

THINKING AND ACTING TOGETHER: PLANETARY SHARED FUTURITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURES

Workshop with & Keynote by Professor Benedict Kingsbury

La Trobe Law School, La Trobe University
City Campus

Wednesday 18 – Thursday 19 March 2026

Concept Note	1
Aims and Objectives	2
General Background Reading	2
Workshop and Keynote Organisation and Outline	3
Workshop and Keynote Programme	3
Supporting Academics	13
Supporting Research Clusters, Centres, and Institutes	14

Concept Note

This workshop begins from three interlinked concepts that traverse all discussions: planetarity, infrastructure, and publicness. *Planetarity* refers not only to ecological limits, but to the entanglement of human and more-than-human systems across scales, where local actions reverberate globally and planetary processes increasingly intrude into everyday life. *Infrastructures* are understood as dynamic assemblages – material, digital, legal, and institutional – that organise flows of resources, care, data, and authority, while embedding normative choices through design and operation. *Publicness* names the normative aspiration that those affected by governance should be taken into account, able to contest decisions, and participate in shaping shared futures.

These concepts respond to an urgent condition. Climate disruption, accelerating digitalisation, public health crises, and widening inequality are increasingly governed through infrastructures that concentrate power, hard-code priorities, and operate at temporal and spatial scales misaligned with democratic accountability. In many domains, infrastructures regulate before law can meaningfully intervene, limiting the scope of legal oversight and collective contestation. Planetary futures are already being built through existing systems of technology, care, memory, and social reproduction – often without adequate mechanisms for public reasoning, responsibility, or repair.

Against this background, the workshop asks how we might think – and act – together differently. Convened around the visit of Professor Benedict Kingsbury (New York University) to La Trobe Law School, the workshop brings together interdisciplinary scholars and practitioners to examine how infrastructures shape collective life, constitute publics, and condition possibilities for justice, care, and shared futurity. Building on Professor Kingsbury's work on infrastructural thinking and the normative

significance of publicness, the workshop moves between conceptual inquiry and grounded experience, from planetary imaginaries to place-based struggles.

The workshop is organised around four interconnected domains – technology, health, collective life, and memory – not as discrete sectors, but as overlapping sites where infrastructural power is exercised and contested. Across these domains, participants will explore how infrastructures produce shared futurities: whose futures are stabilised, whose are rendered precarious, and whose are excluded from view. The urgency of the moment lies in recognising that pathways are rapidly being locked in. The necessity lies in developing legal, institutional, and collective capacities to intervene in infrastructural design and governance before alternative futures are further foreclosed.

Aims and Objectives

The workshop aims to bring together scholars and practitioners from across law, the social sciences, and related fields to engage in sustained, cross-disciplinary dialogue on planetary futures, infrastructures, and publicness. Its primary objective is to foster the development of a shared analytical vocabulary capable of capturing the regulatory, normative, and political dimensions of infrastructures across domains such as technology, health, social reproduction, and memory.

Through structured panels and collective discussion, the workshop seeks to enable cross-learning between theoretical and practice-based perspectives, bridging conceptual inquiry with lived experience and institutional engagement. A further objective is to create the intellectual and relational foundations for future collaborative work, including joint research projects, competitive funding applications, and scholarly publications. By convening participants around a common conceptual framework and a pressing set of planetary challenges, the workshop is designed to catalyse durable research networks and longer-term collaboration beyond the event itself.

General Background Reading

The workshop will be grounded in a shared reading: **Benedict Kingsbury and Nahuel Maisley, ‘Infrastructures and Laws: Publics and Publicness’** (*Annual Review of Law and Social Science* (17:353-373), 2021). This article provides the conceptual and normative backbone for the workshop discussions.

Kingsbury and Maisley argue that infrastructures and laws are not neutral technical arrangements but relational assemblages that actively constitute publics – groups of people brought into relations of mutuality, dependence, and vulnerability through shared exposure to power. They distinguish between *legal publics*, *infrastructural publics*, and *normative publics*, showing how these often diverge in practice, producing gaps in accountability, representation, and justice. Central to the article is the concept of publicness as a normative quality, expressed through accessibility, exposure, and consideration, which should guide the design and governance of both law and infrastructure.

