both are after-effects rather than pre-conditions of a single legal void that gradually expands as the Law reveals itself as being nothing but its own phantasmatic force? And could it prove useful to interpret or re-interpret some of our ethnographic materials as examples and case studies of such legal seductions and optimal injustices?

### **Panel 03: Law & Tempo**

*Organisers: Ida Sofie Matzen, Tamta Khalvashi and Trine Mygind Korsby (UCPH),  
Andreas Bandak (Department of Cross-Cultural and Regional Studies, University of  
Copenhagen)*

Law is a framing element in the lives of human beings; structuring, directing, rejecting, forming or even liberating people's trajectories, choices and possibilities. But in which ways is law 'more' (or 'less') than a frame, and how does law relate to rules and other systems? Are laws played out at an optimal or distinct velocity in our ethnographic material, and which effects may the speed of law have? Taking 'law' in a broad sense – economic, social, religious, judicial, cosmological, cultural, natural or moral – we wish to explore the connection between law and the notion of different tempi. We regard an analytical use of tempo as being a more 'narrow' concept than for instance time or temporality in the sense that tempo zooms in on specific flows and moods that either intensify or decelerate.

We suggest that laws can slow down as well as speed up, and these different tempi can both destabilize and invigorate groups, subjectivities and phenomena through claims of eternity, legitimacy, validity, justice or change. Hence, we aim to investigate how different kinds of law are enacted at different tempi, or how law itself enacts different tempi. Which consequences do changes in tempo have; do they freeze or escalate? How does the pace of law (fastness, slowness or stagnation) affect an illegal migrant, a person involved in organized crime, an environmental activist, a policy maker, a person struck by disease or a spiritual guide? Does a particular pace of law cause repetition, change or uncertainty? What may happen when one abides by law, transgresses, circumvents or breaks it; do things speed up, slow down or stagnate?

We thus invite papers exploring the possible connection between laws (structure) and tempi (intensification) and the possible effects of such connections and paces of law.

## **Panel 04: Grey Zones: Intersecting Spheres of Legality and Illegality**

*Organisers: Michael Eilenberg, Ida Harboe, Martin Demant Frederiksen (AU)*

In this panel we wish to explore the aspects of everyday uncertainty, which we define as ‘grey zones’. This term refers to the ambiguities, insecurities and contradictions, which lead to responses and strategies challenging perceptions of legality and illegality. Within anthropology, ‘grey zones’ have been conceived of in relation to political corruption and zones of ambiguity related to violence. Yet, we propose to expand the term to include situations and places where uncertainty and ambiguity have become part and parcel of everyday life and where the indefinable becomes, that, which defines the situation. These ‘grey zones’ of uncertainty is often most apparent at the margins of the state (being it either the conceptual or literal territorial margins).

In our approach, law is not limited to formal laws, but applies to different constellations of normative orders in society. In this sense, law becomes an umbrella term for different orders and regulations. This approach aims at an understanding of how other (unwritten) local norms for behavior may influence people’s decisions and regulate their behavior, even such normative rules that guide behaviors that are against official law.

For this panel we seek papers exploring how such legitimacies unfold and how individuals and groups navigate within intersecting spheres of legality and illegality.

## **Panel 05: Migrants, Laws and Im/Mobilities**

***Organisers: Carolina Sanchez Boe, Jens Seeberg and Cecil Marie Schou Pallesen (AU)***

In the past decades, anthropologists have stressed the importance of carrying out ethnographies of legal processes with a focus on the ways in which laws are practiced and experienced.

In this workshop, we will explore different ethnographic examples of the shaping of migrants' possibilities of movement through policy- and law making and how migrants respond to these processes. As a way to comprehend how legal processes can become a central component in the framework of people's possible routes, e.g. migrant's possibilities of mobility and immobility, it is essential to look at the ways in which potential migrants interpret, respond to, and make strategic use of laws and policies in order to stay in certain places or go to others.

In this workshop we welcome papers focusing on the following questions:

How do laws and policies create constraints and enticements that draw or tie migrants to specific places or urge them to move to others? Which possible responses can migrants mobilize and in which ways can they develop and shape legal practice? How do migrants negotiate citizenship and resident status, legally, materially, and emotionally? How are processes of (forced) mobility and immobilization experienced?

