

Introduction

Twenty-five years ago, a new journal was founded by a group of fourteen academic lawyers, sociologists and criminologists who wished to open up debate in the fields of sociology of law, critical legal studies and critical criminology.¹ They saw a space in academic publishing for a theoretically oriented journal that would produce critical knowledge and contribute to formulating and shaping intellectual debate across disciplinary and international barriers. Entitling it, *Social & Legal Studies: an International Journal*, they entreated contributors to frame their work analytically, in order that it might have 'international relevance rather than parochial interest' (Picciotto et al, 1992, 5), and set out four main aims for their new journal:

- ~ the publication of committed critical scholarship,
- ~ the promotion of non-Western perspectives on law, regulation and criminology,
- ~ the integration of feminist analyses at every level of scholarship, and
- ~ the advancement of accessible theoretical approaches which enhance analysis and explanation rather than providing description or reports.

The first issue, published in March 1992, contained articles touching on critical legal history, feminist legal theory, critical rights theory, family law and gender, and AIDS and prison law. The second issue, published in June, had a transnational focus, with articles on popular justice and legal struggles in non-European settings. Following this robust start, over the next years, the editors remained true to their intellectual commitment such that even the books chosen for review reflected international and critical perspectives rather than 'black letter' law.

After six years, the editors took stock (Editorial Board, 1998). They found that they were meeting the broad aims set out above, having published papers in the areas of critical legal theory, gender and sexuality, critical criminology and criminal justice, rights and citizenship, regulation in a variety of contexts, post-colonialism and popular justice. They had included authors from, and writings about, a large number of national and international contexts. However, they wished to do more to promote further the kinds of scholarship to which they were committed. With the aim of encouraging more non-western scholarship, they forged closer links with their international board; and, with the aim of promoting more direct and immediate debate between authors, they introduced the journal's distinctive and now familiar 'Dialogue and Debate' section.

Since then, legal publishing has seen many changes. The shift from paper to digital formats, for example, has expanded our scope dramatically and SLS has been fortunate in having the support of many excellent colleagues at Sage as it has worked through these changes. There have also been other important developments in the academic publishing landscape. Most notably, in 1992, SLS was one of only a handful of British journals interested in publishing work of socio-legal and critical interest. Today, many more traditional legal journals also offer a platform for alternative critiques of legal and political orthodoxies. However SLS remains distinctive. Its commitment to offer 'an intellectual space for theoretically informed and empirically grounded work, where diverse traditions and critical approaches within legal study meet' remains firm. It provides an important voice for interdisciplinary and non-western perspectives: in 2016 alone, SLS published authors based in thirteen countries across five continents (Europe, North America, South America, Asia, Australia but not Africa). However, we recognise that structural inequalities in global knowledge production

¹ Sol Picciotto, Carol Smart, Paddy Hillyard, Beverly Brown, Peter Fitzpatrick, Elizabeth Kingdom, Niki Lacey, Sheldon Leader, Martha Minow, David Nelken, Jeremy Roche, Austin Sarat, Joe Sim and Alison Young.

mean we need to do more work to promote non-western scholarship and perspectives from the global south, as Harrington and Manji (this volume) suggest.

From its original 14 members, the SLS editorial board has grown to 21. International Advisory Board members hail from 12 different countries in five continents and continue to provide valuable support and advice. The work SLS does has changed as well. In addition to encouraging debate through its publications, SLS offers financial support to people organising workshops or conferences on a theme which would be of interest to its readers.² And last year, SLS launched a new, occasional feature, which was to offer the inspiration for this special issue: the Review of the Field. As our Editor in Chief blogged at the time:

‘Our ambition is to commission leading scholars to reflect upon their fields of study and to offer a critical appraisal of the key literature and concepts. The aim is to provide, not only a valuable map of the scholarly terrain, but [also to give] authors the opportunity to set a direction of travel for their discipline. [W]e anticipate that reviews will ask new research questions, identify gaps in the scholarship, and explore connections and discontinuities between diverse bodies of knowledge.’ (Stychin, 2017).

The first article in this series, dealing with comparative law (Leckey, 2017a), was itself accompanied by a blog (Leckey, 2017b), confirming a further new endeavour that responded to a world where communication is increasingly digitized. The journal had already taken to Twitter in 2015 (you can follow us on @SLS Journal).

