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The Acting Head of the Department of Political Science welcomes you to the second edition of Tavistock Times for 2014–15.

Happy New Year to everyone at the School of Public Policy. There are more of us than ever with over thirty academic staff, a strong cohort of professional services staff and a great mix of home, EU and international students across our nine masters programmes, our research degrees and our undergraduate modules. At the undergraduate level, there is increasing pressure on places on our modules as a range of degree programmes from the humanities to engineering see the value of understanding the political dimensions of global and local challenges.

The academic year got off to a good start. In October, UCL’s Vice Provost International, Dame Nicola Brewer, invited one of our masters students in public policy to join the University’s Global Engagement Executive Group (GEEG). Sahil Tandon was the top applicant in the competition for appointment to the committee. Sahil took an undergraduate degree in Economics in New Delhi, India and is interested in working with rights-based development and policy making in the future.

In November, in a letter to Provost Michael Arthur from the Director of the Nuffield Foundation, Dr Jennifer van Heerde-Hudson and Dr Slava Mikhailov and the Institute of Education’s Professor John Micklewright were congratulated on the progress of the new QStep Centre. Funded by Nuffield, the Higher Education Funding Council and the ESRC, the QStep Centre aims to advance undergraduate quantitative social science and is a core component of the Department’s new PPE degree launching in 2015–2016.

In the political theory seminar series, students engage with the work of established scholars in the field. Visiting speakers regularly comment on the high quality of feedback acquired through this form of student-led ‘philosophy in the lab’ – a unique feature of political theory at UCL. In parallel, the Centre for Religion and Political Theory has a series of high-profile public lectures, confirming UCL’s newly acquired visibility as the hub for the study of political philosophy and religion in the UK and beyond.

The very well-attended Policy and Practice Seminar Series has been the venue for topical talks ranging from the National Health Service, devolution and the English Question, the principles of non-violent protest to why the public prefers to ignore climate change. This seminar series has now established itself as serving not just our own Department but a much broader community. It attracts a wide and diverse audience from across UCL and beyond. We have an exciting line-up for term two.

Finally, as term two begins I would like to say how pleased I am to welcome Dr Jonathan Monten to SPP. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of international relations, international security and U.S. foreign policy. His recent piece in International Security is on foreign-imposed regime change and democracy.

I wish you all a happy and productive 2015!

Professor Neil Mitchell
Acting Head of the Department of Political Science
## 60 Second Interview

In this sixty second interview we quiz Dr Tim Hicks, Lecturer in Public Policy and PPE Programme Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your name?</th>
<th>Tim Hicks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When did you join UCL?</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your responsibilities in the Department?</td>
<td>I’m the Director of the new Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE) undergraduate programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you particularly like and dislike about your job?</td>
<td>I very much like the freedom my job gives me. Freedom to choose what I research and also, within reason, when and where I work. I dislike grading but I guess everyone says that so I’ll say that I dislike a feature of the academic role that it never occurred to me would be so prominent: judging people. I do it for admissions, grading, reference letters, reviewing for publishers, department hiring etc. I seem to do it a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your favourite book?</td>
<td>To answer a related question, the book I’d take if stranded on a desert island would be “Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your favourite book?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your hobbies?</td>
<td>I remember when I used to play tennis and like it. Other than compulsive news reading and coffee shop loitering, I guess running is the main sporting activity of mine, at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would your ideal afternoon/evening in London include?</td>
<td>A sun-drenched 10km run in less than 40 minutes (which I’ve never managed, of course). A play at the National Theatre. Sushi for dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had not gone into academia what would you be doing now?</td>
<td>Some kind of management consultancy, I suppose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could implement one policy in the world today, what would it be?</td>
<td>I would very much like to see more policies promoting collaborations among public, private, non-profit and citizens in the provision of public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most inspirational person that you have met whilst at UCL?</td>
<td>Inspirational? That’s a bit strong for a Brit, isn’t it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourite location in UCL?</td>
<td>Not strictly a UCL location but you’ll often find me at Continental Stores coffee shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had not gone into academia what would you be doing now?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would your ideal afternoon/evening in London include?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your name?</td>
<td>Tim Hicks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When did you join UCL?</td>
<td>Summer 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your responsibilities in the Department?</td>
<td>I’m the Director of the new Philosophy, Politics and Economics (PPE) undergraduate programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you particularly like and dislike about your job?</td>
<td>I very much like the freedom my job gives me. Freedom to choose what I research and also, within reason, when and where I work. I dislike grading but I guess everyone says that so I’ll say that I dislike a feature of the academic role that it never occurred to me would be so prominent: judging people. I do it for admissions, grading, reference letters, reviewing for publishers, department hiring etc. I seem to do it a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your favourite book?</td>
<td>To answer a related question, the book I’d take if stranded on a desert island would be “Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your hobbies?</td>
<td>I remember when I used to play tennis and like it. Other than compulsive news reading and coffee shop loitering, I guess running is the main sporting activity of mine, at the moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What would your ideal afternoon/evening in London include?</td>
<td>A sun-drenched 10km run in less than 40 minutes (which I’ve never managed, of course). A play at the National Theatre. Sushi for dinner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had not gone into academia what would you be doing now?</td>
<td>Some kind of management consultancy, I suppose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could implement one policy in the world today, what would it be?</td>
<td>I would very much like to see more policies promoting collaborations among public, private, non-profit and citizens in the provision of public services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jayson Browder, a student in our Executive Master of Public Administration in Global Public Policy and Management, has been named a prestigious Carnegie New Leader by the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs. He joins a select group of future public service leaders in the international field who will develop their skills through seminars, formal events, online dialogue and analysis opportunities. The fellows also will have access to a platform to promote ethics in the global issues in which they are involved.

