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Welcome to the ReValuing Care Workshop 2: Caring about Social Interconnection

We are particularly delighted to welcome national and international visitors to Adelaide.

The second ReValuing Care Workshop is hosted by the Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender at the University of Adelaide, and sponsored by the Research Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality at Keele University, and the University of Birmingham.

We hope that you thoroughly enjoy this lively program. The Care Network invite you to join us for drinks on Sunday evening and dinner after (due to budgetary constraints, dinners are not funded by the Network).

Looking forward to seeing you all,

Professor Christine Beasley
Professor Martha Augoustinos
Dr Rosie Harding
Dr Ruth Fletcher
### Summary of Events

#### Program: Saturday 31 August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6pm  | Informal Dinner: Scoozies (272 Rundle Street, Adelaide)  
(Please note: Dinner is at your own expense) |

#### Program: Sunday 1 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>Registration/Arrival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10:00 | Welcome and Introductions  
(Professor Chris Beasley and Dr Rosie Harding) |
| 10:30-12:00 | Panel 1: Lenses of Care: Temporality, Spatiality, Relationality |
|       | Lunch 12:00-1:00 |
| 1:00-2:30 | Panel 2: Challenging Normative Care Contexts |
|       | Afternoon Tea 2:30-3:00 |
| 3:00-4:30 | Panel 3: Political and Institutional Rationalities of Care |
| 6:00  | Drinks—Level 7, Ingkarni Wardli (University of Adelaide) |
| 6:30  | Dinner: Eros Café (275 Rundle Street, Adelaide)  
(Please note: Dinner is at your own expense) |

#### Program: Monday 2 September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10:00-11:00 | Panel 4: Vulnerability and Social Justice  
Morning Tea 11:00-11:30 |
| 11:30-1:00 | Panel 5: Aging Sexualities and Embodied Caring Connections  
Lunch 1:00-2:00 |
| 2:00-3:00 | Panel 6: Crossing Spatial, Relational & Temporal Boundaries of Care  
Afternoon Tea 3:00-3:15 |
| 3:15-4:00 | Closing Discussion & Future Plans  
(Professor Chris Beasley, Dr Rosie Harding & Dr Ruth Fletcher |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Registration/Arrival</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Welcome</td>
<td>(Professor Chris Beasley and Dr Rosie Harding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-12:00</td>
<td>PANEL 1: Lenses of Care: Temporality, Spatiality, Relationality</td>
<td>(Chair: Carol Johnson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11.00</td>
<td>Abigail Baim-Lance</td>
<td>Embodying the Concept: Care as Permanence, Contingency, and Endurance in the Shadow of a South African HIV/AIDS Global Health Intervention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td>Susan Westwood</td>
<td>Bathed in (Heteronormative) Light: Older Lesbians in Residential and Nursing Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12.00</td>
<td>Rosie Harding</td>
<td>Relational Life/Relational Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Lunch 12:00-1:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:30</td>
<td>PANEL 2: Challenging Normative Care Contexts</td>
<td>(Chair: Susan Westwood)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1.30</td>
<td>Lester Watson</td>
<td>Australian Rural Young People Who Care for a Family Member with Physical or Mental Health Problems: Can Research Better Reflect the Interests of Young Carers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td>Damien Riggs</td>
<td>Experiences of the Public/Private Nexus Amongst a Diverse Sample of Australian Families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2.30</td>
<td>Helen Carr</td>
<td>Caring at the Borders of the Human: Pets and the Homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00</td>
<td>Afternoon Tea 2:30-3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program: Sunday 1 September

3:00-4:30  PANEL 3: Political and Institutional Rationalities of Care
(Chair: Ruth Fletcher)

3:00-3.30  Carol Johnson
The Politics of Emotion and Affective Citizenship: Some Implications for
Government Recognition of Caring Relationships

3:30-4:00  Caroline Hunter
Between the Soup Kitchen as a ‘Space of Care’: Ideas of Care Emerging from
the Westminster Byelaw Proposal

4:00-4.30  Laura Grenfell
Courts, Care and Bodies: Is the Parens Patriae Jurisdiction a ‘Jurisdiction of
Care’?