This special anniversary issue is a time to take stock, to celebrate the past twenty five years and also to look forward. And so, in the spirit of past review and future potential, this issue contains five Review of the Field articles, each focusing on an area of scholarship in which SLS has aimed to have had a significant impact. Reviewing a large, evolving field of study that is characterised by porous boundaries, is a challenging task. Authors were thus invited to be idiosyncratic in their coverage, highlighting the works and themes which appear significant to them in how the field has evolved over the past 25 year and how it might continue to develop in the future. The papers also offer some valuable insights into how the journal might do more in the future, both in terms of fulfilling its original mission and more generally.

Our contributors were selected both on the basis of their leading expertise in an area of key interest to SLS and also because of their strong relationships with the journal. Sol Picciotto, who writes below on regulation, was a founding editor of SLS and has continued on its editorial board throughout its 25 years. Ambreena Manji who, with John Harrington, reviews socio-legal scholarship on the Third World; and Alan Norrie and Henrique Carvallho, who write on criminal justice, are equally all board members. Two further papers are contributed by members of our International Advisory Board: former IAB member, Susan Boyd, writes with Debra Parkes on feminist legal studies; while current IAB member, Jon Goldberg-Hiller reviews the field of sexuality and sexual rights.

From its inception, SLS has included book reviews and this special issue is no different. However, the books reviews included below were also specially commissioned with the issue in mind. SLS’s first edition included reviews of a number of books, the significance of which has been proved by time, including: Martha Albertson Fineman’s *The Illusion of Equality: The Rhetoric and Reality of Divorce Reform*; David Dixon’s *From Prohibition to Regulation: Bookmaking, Anti-Gambling and the Law*; and André-Jean Arnaud and Elizabeth Kingdom, *Women’s Rights and the Rights of Man* (reviewed by Sandra Marshall). Here, the authors of the first two books and reviewer of the third were each

² For more details, see: <https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/social-legal-studies/journal200832>.

invited to review a recently published book of their choosing, looking at how the field in which it has located has developed since they wrote at the beginning of the 1990s.

As is fitting, given his long and important contribution to SLS, this special anniversary issue begins with a paper by Sol Picciotto. In its early years, SLS published articles on regulation in a variety of contexts. Indeed, as Picciotto notes in his review of the field, academic concern with the increasing scope of government regulation emerged first in the 1970s but, since 1992, has become a distinctive multidisciplinary field that interrogates the changing nature of the public sphere of politics and the state and its interactions with economic activity and social relations.

Picciotto traces the shifts and developments in scholarly activity in this multilayered and multi-theorized field. He begins by looking back to 1970s and 1980s approaches dominated by the law and economics school in the US and complemented by what he calls a 'regulation school' concerned with political economy and economic sociology, emerging from France. The dominance of free market perspectives, however, meant that it was not until the 1990s that even leading free-marketeters were forced to accept 'the need for "good governance", involving appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks for economic development'. Picciotto highlights Ayres and Braithwaite's seminal work reinforcing the inherently interdisciplinary nature of the approach to regulation, along with other scholarship linking it with legal pluralism and critical criminology and the enormous growth of new forms of regulation. He goes on to review some of the key themes in the field of economic regulation that have emerged in the last 25 years, both in the pages of SLS and elsewhere.

He looks, for example, at the need for state action to curb the essential amorality of profit-oriented corporations, noting both (marginal) successes such as workplace health and safety regulation and failures, such as state reaction to the Foot and Mouth outbreak. A central challenge here is that of identifying proper roles for public authorities and private actors. Should it, for example, have been up to farmers to decide to adopt a preventative strategy and vaccinate their stock? Or was it for public authorities to intervene with alternatives to the ultimate slaughter policy that was adopted? On this point of public and private roles he notes also the 'common pattern [...] for public authorities to abandon prescriptive rules, in favour of specifying desirable outcomes while leaving the methods for attaining them to private actors' and he criticises the limitations of such 'performance- and process-oriented regulatory regimes'. That these measures, usually adopted for cost-cutting reasons and also justified by reference to cooperation and enabling corporate self-regulation, are not always successful is illustrated by process- or performance-based regulation of diesel pollution emission standards (Volkswagon) and deep sea oil and gas drilling (Deep Water Horizon). And the most spectacular regulatory failure in recent times, the great financial crash, was also at least partly the result of a number of different regulatory forms 'favouring private or quasi-public self-regulation.' Picciotto states that '[c]rucially, these forms of regulation took for granted the structural underpinnings of the markets and the factors which led to their meteoric growth. They focused instead on measures aiming to ensure the soundness of the participants, which in practice gave these actors the support and indeed the stimulus to turn finance into a self-sustaining sphere of circulation and speculation.'