The reading offers a common analytical language for examining technology, health, collective life, and memory as infrastructural sites where planetary futures are already being shaped, often in advance of democratic deliberation or legal oversight.

Workshop and Keynote Organisation and Outline

The workshop will take place over two days and will be structured around four thematic panels, a keynote lecture by Professor Benedict Kingsbury, and dedicated spaces for informal exchange. The sequencing of activities is designed to foster cumulative reflection, moving from infrastructural challenges in technology and health to broader questions of collective life and memory.

Wednesday, 18 March 2026 (Room: 3.04)

Welcome: 10.00-10.30

- Panel 1: Technology: 10.30-12.30

Lunch: 12.30-1.30

- Panel 2: Health, Disability and Care: 1.30-3.30

Informal drinks: (4.00 to 5.00)

Keynote Lecture – Professor Benedict Kingsbury: (5.00 to 6.30) (Room 2.15-2.16)

“Sustaining Shared Futurities in a Planetary Era”

Reception: (6.30 to 7.30)

Thursday, 19 March 2026 (Room 3.08)

- Panel 3: Collective Life: (9.00 to 11.00)

Lunch: 11.00-11.30

- Panel 4: Memory (11.30-1.30)

Wrap Up (1.30-2.00)

Across both days, the workshop format combines focused panel discussions with opportunities for informal interaction, enabling sustained engagement, intellectual exchange, and the consolidation of collaborative relationships.

Workshop and Keynote Programme

Wednesday, 18 March 2026

Welcome 10.00-10.30

Panel 1: – 10.30-12.30

Technology and the Infrastructural Constitution of Publics

Chair: Louis de Koker (La Trobe Law School)

This panel examines digital and regulatory infrastructures as sites where publics are increasingly constituted by design. Across domains as varied as parliamentary AI scrutiny, ecological regulation, global payment systems, and legal education, technological and institutional arrangements shape who is recognised in law, who gains access to infrastructural systems, and whose interests acquire normative standing.

Governance in these settings operates simultaneously on three overlapping registers. Individuals and entities are recognised within a legal public through categories such as regulated actor, data subject, beneficial owner, sanctioned person, student, or accredited professional. They are organised into an infrastructural public through algorithmic systems, regulatory frameworks, digital identity regimes, payment architectures, AI platforms, and institutional policies that mediate access to scrutiny, knowledge, financial participation, and professional opportunity. They are also implicated in a normative public, as these systems shape autonomy, accountability, inclusion, exclusion, and even the boundaries of whose interests count, including, potentially, non-human life.

Rather than treating technology as a neutral tool, the panel approaches it as a site of institutional design through which legal, infrastructural, and normative publics are aligned or misaligned. By placing legislative oversight, ecological legitimacy, financial governance, and professional formation into conversation, the panel asks how law might intervene in the design of digital infrastructures to enhance publicness and accountability, rather than entrench new forms of opacity, surveillance, exclusion, and distributive asymmetry across scales.

Lorne Neudorf (La Trobe Law School)

Artificial Intelligence and the Scrutiny of Legislation: An Experimental Evaluation of Large Language Models

This paper reports on an empirical experiment testing the capacity of leading large language models to perform parliamentary scrutiny of legislation at the standard expected of Australia's Senate scrutiny committees. The study examines whether general purpose AI systems, when trained on a closed corpus of committee principles, guidelines and past reports, can identify scrutiny concerns in both bills and delegated legislation and articulate those concerns by reference to established committee scrutiny principles. Multiple platforms were tested using a structured methodology that distinguishes between identification of issues, application of scrutiny principles and fidelity to committee language and format. The findings suggest that while some models demonstrate emerging competence in reproducing surface features of scrutiny analysis, limitations remain in issue detection, consistency and avoidance of false positives and false negatives. The paper reflects on what these results reveal about the current capabilities and limitations of AI in legislative scrutiny and considers the implications for the use of this technology in the context of committee scrutiny work.