6:00      Drinks—Ingkarni Wardli, Level 7 (University of Adelaide)

6:30      Dinner: Eros Café
275 Rundle St Adelaide SA 5000
(Please note: Dinner is at your own expense)
Program: Monday 2 September

10:00-11:00 PANEL 4: Vulnerability and Social Justice
(Chair: Helen Carr)

10:00-11.00 Ruth Fletcher
‘It must be absolutely awful for them’: Strange Connections and Cross-border Abortion Support Networks

10:30-11:00 Michael Thomson
Health Talk and Social Flesh

Morning Tea 11:00-11:30

11:30-1:00 PANEL 5: Aging Sexualities and Embodied Caring Connections
(Chair: Michael Thomson)

11:30-12:00 Chris Beasley (Mary Holmes)
Care and Sexuality: Internet Dating, Sexual Intimacy and Older People

12:00-12:30 Peter Robinson
Between Plucky Self Sufficiency and Despair and Despondency: Older Gay Men’s Views on a Life in Care

12:30-1:00 Elizabeth Peel
Social Interconnection in Dementia Care

Lunch 1:00-2:00

2:00-3:00 PANEL 6: Crossing Spatial, Relational and Temporal Boundaries of Care
(Chair: Elizabeth Peel)

2:00-2:30 Loretta Baldassar
Mobilities as a New Paradigm for Revaluing Care in Family Life: Issues and Challenges

2.30-3:00 Jenny Baker (Margaret Allen and Maureen Dyer)
Paths to Social Caring: Researchers Consider their Journeys
Program: Monday 2 September

Afternoon Tea 3:00-3:15

3:15-4:00 Closing Session: Closing Discussion & Future Plans
(Professor Chris Beasley, Dr Rosie Harding & Dr Ruth Fletcher)

Notes
EMBODYING THE CONCEPT: CARE AS PERMANENCE, CONTINGENCY, AND ENDURANCE IN THE SHADOW OF A SOUTH AFRICAN HIV/AIDS GLOBAL HEALTH INTERVENTION

Abigail Baim-Lance

abigail.baimlance@gmail.com

This paper sets out to explore the interrelations between care as concept and embodied practice. In 2004, a multinational pharmaceutical company funded an HIV/AIDS intervention called “The Future Project” in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. This global health project relied upon community-based voluntary caregivers to assist individuals with HIV/AIDS on therapeutic journeys. The intervention established a powerful concept of care about a timeless community figure, but the depiction veiled the impact of the donor’s resources on program achievements. As a result, when the program ended in 2007, caregivers who continued undertaking prescribed activities did so within increasingly stressful conditions. Observing care under these circumstances in 2007-2008 offers an opportunity to consider the practices of care poised between permanence and contingency, action and imagination, in the everyday and towards long-term horizons.

Two accounts of healthcare journeys with caregiver and isiguli (the ill) pairs traveling between home and clinic form the basis of the analysis. Comparative descriptions develop contingency as the attuned and improvised practices of care to navigate a minefield of contested claims given insecure contexts. Yet, the idea of stability indexing the preceding activity structures inured, even when it intensified the negotiations with which the caregivers contended. In the last section, the paper makes sense of caregivers’ willingness to absorb these daily risks as a concern over establishing time. Found at the nexus between practice and imagination, the paper describes how caregivers used physical labors to care in the everyday to recuperate temporality, turning timelessness into a meaningful grammar of endurance.

Dr Abigail Baim-Lance holds a PhD in social anthropology and studies issues of health and medicine with a focus on institutional forms of social participation. To date, she has conducted research in South Africa and New York, primarily around HIV/AIDS healthcare. She currently serves as research specialist for the New York State Department of Health AIDS Institute. She also hold affiliations with the Amsterdam Medical Centre Department of Social Medicine and the Institute for Social Research. Dr Baim-Lance has recently moved to London where she is settling on a permanent basis.
**Paths to Social Caring: Researchers Consider Their Journeys**

**Jenny Baker**  
(with Margaret Allen and Maureen Dyer)

University of Adelaide  
jenny.baker@adelaide.edu.au

As the Activist Intellectual cluster group of the Fay Gale Centre, the co-authors are commencing a project of interviewing 1970s social activists around gender, ‘race’ and sexuality, about their lives and their activism. The project is intended to both document the explosion of social activism beginning from the 1970s and to explore the conditions of possibility and the ‘light-bulb’ moments which precipitated their activism and thus to theorise the contexts of the activists of the 1970s and the 1980s, in particular.

In this paper, inspired by Gloria Watkins interview with bell hooks, we are ‘interviewing ourselves’ to reveal the circumstances and the social connections which led us to social activism, which we define here as a form social caring. Our activities span gender issues, struggles around Indigenous health rights, trade unionism, the development of women’s/ gender studies and the promotion of social equality in education.

**Associate Professor Jenny Baker** is Director Yaitya Purruna Indigenous Health Unit, in the School of Population Health/Public Health, Faculty of Health Sciences University of Adelaide is a member of the Fay Gale Centre. She has been active around Indigenous Health for many years. Her current ARC project examines, ‘Intersectoral collaboration and capacity building for better outcomes for Aboriginal people in Port Augusta, South Australia’. Her recent book is *Theorising Survival. Indigenous Women and Social and Emotional Wellbeing* Brisbane, Postpressed Publications, 2012.