Another feature of the regulatory state, notes Picciotto, is 'the delegation of public functions to agencies with considerable autonomy from central government, or "non-majoritarian regulators"'. He discusses the literature that assesses this trend towards a greater reliance upon experts and the authority of specialist knowledge as potentially creating a paternalistic technocracy, noting calls for the democratisation of technocratic decision making.

Picciotto also identifies the importance of the emergence of regulatory networks, including internationalised public-private networks and multi-level governance, each resulting from economic globalisation. Again, as the literature shows, it is important to see the interaction between these regulators, sometimes in terms of competition even if within a framework of coordination. Consider, for example, the 'overarching framework [...] created through treaties fostering liberalisation and market access for trade and investment, principally the wide multilateral umbrella of the World Trade Organisation (WTO), but also networks of bilateral investment treaties, now being negotiated on a 'mega-regional' scale, such as the Transpacific Partnership (TPP) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).' But, fused as they are within the contexts also of particularities such as consumer and workers' movements, the global diffusion of regulatory practices follows different patterns and Picciotto refers us to important illustrations.

In sum, Picciotto's paper perfectly captures the ongoing importance and relevance of SLS's first broad commitment to the publication of critical scholarship. In the area of regulation, such scholarship has served the vital role of highlighting important social, moral and economic issues, even in the intricacies of the technical and scientific debates on which regulation is based, refusing to accept its independence from politics.

SLS's second broad commitment, to the promotion of non-western perspectives on law, regulation and criminology, offers the starting point for our second paper. John Harrington and Ambreena Manji begin their review of socio-legal scholarship on the Third World by emphasising the significance of the intellectual biographies of early scholars in this field, including those of two founding members of the SLS editorial board. These young scholars, who learned their trade in the new law schools of the commonwealth, in 'Sudan, Nigeria, Zambia, Kenya, Tanzania and elsewhere [...] found themselves in countries marked by wide and deep legal pluralism, insecure political leaderships and a popular desire for development as the fruit of independence.' Upon their return to the UK, they brought this intellectual and political influence to their research and teaching. Their role in the creation of a 'radical generation' of law schools means that, as Harrington and Manji argue, locations like Dar es Salaam, Lusaka, Port Moresby and Accra have been 'essential points of origin for British socio-legal studies.'

Harrington and Manji identify a heterogeneous range of themes where Third World scholarship has made a particularly important contribution, including within the pages of SLS. This work includes studies of law, class and the state; gender justice; land rights; customary law and legal pluralism. The theme of law, class and the state is illustrated, for example, by papers on law and popular struggle in non-western societies; that of gender justice by papers on women's engagement with the postcolonial state; and that of land rights, customary law and legal pluralism by papers on land reform sponsored by international financial institutions, the use of custom and tradition in land claims, the colonial roots of customary land tenure and the use of CEDAW in international courts in women's land claims. Harrington and Manji identify concerns with transition and change within many of these papers.

While Third World scholarship has indeed engaged extensively with these themes, Harrington and Manji emphasise that it goes much further. And here they conclude that while the journal has made a significant contribution, it also contains important gaps, failing fully to live up to its promise of the promotion of non-western perspectives. Broader theoretical and empirical engagement with, for example, law and development marks a rich recent scholarship, much of it emerging from the US yet missing from the pages of SLS. A second gap identified by the authors is work on legal education in the Third World. Looking to the future, they see a greater place not only for such work, but also for scholarship resulting from Brexit, also anticipating that 'provincializing Europe in the minds of British

academics' may be one of its more positive side-effects. They note, 'diplomatic efforts are already intensifying across the Commonwealth and other countries of the Third World. This will expand opportunities for advisory work already opened-up by the legislative commitment to spend 0.7 of GNI on development aid and its academic outlet, the Global Challenges Research Fund.' Harrington and Manji call for SLS to recognise and support these fruitful areas for future research as one means of allowing the journal to renew its commitment to scholars and intellectual contexts in the Third World tradition.

A commitment to advance work in criminology also featured in SLS's original aims, and criminology and criminal justice have remained central to the journal's output over the past quarter century. In their contribution to this special issue, Norrie and Carvalho characterise the vast scope of this work (around 185 articles, they tell us) as placing criminal justice 'in a confused and confusing historical world where things are not what they seem, where circumstances are bad and in need of emancipatory change, where such change is prefigured but not easy to achieve, and indeed where things may be getting worse.' Whilst remaining agnostic on the important issue of whether such discourse is overly critical or overly generous of the role and forms of law, they pick out four themes which demonstrate the direction of travel in criminal justice scholarship in SLS.