Leo Bromberg (La Trobe Law School)

Revisiting Regulatory Legitimacy Theory in an Era of Ecological Disruption and Technological Transformation: Including Non-Human Animals in Ecologically Rational Regulation

The foundational concept of regulatory legitimacy remains largely anthropocentric, despite the obvious environmental disruption and animal crisis (Crary and Gruen) affecting us all. This paper argues that regulatory legitimacy theory must evolve to account for the interests of animals who share our ecosystems and participate in our social and community life. Building on Parker and Haines' ecological regulation theory, we propose the concept of "ecologically rational legitimacy"—a framework that extends traditional legitimacy beyond human stakeholders to encompass the wellbeing and interests of other living beings and the eco-social systems we share. Ecologically rational legitimacy requires regulatory design and decision-making to be informed by attentiveness to protecting and repairing ecological systems whilst giving particular consideration to animals' capabilities and capacity to participate in decisions affecting their lives. We then examine AI regulation as a critical test case to demonstrate both the practical urgency and analytical utility of this framework.

Natalia Hanley and Leo Bromberg (La Trobe Law School)

Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) in the provision of legal education and legal practice

Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) is increasingly entangled in the provision of legal education and legal practice. Although Gen AI can provide significant opportunities, the appropriate way of embedding Gen AI in the provision of tertiary education, including legal education, remains highly contested, leading some commentators to describe the use of AI in university assessment as a 'wicked problem'.

This paper forms part of a research project, currently at an early stage, which aims to inform the design and development of Gen AI skills in legal education. The initial part of the project involves a scoping review to ascertain evidence-based principles for effectively embedding Gen AI skills in legal education. This paper will focus on the methodological challenges and trade-offs inherent in undertaking research-informed Gen AI adoption in legal education, due to the rapidly evolving technological landscape, shifting regulatory settings, and rigid (and at times contradictory) institutional responses and policies. The project team comprise Associate Professor Natalia Hanley, Dr Leo Bromberg, Dr Maria Itati Dolhare, Madeleine Dupuche, Stephanie Falconer and Heidi Butters-Stabb.

Louis de Koker (La Trobe Law School)

The G20's emerging enhanced cross-border payment system: Who will have access and at what cost?

The global financial standard-setters are working on designing a new payments framework in accordance with the G20's Roadmap for Enhancing Cross-border Payments. The modernisation of payment systems since the 1990s have been accompanied by anti-money laundering and combating of financing of terrorism (AML/CTF) measures that regulate access to the system, initially intended to combat drug trafficking by organised crime. The targets of these measures increased to serious crime (1996) and terrorist financing (2001) and now also supports targeted financial sanctions of the United Nations Security Council as well as autonomous sanctions by states. While ostensibly serving good governance, AML/CTF laws have impacted negatively on the Global South. AML/CTF measures, especially those focused on know your customer (KYC) obligations, exclude those who cannot provide formal verification of their official identity. This in turn spurred the development of supportive infrastructure such as national digital identity systems and the G20's Legal Entity Identifier. While AML/CFT measures continue to disempower and exclude persons in many developing economies that lack appropriate national ID and digital infrastructures, they also subject those who enjoy access to payment services to increased surveillance and political exclusion. This paper outlines some of the tensions in the current design processes of the reforms set to become effective in 2030.

Lunch 12.30-1.30

Panel 2 – 1.30-3.30

Health, Disability and Care: Realigning Legal, Infrastructural and Normative 'Publics'

Chair: Chris Maylea (La Trobe Law School, and Co-Director, Care Economy Research Institute)

This panel examines health and care as foundational to our planetary futures. The panellists will broadly respond to Kingsbury and Maisley distinction between three kinds of “publics”, understood as different ways groups of people are brought together and given (or denied) standing in relation to law and infrastructure. Care relations are governed across legal, infrastructural and normative publics: (1) ‘carers’ and the ‘cared for’ are divided into defined roles under disparate legal regimes (for example, aged care recipient, involuntary patient, and guardianship subject), (2) they are constituted as an ‘infrastructural public’ through organised and often disparate care systems (such as healthcare, disability care, and aged care), and (3) in many settings, both informal and formal, are also paradigmatic members of a ‘normative public’ because those systems directly condition their autonomy, including through coercion, control, exclusion, or dependence.