Professor Margaret Allen is a member of the Fay Gale Centre advisory committee. She retired in 2010 after teaching gender studies and history for four decades. She helped establish women’s / gender studies in the university sector. She researches whiteness and gendered, transnational histories with a particular emphasis upon India and Australia 1880-1940s. She was Vice President (Affirmative Action) of NTEU in the early 1990s.

Ms Maureen Dyer an educational sociologist, was involved in the establishment of Women’s/Gender Studies at the University of South Australia and was deeply involved in advancing gender issues in NTEU. During the 1980s she was involved in the Priority Projects program to promote equity in education in South Australia. Since her retirement she has spent over a decade as an Independent International Affairs Professional and a Gender, Training and Education Consultant chiefly in Papua New Guinea.
This paper considers the so-called ‘mobility turn’ in the social sciences and its relevance to research on caring and social interconnection, particularly in transnational family as well as migrant/diaspora community contexts. The increasing mobility and profound impact of new communication technologies on our ability to care across distance and to manage absence in family life makes an analysis of ‘the portability of care’ a fundamental topic of our contemporary lives.

Whether pushed or pulled out of homelands in search of safe asylum, better economic futures or improved lifestyles, increasing numbers of people are separated from their family by distance and national borders. Those family members who ‘stay behind’ also become part of social relationships stretched across time and place, even though they might never actually relocate or even move at all. In addition to migrant and refugee families, a growing number of other ‘types’ of families are being defined by their experience of mobility, including commuter, fly-in-fly-out, frequent flyer, expatriate and even the multi-local families created after divorce and separation (although it is children and not adults who tend to be mobile in the latter case).

In this paper I am particularly interested in examining how people care for each other across distance and over time. I attempt to locate the emotional intersubjectivities and human embodied interdependence that characterise caring relationships in a transnational context. I examine research on transnational families who increasingly ‘routinely’ live their lives ‘together across distance’. The concept of ‘virtual’ and other forms of ‘co-presence’ (proxy, imagined, ‘soft’, ‘hard’) are examined to explore how people maintain a sense of ‘being there’ for each other, including the special role of visits. Emerging scholarship suggests that the intensive use of Internet-based communication, mobile phones and social media can contribute to strengthening ties and intensifying the circulation of various (cultural, emotional, economic and social) resources within transnational families to sustain ‘translocal households’. The uses of these technologies may also facilitate intergenerational solidarities at a distance, expanding transnational emotional and other forms of support.

This is not to suggest that such transnational forms of caregiving are evenly distributed and shared. Rather, the exchange of support in transnational families is characterised by the asymmetrical reciprocal exchanges that define all intimate social relationships. Just how effective are these transnational forms of exchanges in approximating or ‘standing in for’ the physical co-presence and ‘being there’ that is taken for granted as the bedrock of family caregiving relationships? And what implications do these increasingly common experiences of mobility have for the development of theories of care?
Loretta Baldassar is Professor in Anthropology and Sociology at UWA and an Adjunct Principal Research Fellow at Monash. Loretta has published extensively on transnational migrants, families and caregiving including, Transnational Families, Migration and the Circulation of Care (with Merla, Routledge 2013; Families Caring Across Borders (with Baldock & Wilding, Palgrave 2007), Intimacy and Italian Migration (with Gabaccia, Fordham Uni Press 2011) and Visits Home (MUP 2001), which won the 2001 Victorian Premier’s Community Relations Award. Her current publications projects include a Special Issue of the Journal Global Network on transnational families and co-presence and Refugee Protection and the Role of Law (Routledge).
CARE AND SEXUALITY: INTERNET DATING, SEXUAL INTIMACY AND OLDER PEOPLE

Chris Beasley
(with Mary Holmes)

University of Adelaide
christine.beasley@adelaide.edu.au

The concept of care has not easily attended to the embodied intimacies associated with sexuality (Beasley and Bacchi 2012). In this paper we consider this issue in relation to the specific instance of internet dating among older people. This instance is of importance for considerations of how care might adequately contend with sexuality, because the number of older people that are making use of internet dating as the means to undertake intimate/sexual relationships is increasing worldwide. All the same the literature that attends to this new development remains relatively limited. Overall, scholarship attending to internet dating and older people is limited in terms of qualitative work or analysis of values and behaviours. And yet this new terrain is surely a highly significant issue in terms of understanding possibilities for social change, as well for the future development of facilities/services for older people. Is care the most useful means for exploring such possibilities and developments. What might be the advantages and limits of this concept when we consider the growth of cyber social interconnectedness and sexual intimacy amongst an ever growing older population?

