
EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

MARIA FEDERICA MOSCATI

University of Sussex

Dear Reader,

I write this editorial after attending a show performed by the Company of Elders at the Sadler's Wells theatre in London. The first piece, *They Look Like People*, by John-William Watson, opened with an inspiring sentence:

Change is inevitable;
stillness is impossible.¹

This made me think about this Issue of *Amicus Curiae*. Indeed, all contributions in this Issue demonstrate that law changes, and so too do the ways we not only learn about the law but also how we teach it, how we represent and write about it, and how we resist it. Law can be reimagined, walked, transplanted, resisted and taught and the pieces in this Issue demonstrate how, just like a choreographic work, *what we do with the law* can be achieved through collaboration, empathy, constructive critical conversations and creativity. Indeed, in this Issue you can even dance the law while

listening to the song *Equali-T*, by SJ Cooper-Knock.²

How can law be reimagined? In what ways do law and space interact? In what ways do intergenerational conversations contribute to implementing children's rights? How can legal pedagogy help to address the challenges of artificial intelligence (AI)? How is law transformed when it travels from one country to another? How does legal interpretation change lives? But also, what media do we use to convey our knowledge, ideas and perceptions of the law? These are some of the broader questions that the authors in this Issue address by using not only text but also songs, photographs, drawings and videos. On their own and taken together all the pieces presented here contribute to several areas of current literature including comparative legal studies, queer studies, dispute resolution, law and humanities and children's rights.

¹ John-William Watson is the author of the script of the choreographic work *They Look Like People* and also the author of this sentence.

² Included in the Special Section on "Queer Judgments".

I see editorship as relational, and therefore I try not to limit myself to just overseeing peer-reviews or chasing people to meet deadlines; rather, I prefer to accompany authors and guest editors on their journey. In my role as editor of this edition of *Amicus Curiae*, I have had the privilege of working closely with some of the authors and guest editors, and what emerged from our conversations was a common belief that differences are resources to celebrate, and that we share a commitment to uphold critical and respectful thinking. So, I wish to thank all contributors, reviewers, editorial colleagues, Marie Selwood and Narayana Harave, and, in particular, Graeme Reid, United Nations Independent Expert on Protection Against Violence and Discrimination Based on Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity; they have all contributed to shape this Issue as a collaborative and joyful journey with the hope of encouraging further creative, empathic and critical reflections on how law shapes our lives.

The Issue starts with Johannes San Miguel Giralt who traces the complex exchanges between United States (US) and Cuban legal traditions during the period of military occupation, revealing how law speaks across languages and empires. Drawing on comparative legal scholarship, he reconstructs how US common law ideas were transplanted into Cuba's continental-style system at

the turn of the twentieth century—an experiment in legal translation that exposes both the ambitions and limits of transplantation. Neemah Ahamed's study of Black women's experiences of workplace harassment under #MeToo brings law into dialogue with lived experience, revealing how race and gender alongside other identity factors intersect in shaping access to justice. Drawing on empirical work and the "Naming, Blaming, Claiming" paradigm, Ahamed shows that, while her participants are often able to identify and name harm and able to attribute blame, they hesitate to pursue formal redress. The piece challenges legal scholars and practitioners to consider how intersecting identities mediate one's relationship with the legal system, and how law might better listen to—and believe—the voices of those most marginalized within it.

Then Victoria Barnes, Liam Sunner, and Monica Vessio carry that spirit of listening and questioning into the law school, asking what legal education should offer in an age of AI. They situate debates about integrity and authorship within a broader question of what legal education is meant to achieve, and their piece is an encouragement to address critically, and with a needs-based approach, the emergence of generative AI in law schools. The final article by Nicholas A Pratt turns to Chinese jurisprudence,

examining how “custom” and “good custom” operate as sites of negotiation between traditional values and socialist ideology. By placing the jurisprudence of Mainland China and Taiwan in comparative relief, Pratt shows how the concept of custom remains an active terrain where morality, politics, and legality overlap. His discussion of “good custom” opens a window into the ways in which states articulate social values through law—and, in turn, how business communities might respond to those articulations.

The articles are followed by a note authored by Bianca Jackson on the case law concerning medical treatment for trans children and the concept of a “special category” of medical treatment. Her analysis reveals how the judiciary has largely rejected the idea that gender-affirming care for young people requires automatic court intervention and that the standard principles around consent and parental responsibility apply. However, she also notes an internal dissonance in the recent case of *Ov Pand Q* [2024] EWCA Civ 1577, where the decision of the court seems somewhat at odds with established law.

The Issue then moves on to host three Special Sections. The first Special Section, edited by Katie Jukes and Alex Powell, is the second output of the [Queer Judgments Project](#). It opens by inviting the

reader to watch the video of Graeme Reid’s “Foreword” to the Special Section. Then the reader is taken on a journey through various types of contribution that demonstrate how a queer perspective on law can be adopted to make meaningful changes to the lives of queer people—a queer approach that is conveyed through text, music, songs, poems. Then, our second Special Section, “Pushing the Boundaries of Intergenerational Activism in an Era of Polycrisis”, edited by Kristen Hope, Amrit Rijal, Prathit Singh, Januka Jamarkatel, Brian King, Siroun Thacker, Rodoshee Sarder and Osish Niraula, brings together youth and adult voices that offer various examples of intergenerational collaborations advancing children’s rights. The last Special Section, “Law’s Spaces and Places”, edited by Andrew Benjamin Bricker, offers a scholarly exploration of law’s spatial dimensions in Central London, curated by members of the Law and the Humanities Hub at the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies—law can indeed be walked!

In the Visual Law section, Hamsini Marada reflects on the various ways in which law interacts with the visual when it is captured by the camera. Marada does so by analysing visuals created by the camera and her own paintings and sketches.

Three book reviews then follow. Marian Roberts’ review of *Rethinking*

Family Mediation: The Role of the Family Mediator in Contemporary Times by Rachael Blakey offers the reader some broader reflections on mediation theory and practice. Ling Zhou brings the reader a review of a comparative analysis of *Law and Social Policy in the Global South: Brazil, China, India, South Africa*, an edited collection by Ulrike Davy and Albert H Y Chen.

Finally, Mei Ning Yan reflects on the links between big tech and the law in China that Angela Huyue Zhang analyses in her *High Wire: How China Regulates Big Tech and Governs its Economy*.

As usual, the Issue ends with Eliza Boudier's round-up of news and events from the Institute of Advanced Legal Studies.

For Professor William Twining

Sadly, while this Issue was in production, we received the news that Professor William Twining died on 9 October 2025 at the age of 91. Professor Twining has gifted us not only with his formidable scholarship but he has also shown us all that emotions, personality and personal histories are essential in studying, learning and practising law comprehensively, critically and creatively. His legacy is to situate the importance of human relationships and their dynamics at the core of approaching the study of law and for that we will be forever grateful.