The panellists will bring their own work into conversation with this analytical framework, using it to identify the potential misalignments it reveals between those formally recognised in law, those included or excluded by existing care infrastructures, and those whose autonomy is so profoundly shaped by these arrangements that they ought to count in how the law and infrastructure of care is configured.

From the design of urban environments and welfare systems to laws governing mental health interventions and the growing concept of the ‘right to care’ in international law, the panel brings legal, socio-legal, and geographical perspectives into conversation.

Yvette Maker (University of Tasmania / Melbourne Law School) will consider the shifting focus within the UN system towards care and support for self, others, and planet as a foundational condition for the enjoyment of human rights.

Ilan Wiesel (University of Melbourne) will draw on his work on ‘shadow care infrastructures’ and related areas to examine how formal and informal systems of support operate amid welfare retrenchment, producing uneven geographies of care.

Piers Gooding (La Trobe Law School) will revisit the history of deinstitutionalisation and neoliberal reform in mental health law and policy, and chart it to emerging socio-economic accounts of mental health today.

Informal Drinks 4.00-5.00

Following Panels 1 and 2, participants will gather for informal drinks, providing space for reflection, cross-panel exchange, and the continuation of conversations initiated during the day.

Keynote Lecture 5.00 to 6.30

Welcome & Introduction

Professor Nick Bisley FAHA
Pro Vice-Chancellor Research
Professor of International Relations
La Trobe University

Lecture

Professor Benedict Kingsbury
“Sustaining Shared Futurities in a Planetary Era”

This keynote will further flesh out the workshop’s core themes, reflecting on the role of law, infrastructures, and publics in shaping planetary futures, and offering a forward-looking agenda for collective action and research.

Keynote Abstract

How can we imagine and sustain shared futures in a time of profound planetary challenges? This lecture explores how law and infrastructure shape our capacity to live together on a rapidly changing planet. From digital systems and global and space networks to legal and institutional arrangements, infrastructures do more than provide technical support — they organise relationships, distribute power, and structure responsibility and opportunity. By understanding infrastructure as a set of social and legal relationships rather than merely technical objects, the lecture examines how new publics emerge, where law falls out of step, and how practices of care, repair, and collective action might help sustain shared futures across local and planetary scales.

Reception 6.30-7.30

A reception will follow the keynote, creating further opportunities for engagement among participants, invited guests, and members of the La Trobe community.

Thursday, 19 March 2026

Panel 3 – 9.00-11.00

Collective Life: Infrastructures of Social Reproduction and Planetary Co-Habitation

Chair: Luis Eslava (La Trobe Law School)

This panel examines collective life as an infrastructural accomplishment. Across domains such as accountability mechanisms, legal pluralism, extractive economies, energy transition, and narrative practice, it considers how material, institutional, and cultural arrangements organise everyday cooperation, structure authority, and shape possibilities for shared futurity.

Across these domains, governance operates on three overlapping registers. Communities and individuals are recognised within a legal public through constitutional guarantees, donor frameworks, regulatory regimes, accountability mechanisms, and environmental law. They are organised into an infrastructural public through development programmes, resource corridors, pipelines, bureaucratic systems, and institutional architectures that stabilise particular modes of living together. They are also implicated in a normative public, as these infrastructures shape autonomy, belonging, and the conditions under which collective agency can be exercised or foreclosed.

Rather than treating collective life as a spontaneous social fact, the panel approaches it as something actively produced through infrastructural design. It asks how infrastructures of governance, extraction, justice, and representation align or misalign legal recognition, material organisation, and normative standing—and whether they enable more just forms of planetary co-habitation or entrench fragmentation, dispossession, and ecological precarity.