Chris Beasley is Professor in Politics and Co-Director of the Fay Gale Centre for Research on Gender at the University of Adelaide. Her books include Heterosexuality in Theory and Practice (with Heather Brook and Mary Holmes, Routledge, 2012), Engaging with Carol Bacchi (edited with Angelique Bletsas, University of Adelaide Press, 2012), Gender & Sexuality: Critical Theories, Critical Thinkers (Sage, 2005), What is Feminism? (Sage, 1999) and Sexual Economyths (Allen & Unwin, 1994). She is currently writing a book on contemporary popular film titled The Cultural Politics of Popular Film: Power, Culture and Society (with Heather Brook, Manchester UP) and preparing another book, Internet Dating (with Mary Holmes, Routledge).

Mary Holmes is an Associate Professor in Sociology at Flinders University. Her books include What is Gender? and Heterosexuality in Theory and Practice (With Chris Beasley and Heather Brook). She is currently writing a book based on her research on distance relationships and another on Internet Dating (with Chris Beasley).
CARING AT THE BORDERS OF THE HUMAN: PETS AND THE HOMELESS

Helen Carr
Kent Law School
h.p.carr@kent.ac.uk

This paper follows the homeless person’s pet through the ‘lawscape’ (Phillippopoulos-Mihalopoulos 2007) of homelessness to explore, through acts of translation and association, its spaces of care, dependency and control (Latour). The paper argues that the pet (usually, but not always a dog) provides a productive vantage point from which to explore care and homelessness because it highlights a close and perhaps unexpected juxtaposition of care and control as well as disrupting the normative asymmetry of care and dependency. For example the bond between the pet and the homeless person appears to be deep, caring and almost co-dependent (Fox 2010), perhaps because of the amount of time they spend together. The bond is arguably redemptive overcoming the ‘otherness’ of the homeless. Like ‘us’, ‘they’ value the companionship of a pet and will put themselves at risk in order to sustain the relationship – witness the account of the homeless man who jumped into the River Liffey to save his rabbit which had been thrown there by a drunken youth. The pet can provide actual redemption too – there are numerous stories of dogs (and a cat!) saving or turning around the lives of homeless people. Another, more cynical perspective, would suggest that the presence of a pet is a form of commodification of homelessness. This too has potential as a strategy for inclusion. The pet enables the homeless to brand themselves as deserving of support, increasing the possibilities of donations. On the other hand the pet can serve to exacerbate the exclusion of the homeless. Only a small number of housing providers and hostels are willing to accept pets so the dog bars its owner from many housing solutions. The dog may be rounded up as a stray and the homeless person will lose the dog unless he or she can pay a repatriation fee. The paper will explore the work of the Hope Project run by the Dogs Trust and Oxford City Council’s stray dog initiative both of which attempt to overcome these barriers. The pet also opens the homeless person to a range of criminal interventions including the Dangerous Dogs Act 1997, the offence of a dog being dangerously out of control and pet neglect and cruelty. Finally pet ownership also increases the homeless person’s potential for victimhood – he or she faces the possibility of the pet being stolen or abused. So the standard account of a soup kitchen run by local churches in Muswell Hill is made more complex by its exclusion of dogs from its premises. The dogs are tied up outside and allegedly stolen by other homeless people. This results in fights and police interventions. A focus on the pets of the homeless therefore helps us rethink care, understanding the homeless as providers as well as recipients of care, entrepreneurs of the self as well as beggars, and that provision and receipt of care can simultaneously include and exclude the homeless in multiple and unexpected ways.
Notes

References

**Dr Helen Carr** is a Reader at Kent Law School whose research interests and publications focus on social welfare law, in particular housing and homelessness and adult social care. She is interested in the regulation of the poor, gendered and other practices of inclusion and exclusion and her work tries to combine doctrinal and theoretical analysis. She is currently working on a book on law and homelessness with Caroline Hunter to be published in 2014 and wondering whether a post-human perspective can add value to theorizing about social welfare law.
“IT MUST BE ABSOLUTELY AWFUL FOR THEM”: STRANGE CONNECTIONS AND CROSS-BORDER ABORTION SUPPORT NETWORKS

Ruth Fletcher

Keele University
r.fletcher@keele.ac.uk

The figure of the stranger is often seen as the effect of processes of inclusion and exclusion such as migration and multiculturalism. Ahmed (2000) has invited us to look beyond stranger fetishism and unpack the multi-tiered ways in which ‘economies of strangering’ actually operate. Here I am interested in the economy of strangering that comes into being as volunteers provide support to women crossing borders in search of abortion care. Drawing on accounts of 3 different support groups – Irish Women’s Abortion Support Group, ESCORT and Abortion Support Network – and on interviews with 6 volunteer members of IWASG and ESCORT, I consider what the register of strangeness tells us about this form of care-giving. Strangeness worked in part to criticize the women’s home country for making them travel for abortion care. Volunteers thought that women should not have to rely on the kindness of foreign strangers. But strangeness was also productive as volunteers provided an ‘alternative home’ and negotiated with the clinics on women’s behalf. In reflecting on how these volunteers imagined care for abortion-seeking women, I consider what this economy of strangering means for our theorization of care as connection.