Their first theme is popular justice which they take to be emblematic of work in the 1990s and important to the journal's commitment to the scholarship of emancipation. In its first special issue (De Sousa Santos, 1992), SLS focused on 'state transformation, legal pluralism and community justice', interrogating these key themes in diverse historical and contemporary settings, including the Soviet Union, China, Cuba and Sri Lanka. Here theoretical contributions were 'balanced against case studies of popular or community justice in different parts of the world' and showed that popular justice was a 'moving concept'. But, it wasn't long before a world would emerge 'where the popular could be equated with authoritarianism and consumer choice. In such a world, emancipation would come to be regarded in both *realpolitik* and social theory as just the way and the language in which governance would occur.' After discussing work on the dialectics of formal and informal control, Norrie and Carvalho conclude that 'a method of understanding popular justice that fails to give credence to its particular *formal* qualities will end up misrepresenting and discounting its true historical and emancipatory significance.'

Norrie and Carvalho next identify an emerging theme of social control and governmentality. As they say, '[p]apers within this broadly conceived theme have largely explored the extent to and ways in which diverse aspects of criminal law and justice are intrinsically connected to a particular form of social, or civil [...] order.' They remind us of papers on the interrelation of knowledge and power, the social construction of dangerousness, and those highlighting criminal justice's violent and oppressive side. Problematic links between race and drugs and between youth and the need for control and historical looks at the criminalisation of certain tribes in 19th century India, for example, point to criminal justice 'perpetuating many forms of injustice and aimed at producing power, exclusion and control' and 'evidences how any promise of emancipation contained within it is, at the very least, hard to articulate and yet to be actualised.'

Norrie and Carvalho's third theme is transitional justice. Transitional justice 'is associated with the transition from violent authoritarian regimes to more liberal (and neo-liberal) regimes that are judged politically and legally more progressive. Empirically, transitional justice studies analyse the legal forms that accompany such transitions and which seek to judge and resolve past violations in order to establish a better present and future.' SLS's commitment to feminist and to Third World perspectives links with this theme in criminal justice such that '[s]ince the turn of the century, *Social & Legal Studies* has published about 30 essays on transitional justice. [...] Geographically, it has

discussed the phenomenon in a variety of settings: Northern Ireland, South Africa, the former Yugoslavia, Sierra Leone, New Zealand, Rwanda, Argentina, Japan, Sri Lanka. Papers have discussed the Holocaust and the overall effect of Empire and the need for restitution.' These papers have deployed a range of different theoretical perspectives, including feminism, psychoanalysis, critical discourse analysis, Derrida's theory of 'spectrality' and Agamben's of 'bare life'. This is an extremely rich body of work that has focussed upon many specific issues including reconciliation, the role of the trial, truth, fact finding and healing, the creation of new representative institutions, the treatment of girl soldiers and of former combatants, legacies of prejudice, alternative tribunals, apology, the role of forensic science and the court as archive.

Norrie and Carvalho conclude with reflections on the dialectical relations between form and history, first drawing upon Gramsci's view of the old and the new. They suggest that criminal justice scholarship demonstrates that '[e]ven as the world becomes contorted into ways of denying the human spirit, it seems at the same time to honour it in the distortion.' They also draw upon Marx to see four dialectical tropes at play in their four themes. Overall, Norrie and Carvalho postulate that the way forward for criminal justice scholarship is 'to continue to critically examine criminal justice as just one dimension of a larger social whole, which is inherently interrelated to social, historical, anthropological and ethical issues and transformations' which could, potentially, provide us with a fifth trope, to set alongside our four, and already foreshadowed in the positive, emancipatory aspect of critical scholarship: *the dialectical emergence of the new.*'

Norrie and Carvlho identify a further feature of the work published in SLS over the last quarter century, which speaks to the journal's third broad commitment: to integrate feminist analysis at every level of scholarship. They note, '[i]n the journal's history so far, something between one third and one half of all the papers published discussing criminal justice have issues of gender and sexuality as one of their main foci.' In this regard they highlight papers on the juridification of the male body in the context of sadomasochism, the history of psychiatric admissions and its link to criminalisation and incarceration, the criminalisation of women who kill, 'homophobic violence and the criminalization of homosexuality; sexual violence against children and the criminalization of paedophilia; sexual and gender violence in an international and global perspective; sex trafficking; the criminalization of abortion and of pregnant women who take drugs; the problem of forced marriages; prostitution; incest; and sexually-transmissible diseases; among others.' This rich and diverse scholarship is not only about power and oppression, however, much of it also speaks to resistance and reform and the ways things might be different.