## **Panel 06: Property, Ownership and Legal Pluralism**

*Organisers: Maja Hojer Bruun (AAU) and Quentin Gausset (UCPH)*

This panel focuses on property rights and the ways that people assert, articulate and contest ownership, both through various forms of laws and other social practices.

The ownership of natural resources, means of production, financial, material and human capital, has always been at the core of legal and anthropological theorizing. It has major practical applications for policy, legislation and conflict resolution in disputes over ownership to land, urban space, cultural heritage, intellectual property and other material and immaterial resources such as genes, tradable quotas in rights to pollute or fish and internet domain names.

Even in societies with formal codifications of property law, legislation only provides one component of a specific property regime, a component that is often contradicted or contested by local actors' practices and understandings of ownership, propriety and justice including ideas of care, stewardship, communality and belonging. Such social practices confront, confirm, or reform existing property laws. Questions of who owns or has the rights or powers to use and control resources at different times and in different parts of the world draw attention to the dynamic nature of property and to the moralities and diverse communications of ownership and law.

The panel invites papers that present and discuss ethnographic examples of persons and institutions involved in processes of negotiation of ownership rights, appropriation or expropriation, privatization or collectivization, and use these to explore what property, ownership and law may mean in different settings.

## **Panel 07: Law, forgiveness and the future in fields of transitional justice**

***Organiser: Ane Nord (AU)***

Within the last three decades a vast number of countries have been through what is termed transitional justice processes. The term refers to “*the set of judicial and non-judicial measures that have been implemented by different countries in order to redress the legacies of massive human rights abuses*”

Different legal processes and procedures have been used in the transition processes; from the “blanket amnesty” given to everybody who had worked for the Chilean junta of Augusto Pinochet to the “third way” of conditional amnesty as it happened in South Africa.

In this workshop we explore the relationships between legal frameworks, juridical processes, political decisions and emotions, anticipations and (coping) practices towards moving on as they are experienced by those having lived through dictatorships or authoritarian regimes.

We will be exploring how legal frameworks influence positions toward revenge, forgiveness and how law influences individuals, communities and (sub)cultures with regards to feelings of recognition among victims of gross human right violation. The workshop may incorporate diachronic tracing of the transition processes in the exploration of empirical intersections between law and lives.

A central question will be the notion of “justice” and how justice may be considered a universalized or a contextualized concept and phenomenon. Furthermore a question of interest will be how dealing with is past is incorporated in daily lives and how the past may lead to certain imagined futures.



## **Panel 08: Egalitarianism**

*Organisers: Thea Skaanes, Henrik Hvenegaard Mikkelsen (AU)*

While the classic ethnographic record is brimming with various examples of egalitarianism, anthropologists of recent decades have almost abandoned this area of empirical research. Especially poststructuralist and Marxist inspired feminists have effectively demonstrated how claims of egalitarianism as the law that guided society's values and organization were most of all a smokescreen of naivety that clouded a wealth of underlying hierarchies; egalitarianism, it was argued, was a non-empirical chimera, a figment of our imagination. While hierarchy thereby was conceptualized as a fundamental, cross-cultural and inexorable condition, a more or less explicated law, of socio-political life, egalitarianism became viewed as merely part of the superficial appearance and idealized - but seldom achieved - form of society.

The concept of “law” entails both hierarchy (someone instigating/upholding the law) and egalitarianism (everybody adhering to the law). Law may thereby crystalize - and generate a general awareness - of different forms of equality and hierarchy.

Thus, while egalitarianism has repeatedly proved itself to be a phenomenon that evaporates under analytical gazes, this workshop seeks to recapture egalitarianism as an analytical concept. We encourage participants to address egalitarianism empirically, methodologically and theoretically in relation to law and to discuss egalitarianism in connection to related principles, such as hierarchy, sameness, and distinction. We invite papers that explore ethnographic settings in which various forms of egalitarianism emerge. These papers may draw analogies to - or otherwise revisit - “classical” ethnographies on egalitarianism (e.g. the works of Clastres, Woodburn and Evans-Pritchard). Also, we encourage participants to engage with new ways of conceptualizing egalitarianism: could egalitarianism be found empirically? Might egalitarianism in relation to law be viewed as a state of ‘becoming’ rather than understanding it in absolutistic terms as a digital either being there or not? Might such an approach enable us to understand egalitarianism - rather than hierarchy - as a force that inserts itself into social life?