Caitlin Reiger (Chief Executive Officer, Human Rights Law Centre) will reflect on the creation and evolution of legal infrastructures designed to provide accountability for mass atrocities. Such mechanisms mobilise multiple publics while seeking to break cycles of collective violence and reconstitute social bonds. Drawing on her practitioner experience with truth-telling and justice processes in Cambodia, Sierra Leone, Myanmar, and Australia, she will examine the tensions between institutionalised justice timeframes and shifting community expectations about how societies confront past harm and “move on.”

Lisa Denney (La Trobe University) will examine donor programmes as governance infrastructures that seek to accommodate legal pluralism while remaining shaped by funding logics, metrics, and bureaucratic expectations. Drawing on recent examples from Papua New Guinea, she will explore how development interventions attempt to integrate plural legal orders within institutional frameworks that often constrain their recognition. Using the infrastructures and publics framework, she will consider how donor systems constitute particular legal and infrastructural publics that diverge from lived normative publics embedded in collective practices of justice.

Kathleen Birrell (La Trobe Law School) will explore how colonial logics of extraction are embedded in both material infrastructures and legal and literary forms that organise publics and distribute responsibility. Drawing on decolonial analyses of extractive assemblages alongside Kingsbury and Maisley’s account of infrastructural publics, she will suggest that law operates as both material and discursive infrastructure, shaping collective agency while fragmenting accountability. Engaging an infrastructural reading of Alexis Wright’s *Carpentaria*, she will argue that Indigenous narrative insurgency disrupts dominant infrastructures of extraction and settler legality, prefiguring alternative legal norms and publics grounded in relationality.

Julia Dehm (La Trobe Law School) will examine fossil fuel infrastructures as sociotechnical arrangements that materially reproduce carbon-intensive forms of life while shaping the horizons of energy transition. Pipelines, ports, and resource corridors, she will argue, stabilise particular planetary futures by organising political constituencies and legal commitments. Framing transition as an infrastructural question, she will explore how struggles over construction, maintenance, and dismantling constitute new legal, infrastructural, and normative publics—and what it would mean to design infrastructures capable of sustaining more viable forms of planetary co-habitation.

Lunch 11.00-11.30

Panel 4 – 11.30-1.30

Memory as Infrastructure: Recording, Recognition and Repair

This concluding panel examines memory as an infrastructural and legal practice through which recognition, accountability, and futurity are organised. Focusing on territorial demarcation, nationality documentation, archival construction, and heritage inscription, the panel explores how systems of recording shape who is recognised in law, how histories are made legible, and whose claims to justice endure across time.

Across these domains, governance operates on three overlapping registers. Communities and individuals are recognised within a legal public through constitutional guarantees, nationality regimes, heritage conventions, and institutional mandates. They are organised into an infrastructural public through documentary systems, bureaucratic procedures, archives, and listing processes that stabilise certain narratives while marginalising others. They are also implicated in a normative public, as these infrastructures determine whose suffering counts, whose territory is remembered, and whose identity or loss is preserved for future generations.

Rather than treating memory as retrospective, the panel approaches it as a site of institutional design. It asks how infrastructures of recording and inscription align or misalign legal recognition, material access, and normative standing — and whether they enable repair, reinforce exclusion, or reshape the terms on which publics are constituted over time.