Dr Ruth Fletcher studied for an LLB at Trinity College Dublin and an MA in Women’s Studies at University College Cork. She lived in Toronto for 5 years while doing an LLM and a DJur at Osgoode Hall Law School, York University, before joining Keele in 1999. Ruth’s research interests include Gender, sexuality and law, particularly reproduction, Health law, Feminist and critical socio-legal theory, Human rights and equality, Governance and civil society. Her current major research project is ‘Peripheral Life: Governing Abortion in Transnational Times’. This book project draws on critical approaches to transnational governance to consider the significance of abortion travel practices for key concepts of reproductive regulation. Ruth co-ordinated an international research network (Leverhulme 2000-3) in Gender, Sexuality and Law with the Centre for Feminist Legal Research, Delhi and the Centre for Interdisciplinary Gender Studies, Leeds. In 2004-9, she was Associate Director for the AHRC Research Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality, and Co-ordinator of the Centre’s research cluster in healthcare law and bioethics.
COURTS, CARE AND BODIES: IS THE PARENTS PATRIAE JURISDICTION A ‘JURISDICTION OF CARE’?

Laura Grenfell

University of Adelaide
laura.grenfell@adelaide.edu.au

Care is not a term that is often used to describe the role or jurisdiction of courts in relation to bodies. However, the centuries-old parens patriae jurisdiction (‘parent of the nation’) enjoyed by superior courts gives them a ‘jurisdiction of care’ in relation to the bodies of those who are incapacitated. In Australia this was confirmed twenty one years ago by the landmark Marion’s case where the High Court held that superior courts in Australia have the power to order the non-therapeutic sterilisation of a mentally incapacitated female minor to prevent her from achieving menstruation and motherhood. In that case the Court quoted from a nineteenth century English case in order to explain the nature of the jurisdiction:

(1) it belongs to the King, as parens patriae, having the care of those who are not able to take care of themselves, and is founded on the obvious necessity that the law should place somewhere the care of individuals who cannot take care of themselves, particularly in cases where it is clear that some care should be thrown round them.*

The High Court stated that in exercising this jurisdiction the superior courts are not merely supervising or reviewing parental or guardian care and control because the Crown has the broader responsibility to care “for those who cannot look after themselves; it includes infants as well as those of unsound mind.”[71]

Since this time some Australian superior courts have extended this jurisdiction in order to allow the removal of semen from dead male bodies so as to enable the impregnation of their spouse. Thus a snapshot of the ‘jurisdiction of care’ shows that on the one hand it can be used to sever and control social connection while on the other hand it can also be used to facilitate interconnectedness.

This paper considers how care has been, and is being, theorised, imagined and practised by Australian superior courts in their exercise of the parens patriae jurisdiction.

Dr Laura Grenfell is a Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Adelaide. Her books include Promoting the rule of law in post-conflict states: Justice in many rooms (Cambridge University Press 2013) and Australian Public Law (with Alex Reilly, Gabrielle Appleby and Wendy Lacey, Oxford University Press 2011).
In this paper, I will explore the concept of relationality and the relevance of it for law. My focus is on law relating to mental capacity, best interests and dementia, as this provides a useful conceptual testing ground for understandings of relationality. The experience of dementia care casts a spotlight on the conceptual and practical limitations of the isolated individual as the subject of law, because of the complex web of social interconnection required to care for and support a person living with dementia to live well. The aim of this paper is to provide a conceptual overview of how taking a relational approach to understanding everyday life can bring greater clarity and nuance to law. I will argue that there are three competing approaches to relationality that have developed in the academic literature: relationality as care ethics; relationality as constraint; and relationality as interpersonal context. A fourth approach has recently begun to emerge: relationality as a lens, focused on interwoven dynamics of everyday life, and it is this approach that I seek to develop as a concept focused on the interconnected nature of life. As such, I will argue that taking a relational approach to law would provide us with a more nuanced legal subject. As well as outlining the conceptual potential of relationality, I also seek to explore the limitations of it, and address some of the potential challenges that a relational approach to life and law would inevitably sustain.