## **Panel 09: Law, Subjectivity and Intimacy**

*Organisers: Helene Risør and Lotte Buch Segal (UCPH)*

This panel invites papers on the ways in which forms of life come into being in their intertwinement with law. Our basic premise is that law is an instance or social technology through which subjectivity is produced as well as denied, and that this relationship is key in order to understand the subjects and modes of intimacy that are allowed to come into being. We concur that this is particularly the case in intense situations of both on-going and momentary hardship. Thinking of the situations and the methods through which subjectivity and law intertwine we thus wish to look into when and how people evoke the law – or some notion of the law - or when and how people are evoked by legal techniques. Deliberately blurring the boundary between the interior and the exterior of forms of life this panel seeks to calibrate the anthropological discussion of the intangibles of humanity that occur in the entanglement of law, subjectivity and social relations.

Studies to be included in this panel spans a variety of cases: It may be persons – or social categories - whose legality is suspended and hence their lives, and perhaps very existences, are put on hold. It may be processes through which new social categories emerge through legal recognition and the novel social relationship and conflicts that arise in this context. And it may be cases of creative manipulation of the law or understandings of legality that allows people to gain time and the possibility of maintain their lives, social relations and belonging.

## **Panel 10: 'Living Documents'**

***Organiser: Kristina Grünenberg, Karen Fog Olwig, Marianne Søndergaard Winther, Line Richter, Karina Dalgas, Vera Skvirskaja, Nina Gren, Anja Simonsen, Helene Ilkjær (UCPH), Ida Marie Vammen (DIIS), Karen Valentin (AU/Emdrup), Dr. Madeleine Reeves (University of Manchester)***

### *Mobility and documentary practices*

This panel explores how human mobility is entangled in legal documents, forms of certification and bureaucratic practices, both for those who have documents, and those who do not. Documents are closely linked to migrants' trajectories of mobility and immobility. They influence opportunities for travel and the need to take risks along the journey; they shape livelihood prospects, visibility in the country of destination and the possibilities for circular migration and return; they function as modes of authentication of identities, skills and attributes, but even 'authentic' documents are often contested and disputed as migrants move from one legal domain to another. Furthermore, different kinds of documents and certifications may work counter to each other, and they may be more or less tangible, either as objects which migrants carry along or obtain on their journeys or as immaterial, often virtual forms of documentation. Documents thus assume a life of their own as migrants, moving 'legally' or 'illegally', engage with, interact with and embody them.

The panel takes its point of departure in an understanding of legal documents and other forms of certification as bureaucratic instruments of statehood and material objects that represent legibility, but which also function as actors and creators of subjectivities, practices and emotions. We welcome papers that address ethnographic findings and theoretical reflections such as: How do documents and documentary practices shape mobility? In which ways do people perceive and renegotiate state restrictions to documents? How do documents affect migrants' subjectivities? What are the empirical and analytical advantages and limitations of approaching the anthropological study of mobility through documents?

## **Panel 11: Legal Authority as Cultural Form in Business and Organizations**

*Organisers: Jakob Krause-Jensen (AU/Emdrup), Karen Lisa Salamon, Steffen Jöhncke (UCPH)*

Legitimacy in the form of legality is a recurring figure in relation to the way in which organizations and other institutional cultural forms attempt to present themselves as rational, necessary, reasonable and effective in their ways of governance and productivity.

Max Weber wrote that "...it is useful to classify the types of authority according to the kind of claim to legitimacy typically made by each....The 'legitimacy' of a system has far more than a merely 'ideal' significance, if only because it has very definite relations to the legitimacy of property" (1922/1947:298).

The panel will address a number of instantiations of this formation as they take place within different public and private organizations and sectors:

Steffen Jöhncke (UCPH) will discuss the use of "evidence" in public sector operationalisations for the purpose of legitimation of certain procedures and positions of legality and property, to the exclusion of others. For example, which instances decide how procedures are defined as valid evidence in relation to the treatment of citizens and the protection of their legal certainty.

Karen Lisa Salamon (UCPH) will address authenticity and authentication (including issues of signature, provenance and IP) as contemporary forms of legitimation and production of social and cultural exclusion/exclusivity and authority. She will draw on ethnographic material from cultural industry to argue that this conglomeration attains increasing significance as cultural form.

Jakob Krause-Jensen (AU) will discuss how the contemporary legal mode of the corporation organises property relations and understandings of 'value', and how this may become a matter of anthropological concern.