Bruno Pegorari (La Trobe Law School)

This paper reads Indigenous practices of self-demarcation (*autodemarcação*) in Brazil through Kingsbury and Maisley's framework of infrastructures, publics, and publicness. Brazil's constitutional and administrative apparatus for Indigenous land demarcation, grounded in Article 231 of the 1988 Constitution and operationalised through FUNAI, the Ministry of Justice, and the Presidency, constitutes a legal-bureaucratic infrastructure that has become substantially inoperative. Procedural backlogs, political capture, and sustained legislative counter-attacks have produced a divergence between legal publics and infrastructural publics: Indigenous peoples are formally recognised as bearers of constitutional rights but functionally excluded from the infrastructure meant to realise them. Drawing on Luisa Molina's ethnographic work on the Mundurucu people's self-demarcation of the Daje Kapap Eypi/Sawré Muybu territory, the paper frames self-demarcation as an emergent, non-state infrastructure that is simultaneously mimetic of, but radically different from, the state apparatus. Communities assume roles ordinarily performed by state agents while grounding the process in their own epistemologies, temporalities, and relations with the land, producing a territorial record that speaks to the state's bureaucratic requirements while placing substantive decisions about the territory (its names, boundaries, significance, and extension) in Indigenous hands.

Through the panel's thematic lens of memory, the paper proposes that self-demarcation is a practice of infrastructural memory from below: it intervenes in how territories are remembered, recorded, and made legible, reshaping who

counts as a public and on whose terms territorial futurity is imagined. The analysis is situated within Kingsbury's broader intellectual trajectory, from his processual reconceptualisation of self-determination (1992), through his account of Indigenous peoples as a sui generis legal category open to rights that require Indigenous epistemological inputs (2001), to the infrastructure framework (2021), suggesting that the normative space left open for Indigenous self-understandings in his earlier work finds material expression in the emergent infrastructures Indigenous peoples build when state systems fail. In this sense, state authority over territorial processes is revealed as functional rather than foundational; self-demarcation, even absent formal recognition, produces a performative transformation in the community's relationship to land and state, one that departs from the standpoint Indigenous peoples already occupy within the infrastructure and asserts, from that position, a new capacity to delimit, demarcate, and defend territory, reshaping its futurity.

Andrea Immanuel (La Trobe Law School)

In the international legal order, it is usually territorial states that issue legal identity documents to administer their nationality to individuals. Also, it is usually state-issued nationality documents that enable individuals to prove their nationality within this legal order. This paper addresses two types of situations during armed conflict where the territorial state is unable or unwilling to issue nationality documents whilst simultaneously non state armed groups ('NSAGs') undertake the grant of such documents. The first of such situations is one where a portion of a state's territory comes under the effective control of an NSAG during armed conflict and the NSAG issues nationality documents. In this regard, the International Committee of the Red Cross estimates that, currently, there are about four percent of NSAGs that issue some form of legal documentation to individuals under their control.¹ The second situation is where a national liberation movement ('NLM'), a special type of NSAG, issues nationality documents to individuals under its control. A key example of an NLM issuing such documents is the Polisario Front issuing passports and national identity cards to the Saharawis of Western Sahara who are under its control.

These two situations show that, in practice, individuals might find themselves in situations where they would have to engage with NSAGs and receive NSAG-issued documents instead of state-issued documents during armed conflict. For international law, these two situations raise complex questions including whether NSAGs have the legal capacity to issue nationality documents, whether NSAGs are prohibited from issuing such documents and whether the state whose territory is under NSAG control must recognise these documents for humanitarian reasons. In this paper, I do not address these questions of legality and legitimacy. Instead, I will examine the conceptualization of nationality documents within the international legal order, through the lens of infrastructure

¹ Bamber-Zryd, Matthew, 'ICRC Engagement with Armed Groups in 2025', *Humanitarian Law & Policy Blog* (Blog Post, 30 October 2025) <<https://blogs.icrc.org/law-and-policy/2025/10/30/icrc-engagement-with-armed-groups-in-2025/>>.

and publics. This lens is helpful to understand how nationality documents create social and public relations. It is also useful to understand whether and the extent to which nationality documents are related to statehood and state-building. This paper will also examine the question of what understanding nationality documents as infrastructure would reveal about the practice of NSAGs issuing such documents to individuals living in the territory under their control. At this stage, my intuition is that conceptualizing nationality documents as particular forms of infrastructure will reveal important insights about the role of nationality documents in creating and constituting publics. As such, these insights can reveal the functions of the territorial state in the grant of nationality documents and enable us to make sense of NSAGs issuing these documents during armed conflict under international law.