Dr Rosie Harding is Senior Lecturer in Law at the University of Birmingham. Her research explores the place of law in everyday life with a particular focus on legal consciousness studies, resistance and equality struggles. Her primary interests are in regulation and recognition of caring and intimate relationships. Her current research project is focused on the experiences of people living with dementia and those who care for them in navigating the complex regulatory systems surrounding health and social care, mental capacity and powers of attorney. She is currently working on a book project exploring these issues. Her first book, *Regulating Sexuality* won the 2011 Hart-SLSA Book Prize and Early Career Prize. Rosie is principal investigator for the AHRC ReValuing Care research network (www.revaluingcare.net).
The Soup Kitchen as a “Space of Care”: Ideas of Care Emerging from the Westminster Byelaw Proposal

Caroline Hunter

York Law School, University of York
caroline.hunter@york.ac.uk

Soup runs have been described as “spaces of care” (Johnsen et al, 2005) i.e. “socio-spatial field[s] disclosed through practices of care that take place between individuals” (Conradson, 2003, p. 508). However, they are often viewed negatively by both local residents and local authorities. In particular government policy has been at odds with the “non-interventionist and accepting ethos typical of soup runs” (Johnsen et al, 2005, p. 333). In March 2011, Westminster City Council started a consultation on a byelaw which would have outlawed both rough sleeping and soup runs in an area around Westminster Cathedral. The proposal sparked a polarised response from residents’ groups who supported the byelaws and from those who organised the soup runs. Other NGOs working with the homeless, while resisting the byelaw outlawing rough sleeping, were more ambivalent about the soup kitchen byelaw. Contrasting the views of the Council that the needs of rough sleeper for food “are best met by encouraging the use of indoor services, where people can be looked after and supported with dignity” (Westminster Council, 2011) and others who supported the byelaw with those who resisted its implementation, this paper will analyse how the idea of “care” for the street homeless was constructed by those involved.

Caroline Hunter is Professor of Law at York Law School, University of York. Her research interests focus on the interaction of law, policy and practice, particularly in relation to housing and anti-social behaviour. She has recently completed an ESRC funded project looking at the use of medical evidence in homelessness cases which is part of a larger project with Dr Helen Carr considering the governance of the homeless which will be part of a book entitled: Governing the homeless: law, governance and plurality at the margins.
THE POLITICS OF EMOTION AND AFFECTIVE CITIZENSHIP: SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR GOVERNMENT RECOGNITION OF CARING RELATIONSHIPS

Carol Johnson

University of Adelaide
carol.johnson@adelaide.edu.au

This paper argues that the politics of emotion plays a significant role in influencing which caring relationships are recognised by government. In other words, the politics of care is implicated in regimes of affective citizenship. Which emotions are recognised by government as legitimate or illegitimate influences constructions of citizen identity and resulting rights and entitlements. Such recognition also has implications for issues of embodiment and the politics of touch (as physical manifestations of emotion). The paper draws on examples from Australia, the UK and the US with a particular focus on the implications of issues of gender and sexuality for the politics of care.

Carol Johnson is a Professor of Politics at the University of Adelaide. Her previous work on Affective Citizenship, the politics of emotion and the politics of touch has been published in journals such as Citizenship Studies, Sexualities, Theory & Society and Australian Feminist Studies.
SOCIAL INTERCONNECTION IN DEMENTIA CARE

Elizabeth Peel

University of Worcester
e.peel@worc.ac.uk (email before 1 July, e.a.peel@aston.ac.uk)

In this paper I draw on the ‘Dementia Talking’ corpus of 45 hours of video data collected from three distinct yet complimentary British settings: a specialist dementia care home; people with dementia’s own homes; and a GP-based memory service. In so doing, I explore how discursive (and non-discursive) acts of ‘feeling’, ‘touch’ and ‘emotion’ are constructed and interact to position the person living with a dementia as with, or without, ‘capacity’. I argue that social interconnectedness can be usefully interrogated at the micro-level of everyday practice; and that these mundane practices combine to shape, contest and (re)value broader regulatory forces.

Elizabeth Peel is Professor of Psychology & Social Change in the Institute of Health and Society, University of Worcester, UK. She is a social, critical, feminist, (often) qualitative psychologist who has conducted research on a range of sexualities and health topics, especially diversity training, same sex relationships, and type 2 diabetes. Her co-edited book Out in Psychology won the APA Div 44 Distinguished Book Award 2007, and she won the BPS Psychology of Sexualities Section Outstanding Academic Writing Award 2012. Her latest co-authored textbook LGBTQ Psychology was published by CUP in 2010, and she is on the Editorial Board of five journals. Since 2010 her research has focused on dementia care. The first project was ‘Duties to Care: A socio-legal exploration of caring for people with dementia’ (2010-12, with Rosie Harding, University of Birmingham UK). Her second project was supported by a British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship ‘Dementia Talking: Care, conversation and communication’ (2011-12). More information about both projects can be found at: www.dementiaproject.net<http://www.dementiaproject.net>
EXPERIENCES OF THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE NEXUS AMONGST A DIVERSE SAMPLE OF AUSTRALIAN FAMILIES