## **Panel 12: The law and its exceptions**

*Organiser: Heiko Henkel (UCPH)*

As the call for papers of this meeting suggests, the social contexts studied by anthropologists today are, in many ways, defined by law. In fact, the power of the sovereign state is often said to be rooted in the power of setting law. But also, and in some tension with this, it is said that it is the state's power to define exceptions to the law, that marks its sovereignty.

The panel invites papers that discuss the ways the legal apparatuses of modern nation states regulate contemporary 'forms of life', how these regulations are established, interpreted, contested and subverted. Moreover, the panel invites papers that discuss the role of 'exceptions', not only in the Schmittian form of executions of state sovereignty, but also in the form of more localized exceptions that seek to conjoin particular rationalities with the universalizing scope of a generalizing law.

### **Panel 13: Love and exploitation; the laws of love**

***Organiser: Nina Vohnsen (AU), Bjarke Oxlund (UCPH)***

To philosopher Alain Badiou, true love is seeing the world from the perspective of two. The true lover should not seek to change or alter the other but to expand his or her self by embracing the being of the other fully as he, she, or 'it' is. The bureaucrat confronts the opposite task. Not only must he or she, wrote Max Weber, succeed in eliminating from the execution of his or her business such irrational and emotional elements as love and hatred. In fact they are expected to act without regards for persons. The human capacity to act as bureaucrat and lover respectively confronts the self with a particular problem – the eradication of self-serving behavior. The lover and the bureaucrat must perform a great work on the 'self' which must either be expanded or erased to partake in the ideal actions of loving properly and administering properly. If these definitions of proper loving and proper 'lawing' rings hyper-idealistic, the sentiments they express are nevertheless found at the heart of Euro-American cultural imagery and official legislation concerning the prevention of exploitation (in terms of emotional, economic, and physical relations) between people or between people and animals, or the nature.

In this panel participants are invited to think about such instances where humans breach the laws of loving or discredits the love of law and engage in exploitative and selfish behaviour in mundane or poetic meetings with others.

## **Panel 14: Peri-legal and inter-legal spaces: Action in the gaps**

***Organiser: Heather Swanson (AU)***

As anthropologists have long pointed out, the creation of the category of the “legal” inherently produces its opposite, the “illegal.” Yet, the creation of elaborate legal systems does not lead to a world where everything is encompassed by a binary of legality/illegality. Rather, practices of making and enacting legal frameworks also depend on spaces in which formal law does not rule. Consider all of the times people say, “Well, there isn’t really a regulation for this.” From standards of proper professional behavior to ways of “just getting things done,” there are many situations for which there isn’t an applicable law. These are not spaces of “lawlessness”; they are neither criminal nor wholly outside of legal apparatuses. They are, instead, spaces where logics other than those of the legal/illegal binary dominate.

In contrast to “extra-legal” zones which are presumed to lie beyond “beyond” the pale of law, this panel focuses on what we call “peri-legal” and “inter-legal” spaces – gaps that both hover at the edges of legal systems and are nestled within their interstices. Such gaps are dynamic and shifting; they open and close as laws and practices change.

This panel seeks papers that probe these spaces, which are entangled with the law, but into which laws do not travel well. We welcome creative submissions that address questions such as: How do peri-legal and/or inter-legal spaces come into being? What goes on within them? How are they integral to the functioning of the legal frameworks with which they are entangled?

## **Panel 15: Spirits of the Law**

***Organisers: Nils Bubant, Mads Daugbjerg and Christian Suhr Nielsen (AU)***

Secular law seeks to manage a world that we often take to be disenchanted and 'rational'. But is it? Spirits, gods, and demons continue to play a role in the everyday lives of people around the world in ways that entangle spirit world in complex ways with the public, the bureaucratic, and the legal. Some even claim that the invisible realm of magic, spirits and the divine has come to play a new public role in 'post-secular' society and that neoliberal forms of politics and economics - both highly legalised domains - have entailed a revitalisation of 'the occult'. Might the laws that govern states, economies, global organisations, and corporations be entangled with, perhaps even causally linked to, the invisible worlds of magic, spirits and the divine? And might, likewise, the 'laws' understood to structure spiritual or otherworldly domains parallel, incorporate, or co-produce the allegedly disenchanted bureaucratic systems with which they coexist?

This workshop invite papers that explore the mutual enmeshing of secular and spiritual law, the overlaps between the secular spirit of legal or bureaucratic worlds and the world of spirits.