Michelle Burgis-Kasthala (La Trobe Law School)

Archiving During Genocide: The Gaza Tribunal and the Building of a Palestinian Polity

Through a dedicated funding stream of the Organization of Islamic Conference's Youth Forum, the Gaza Tribunal – later renamed the Gaza People's Tribunal - was first convened in Mayfair, London in November 2024. It then organised two public gatherings in Sarajevo in May and Istanbul in October 2025. Even before its official, publicly oriented work began, discussions commenced into its afterlife through the creation of a dedicated archive. Funding constraints and limited time always meant that its work of advocacy and documentation would be finite. To counter such a limited contribution in rallying against the genocide in Gaza, the archive was seized upon to sustain the Tribunal's legacy into an unknown future. At the final open forum convened in Istanbul this was the primary request of the audience – to ensure that materials in their various formats were preserved for future efforts in advocacy, political organising, memorialising and academic research. As a member of the archive team, I was initially swept along by this belief in futurity. Most acutely, concern over the effort and risks undertaken by Palestinian contributors prompted an ethical commitment to ensure such efforts could be preserved for posterity. Yet such ideals sat uncomfortably alongside growing misgivings around the personal political projects of Tribunal participants, infrastructural and legal challenges in settling on an archival site and most crucially, questions of custodianship of the material itself. While Palestinians have been consulted throughout the life of the Tribunal, the extent to which its key legacy, the archive, is publicly shaped and owned, is less clear. Here in this talk, I aim to draw on Kingsbury's work around publicness to think through the troubled politics of archive making during genocide and political annihilation.

Maria Elander (La Trobe Law School)

After a change in 2023 to the interpretation of the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Committee has in quick succession inscribed five sites associated with recent conflicts to the World Heritage List of cultural heritage.

On a list that otherwise primarily features sites that are outstanding for their positive contributions to the world, the newly listed sites stand out for their associations with violence, atrocities and harm. The change comes at a time when the promises of international criminal law seem increasingly unfulfillable. In this paper, I explore the way these changes to the understanding of world heritage expand the infrastructure of mechanisms that address past atrocities and what kinds of publics this expansion enables and forecloses.

Wrap-up 1.30-2.30

Supporting Academics

Professor Luis Eslava

La Trobe Law School

Co-Lead, International and Comparative Law Cluster (ICLC)

Workshop Convenor

Dr Maria Elander

La Trobe Law School

Associate Dean: Research and Industry Engagement (ADRIE)

Co-Lead, International and Comparative Law Cluster (ICLC)

Professor Louis de Koker

Lead: La Trobe LawTech

La Trobe Law School

Dr Piers Gooding

La Trobe Law School

Lead, Law in Context Cluster (LiC)

Dr Julia Dehm

La Trobe Law School

ARC DECRA Fellow

Research focus on international law, resources, and planetary transformation

Dr Kathleen Birrell

La Trobe Law School

Director of Graduate Research

Research focus on Indigenous sovereignties and plural legal epistemologies

Dr Lisa Denney

La Trobe University

Director, Centre for Human Security and Social Change

Research focus on legal pluralism, governance, and post-conflict justice

Professor Chris Maylea

La Trobe University

Care Economy Research Institute

Research focus on human rights, mental health law, and governance of care systems

Supporting Research Clusters, Centres, and Institutes

International and Comparative Law Cluster (ICLC)

La Trobe Law School

A central institutional partner, providing the intellectual home for the workshop's focus on international law, global governance, infrastructures, and planetary futures.

Law in Context Cluster (LiC)

La Trobe Law School

Supporting interdisciplinary and socio-legal engagement across technology, health, collective life, and memory.

Centre for Human Security and Social Change (CHSSC)

La Trobe University

Contributing expertise on power, institutions, social change, and contested governance in planetary contexts.

Care Economy Research Institute (CERI)

La Trobe University

Providing a critical lens on care, health, social reproduction, and infrastructural governance of vulnerability.