Damien W. Riggs
Flinders University

To date, families formed through heterosex have remained the norm within Australian policy and legislation, despite the rapid growth of a diverse range of families formed through other means and with different familial configurations. Whilst attention has increasingly been paid to such family diversity, it still remains at the margins of understandings of Australian families. This paper reports on semi-structured interviews undertaken in 2011-2012 with 75 Australian families, differentiated by mode of family formation (heterosex, assisted reproductive technologies, offshore surrogacy, foster care, and adoption) and family form (heterosexual couples, lesbian couples, gay couples, and single parents). A comparative thematic analysis was undertaken exploring differences between family forms and modes of family formation. Adopting a social constructionist framework, the analysis sought to identify how different cohorts understood ‘family’, how this shaped their decisions about family formation, and what this can tell us both about general norms in relation to Australian families, in addition to how this is enacted within specific family cohorts. Findings suggest that awareness of the role of the state is differentiated by mode of family formation, with those formed through heterosex having far less of an understanding of state influence and control than other modes of family formation. There was a general tendency across most family forms to adopt a relatively normative approach to understanding family. Non-normative approaches to understanding the rights and needs of children tended to arise when interviewees were able to perceive the difference between their own needs and desires as adults, and the needs and desires of the children they were raising. That this was primarily the case in the examples of parents raising children to whom they are not genetically related suggests both the dominance of genetics as a narrative that subsumes individual difference, whilst at the same time highlighting how discussions of kinship and relatedness may engender awareness of the ways in which claims to family can operate to open up or close down understandings of difference.

Dr Damien Riggs is a senior lecturer in social work at Flinders University, where he teaches in the areas of child and family wellbeing, gender/sexuality, and mental health. He is the author of over 100 publications in these areas, including What about the Children! Masculinities, sexualities and hegemony (Cambridge Scholars Press, 2010).
BETWEEN PLUCKY SELF SUFFICIENCY AND DESPAIR AND DESPONDENCY: OLDER GAY MEN’S VIEWS ON A LIFE IN CARE
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Based on interviews with 25 gay men aged 60 and above, this paper examines the narratives gay men draw on when speaking of the type of care they think they might need in old age. The non-representative sample of gay men was recruited in Auckland, London, Manchester, Melbourne, and New York as part of a larger research project and comprises six men in their 80s, nine men in their 70s, and 10 men in their 60s. The care narratives the men in their 80s drew on varied between an absence of serious concern for the future, with no real evidence of planning, and, on the other hand, a heightened anxiety about having to live in old age accommodation. In a number of cases, the men who expressed concern about institutional care specifically related it to having (a) to live in female-dominated environments and/or (b) to return to the closet because of heterosexist values they feared would prevail in retirement homes. A strong theme of self sufficiency ran through the narratives of the men in their 60s and 70s reflecting a pragmatic approach to life, as well as a degree of denial in relation to what old age would bring. All the men were living independently at the time of interview.

Dr Peter Robinson is a Lecturer in Sociology at Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne. His first book, The Changing World of Gay Men was published in 2008 (Palgrave Macmillan) and won the inaugural Raewyn Connell prize for the best first book in Australian Sociology. His research interests include ageing, sexuality, and social justice. His second book, Gay Men’s Relationship Stories Across the Life Course, which is due for release in July 2013 (also with Palgrave Macmillan) draws on interviews with 97 men from Australia, England, Hong Kong, India, New Zealand, and the United States.
Contemporary democratic processes – real and imagined – often rely on public deliberation and reasoning. It is argued that such public participation can increase the democratic legitimacy of decision-making, manifest collective agency, and can provide a cognitive gain as decision-making is opened up to a greater range of knowledge’s. Such imagined gains have driven developments in policy making and theorizing about health and health care. From localised priority setting through to national policy consultation, there is an increasing reliance on health-talk. Further, and the focus for this paper, contemporary models of social justice have increasingly recognised the importance of health and have mobilised health-talk in their ‘operating plans’. Health-talk is, however, far from unencumbered. Public discussion regarding health is structured by a complex and interrelated network of factors. It is influenced by individual health status, social connectedness, institutional discourses and practices, professionalization, corporate power, and so forth. These factors effect our embodiment, our embodied understandings of health, and the parameters and possibilities of health-talk. This paper cautions that we must attend to these factors, and the processes they provoke, if the future spaces that we imagine in our pursuit of social justice are to be effective.