SLS's promotion of the integration of feminist analysis is at the heart of our fourth paper, which focuses centrally on the field of feminist legal studies. Echoing Harrington in Manji with their focus on the significance of academic biography, Boyd and Parkes locate their own intellectual trajectories within the broad shifts underway as they each entered the academy, nearly two decades apart. They note that by the emergence of SLS, in 1992, there was 'no shortage' of feminist scholars in legal academia and related disciplines as numbers increased during the 1980s. Many of these scholars focussed on women's inequality, questioning 'the extent to which law or legal rights alone could provide remedies' for disadvantage. Different categories of feminist theories such liberal, socialist and radical were the frameworks within which women and law were examined. But, as Boyd and Parkes note, in this period as well '[t]he rise of postmodernism and the deconstruction of universalizing concepts such as 'patriarchy' [...] played a role in diverting feminist attention away from a focus on any unitary notion of 'woman' as a subject. Concepts of power were rendered more complicated, challenging the radical feminist association of oppression with male-identified culture,

law, and state.’ They also note another important development in the feminist literature of the 1990s: intersectional analyses of power and oppression.

Boyd and Parkes identify three themes in feminist legal literature in the decades since. The first is ‘strategic engagement’: ‘[f]eminist legal theory has always been informed by, and grounded in, the need to engage strategically with law to improve social conditions for women.’ Feminist theory grew from feminist activism and praxis has always been a part of it. Their review of the literature shows that after the 1990s, despite more feminist work with a specific problem-centred focus and less exploring ‘the more abstract questions about feminist legal theory *per se*’, that theory was and still is important to feminist scholarship. They note in the pages of SLS ‘numerous examples of feminist scholarship which consider questions of legal strategy and effective (or not) reform efforts in areas such as domestic violence, sex work and trafficking, labour rights for sex workers, intersexuality and the right to bodily integrity, technology-facilitated sexual violence, sexual assault, and forced marriage’.

Boyd and Parkes’ second theme is ‘women or gender’. They see a trend in feminist literature over the years to ‘focus less on the category of “women” and more on gender oppression, and its intersection with other axes of oppression such as race, class, and disability.’ Attention to gender also meant engagement with sexuality, queer theory and the ‘experiences of transgender and intersex people [which] fundamentally challenged the binary categories of male/female and man/woman, positing instead a multiplicity of genders, sexes, and sexualities.’ The authors acknowledge the healthy disagreement among feminists about this trend, some saying that moving away from women diminishes the distinctiveness of feminism, with others feeling it strengthens rather than weakens it. Papers in SLS also reflect the influence of gender and queer theory on feminism. The authors highlight articles by feminist scholars on the legal regulation of gender identity and trans experience, on problematising ‘repronormativity’ by considering how the law conceives (or not) of pregnant trans men, on how notions of time and permanence figure in the legal recognition and regulation of people who are transitioning and on judicial attitudes, regulatory regimes, and legislative changes on gender recognition and trans legal subjects.

Their final theme is ‘choice or constraint’. Boyd and Parkes note how feminist legal scholars have ‘subjected key liberal concepts such as choice and autonomy to critical analysis’, suggesting that ‘few choices are unconstrained by the material and ideological conditions surrounding them.’ Feminists have challenged liberal ideas of autonomy and agency. While these themes have not received extensive treatment and in the pages of SLS, we see them raised in papers on forced marriage, abortion, trafficking, prostitution and sex work, mothers who engage in drug use and medicalisation of gender recognition.

Overall, while Boyd and Parkes suggest that more remains to be done to meet SLS’s ambitious goal of integrating feminist theory ‘at every level’, they see feminist work as continuing to thrive in the future. They suggest that a problem driven focus is not a weakness, but contributes positively to feminist legal theory’s present-day heterogeneity, anticipating that in the future it ‘will draw upon various theoretical tools that have been offered by feminists over time, including those in the materialist tradition, those from the deconstructionist or postmodernist tradition, and those from critical race and intersectionality theory.’