Attempting to address this, I bring together two rather different theoretical enterprises. First, I turn to the work of Helga Nowotny, Peter Scott and Michael Gibbons, who have argued that we need to restructure the space within which we reason about science (including the health sciences) if we are to have a more productive relationship between science and society. Nowotny and her colleagues are the architects of a contemporary agora which they see as essential for a more socially robust science. The authors recognise, however, that they have constructed a largely asocial and apolitical space. In addressing this, I consider whether Christine Beasley and Carol Bacchi’s idea of social flesh can politicise this space, allowing us to better recognise the encumbered nature of health-talk and more effectively secure and promote health. I argue that a socially robust and just approach to health is possible if we import into the contemporary agora their concept of social flesh, a political intervention that aims to foreground and account for our intersubjective embodiment. In mobilizing Beasley and Bacchi’s ethical ideal, I argue for it to be an essential component in our public deliberation about health.
Michael Thomson is Professor of Law at the University of Leeds. He is a health care lawyer with a particular interest in gender, decision-making with children, and the place of health in contemporary models of social justice. His publications include *Endowed: Regulating the Male Sexed Body* (Routledge, 2008) and (with Martha Fineman) *Exploring Masculinities: Feminist Legal Theory Reflections* (Ashgate, 2013). His current projects include exploring understandings of bodily integrity in legal reasoning and the utility of Amartya Sen’s capabilities approach as an evaluative tool in best interests assessments.
AUSTRALIAN RURAL YOUNG PEOPLE WHO CARE FOR A FAMILY MEMBER WITH PHYSICAL OR MENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS: CAN RESEARCH BETTER REFLECT THE INTERESTS OF YOUNG CARERS?

Lester Watson
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This paper draws upon a current doctoral research project that is exploring the experiences of children and teenagers in rural Australia who provide primary care to family members with physical and mental health problems. Adopting a poststructural perspective, the paper firstly reflects upon the processes of deinstitutionalisation and normalisation of care in the home and the consequences of this for children as carers. It then asks some questions of current young carer research that has been driven by a social justice agenda to act in the interests of young carers, but derives problematically from the construction of children in Western society as innocent, partially competent and vulnerable. It argues that in this same cultural context young carer research has been predominantly adult-designed, adult-led and conceived from an adult perspective, and hence reflects adult-centered interpretations and agendas. The paper discusses this socially constructed nature of childhood in terms of a Foucauldian-type genealogy and the roles of developmental psychology and the psy-complex, which are brought together with a children’s rights perspective to propose a new approach to research that can develop a young carer’s ‘standpoint’ – one that collaborates with young carers in the development of the research design, methods, and issues to be examined, and provides them with the opportunity to stimulate their own terms of participation. The paper will present reflections on the PhD research which is currently ongoing and collaborating with young carers.

Lester Watson is a doctoral candidate in the School of Psychology at the Charles Sturt University, Australia. He has worked for more than three decades in various arms of the Australian Government. His qualifications include an Honours degree in psychology from Charles Sturt University and a political science degree from the Australian National University.
A central feature of care in the fourth age is the medicalisation of ageing bodies, the emphasis on collective bodily care and the power dynamics involved in that care. An aspect of these dynamics that has not yet been explored is the intersection of age, gender and sexuality in the provision of personal care in residential settings for older people. Single, childless, older women are most likely to populate these settings. These women are also more likely to be lesbians, both because older lesbians and gay men are earlier and disproportionate users of formal social care, and because older lesbians are more likely than older heterosexual women to be single and childless. Lesbians have often found the processes of self-disclosure in health contexts a treacherous terrain to navigate in earlier life, many avoiding screening/treatment and/or choosing not to disclose their sexual identities to medical professionals, particularly during intimate physical examinations. Some younger(er) lesbians also report feeling vulnerable to the heteronormative gaze in those gay commercial contexts frequented by heterosexual women. This paper explores the overlap between these two sites of vulnerability, considering how older lesbians experience the heteronormative gaze in residential care contexts, focussing in particular on the experience of being bathed. It considers how sexuality impacts the dynamics of care work and how the physical frailties and cognitive/communicative impairments associated with the fourth age may impinge upon the capacity of older lesbians to resist heteronormativity in care contexts, thus complicating the gender politics of personal care in older age.

Sue Westwood has qualifications in gerontology, law and gender, sexuality and human rights. A freelance trainer, researcher, organisational consultant, and occasional tutor at the Law School at Keele University, Sue is also about to complete a PhD in Law at Keele. Her research explores equality issues in relation to older people with lesbian, gay and bisexual identities, from a feminist socio-legal perspective.
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