In our final paper, Jon Goldberg-Hiller observes the connection of feminist legal theory with studies on sexuality and law. He notes that SLS was the first socio-legal journal to publish extensively studies of the latter and ‘explicitly embrace a queer legal and political agenda.’ His contribution here reviews how this framework for studying law serves the journal’s original, broad and ongoing,

commitment to publish *critical* scholarship. He remarks upon the timeliness of his stock-taking, noting that ‘the historical arc of the journal [...] encompasses one of the most dramatic socio-legal phenomena since the rights revolution’. The remarkable speed of the movement from the legal idea of same sex marriage to legal reality has invigorated work on social movements and social justice for queer activists, queer theorists and socio-legal theorists generally.

Goldberg-Hiller also identifies three themes in the early work of the journal. ‘The first was that law was understood as process and as “decentered” (Scheingold 2004, xxii), involving multiple layers of legal meaning rather than being concentrated in institutional action or reflecting super-structural foundations.’ He highlights pieces on the decentering of law, and the building of links across social movements and legal struggles. This theme of law as process and a site of struggle, links with Goldberg-Hiller’s second theme of anti-foundationalism. Across the first years of SLS’ publications he sees the journal’s engagement with emerging queer theory and increasing activism to allow law to be seen as ‘one element of a technology of gender’ that produces as well as polices identities. By way of illustration, he offers work in SLS on the discursive construction of the heterosexual male, the infertile woman, the juridification of the male body, and the discursive link between sexuality and race.

Goldberg-Hiller’s third theme in SLS’s early work is that of the ‘relationship of rights to sexual and gender justice movements’. In the context of law and sexuality, he remarks upon SLS’s embrace ‘of research into gender and sexuality that was attentive to and helped to develop a queer sensibility for legal analysis’ at a time when ‘other journals pursued critical work [...] showing that the value of rights were dependent on adequate resources and that they held complex meanings for individuals.’

Looking to the future and assessing the continued value of a focused intellectual agenda on the politics of sexuality, Goldberg-Hiller reviews a range of more recent literature, including scholarship on sexual rights in the global north and south and intersectionalities. He concludes that the ways in which ‘juridical demands for state recognition of rights and citizenship appear imbricated with renewed biopolitical forces making rights strategies politically fragmenting’ and not always politically progressive. He believes, however, ‘that one place to continue a productive study of rights is to focus on temporal disjunctions within sexual rights politics.’ Drawing on the work of political theorist, Jacques Ranciere, he notes that ‘[s]tripped of linearity, there is no “after” to equality that isn’t both structural “police” and potential “politics”.’ Goldberg-Hiller thus cautions regarding the need to remain attentive to structural issues that have become increasingly prominent in political engagement and to intersectional critique and Critical Indigenous Scholarship, suggesting that scholarship on sexual and gender identity can continue to ‘create the aesthetic space for renewed development of critical legal theory.’

Goldberg-Hiller draws throughout on Ranciere’s idea of political aesthetics, which he takes to mean that ‘the political potential of scholarship will not be located in its sociological truths but may be found in its potential disruptions.’ We take this to offer an important, general lesson for the journal, which speaks both to its original mission and which might help to ensure its continued saliency in the years ahead, in foregrounding the importance of dissensus, disruption and recovery of submerged potentials. More generally, we see in each of the essays in this volume, a range of ways in which critical legal scholarship has developed over the years and the rich contribution SLS has made to that development. We hope to continue, expand and enhance that work as we take the journal forward into the next quarter century. We also look forward to discussing as a board and with the journal’s broader readership, what we can learn from these rich essays about where we are failing to meet the goals set out in a mission statement crafted 25 years ago; how we might better fulfill them and,

indeed, how in the words of Harrington and Manji (this volume) our founding values can be 'refurbished and mobilized for new times'.

References

De Sousa Santos, B (Guest Editor) (1992) Special Issue: State Transformation, Legal Pluralism and Community Justice. *Social & Legal Studies* 1(2).

Editorial Board (1998) Editorial: Six Years On. *Social & Legal Studies*. 7(1): 5-6.

Leckey R (2017a) Review of Comparative Law. *Social & Legal Studies*. 17(1): 3.

Leckey R (2017b) A Review of Comparative Law. Blog, 5 June.

<https://socialandlegalstudies.wordpress.com/2017/06/05/a-review-of-comparative-law/> blog

Picciotto, P, Smart, C, Hillyard, P, Fitzpatrick, P, Kingdom, E, Lacey, N, Leader, Roche, J, Sim, J, and Young, A (1992) Editorial. *Social & Legal Studies* 1: 1: 5.

Stychin (2017) Something New at Social & Legal Studies – Review of a Field. Blog, 16 September 2016. <https://socialandlegalstudies.wordpress.com/2016/09/16/something-new-at-social-legal-studies-review-of-a-field/>