For Browder, a highly accomplished military veteran, the Carnegie New Leaders fellowship complements the courses he’s taking at NYU Wagner this term, “as well as the core values Wagner instils in all its students,” he explained. He is thrilled to join an esteemed community of business professionals, policy makers, social innovators and scholars who are changing the way global ethics are approached in the 21st century.

Browder is currently an MPA candidate in the joint Global Executive MPA degree programme of NYU Wagner and UCL School of Public Policy. He is a multi-decorated U.S. Air Force and Iraq veteran and a U.S. Fulbright Scholar. While serving as a Fulbright Scholar, he was assigned as a U.S. Cultural Ambassador to Turkey with the goal of promoting cross-cultural awareness. Additionally, he served as an adjunct academic faculty member, providing research on the Syrian conflict, Turkish and Iranian relations and U.S. foreign policy at Bayburt University.

He previously served as a legislative assistant for Military Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives and as an adjunct junior fellow at the American Security Project. His analysis on national security and foreign policy issues has been published in numerous media and think tank organisations such as Asia Times, NPR, Foreign Policy Journal, the Partnership for a Secure America and the Truman National Security Project. He holds a BA in Sociology and Latin American Studies from Fordham University.

You can find more information about our EMPA programme and scholarships available by visiting our website at www.ucl.ac.uk/spp/teaching
DOES PARLIAMENT MATTER?

On 9 October 2014, Professor Meg Russell gave a UCL Lunch Hour Lecture on ‘Does Parliament Matter?’

Many people dismiss the Westminster parliament as an ineffective ‘talking shop’ and similar allegations are commonplace about parliaments in other democracies but based on substantial research Meg Russell argues that Westminster is influential – and almost certainly increasingly so. Her lecture seeks to dispel some common misconceptions about how parliamentary institutions work, in the UK and beyond.

View the video of the lecture here:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KKVuOAUVNnl&list=PL3pa6ekyhIt2rdDzsF3JtUs3djBe2MF&index=2

Further information on the UCL Lunch Hour Lecture Series can be found at:
http://events.ucl.ac.uk/calendar/tab:lunch_hour_lectures

PATHWAYS TO EU REFORM

Pathways to EU Reform is the first in a series of policy panels on Britain & Europe, hosted by UCL’s European Institute.

Ever since David Cameron’s Bloomberg Speech in January 2013, the question of EU reform has been high on the political agenda. Yet, while we know that the Prime Minister’s support for continuing British membership will be conditional upon the Union’s substantive reform, we know little about how such reform could be achieved. This question is acute, given that governments’ willingness across Europe to back Cameron’s agenda – as expressed in the June 2014 European Council Conclusions – contrasts starkly with their reluctance to launch a full-fledged Intergovernmental Conference to re-open the EU’s Treaties.

Our panel brings together experts on British and EU politics, constitutional law and media coverage to explore the political, constitutional and legislative possibilities for reform; to discuss each route’s advantages and challenges; and to ask how different options can translate into a coherent political strategy – in negotiation with Britain’s European partners and eventually, in communication with Britain’s electorate.

The event is co-organised by the Centre for European Reform and will take place on Wednesday, 21 January 2015, 5:45 – 7:30pm at UCL’s Bloomsbury Campus (AV Hill Lecture Theatre).

Speakers are:
Wolfgang Blau (Director of Digital Strategy, The Guardian), Richard Corbett (MEP, former adviser to the European Council), Deirdre Curtin (Professor of European Law, University of Amsterdam) and Charles Grant (Director, Centre for European Reform).
UNDERGRADUATE – AFFILIATE PROGRAMME NEWS

AS THE SUN SETS—An Affiliate Student’s Take on a Term in London

Zak Harvey, UCL Department of Political Science Affiliate Student (2014-15) writes:

When studying in a new country one often finds themself looking for something that reminds them of their home state or their home university—a constant of sorts. A constant could be as simple as how the sky at night looks or the melodic humming of traffic outside your window. For me this constant is a sunset. No matter if I was on a train from Sintra to Lisbon or skirting between cars near Westminster, as the sun was setting it made me turn to the west and think of home.

Throughout all my travels across Europe and throughout the city of London, nothing has been more calming or beautiful than the soft glow of a sunset as it embraces the city. A sunset for me also serves as a reminder of time. Though three months in a country—spending time away from the comforts of home—may seem like an eternity, I can personally attest that it is not. During my time in London I consistently thought to myself that I wish I had just a little bit more time to take it all in. Whether it meant going to another park, another market or going to one more museum, time was always an ever present factor. That being said, it was a busy a term.

During the course of my study here at UCL I had been able to put practice in the classroom into action in the city. Dr James Melton had arranged trips to tour Parliament as well as the Supreme Court for the Affiliate students. While at Westminster we went to a workshop on the legislative process. A key distinction to the British legislative process that struck me was the nuance of the role of the monarch in the government. Coming from the United States we often appreciate the celebrity of the monarchs but going to Westminster gave me the opportunity to appreciate the legacy of the royals being intertwined in the governance of the nation. Being able to walk through the halls of Westminster and listening to the MPs debate in their respective chambers was truly magnificent in its own right. The ornate designs of the committee rooms and of Westminster Hall were truly stunning.

The Supreme Court albeit a much more recent addition to British political institutions gave me a different perspective on British politics in comparison to Westminster. The Supreme Court to me served as an important reminder that politics is a living and breathing entity. Politicians come and go, laws are passed and struck down and institutions can be demolished or created. It is in the creation of the Supreme Court that I find the intricate beauty in the study of political science. The Court is the manifestation of a collaboration of people effecting a change to make Britain a better place.

From Parliament, to the London Eye, to Regents Park and to Buckingham Palace, many of the quintessential landmarks left me with impactful and memorable experiences during my time abroad. Although the sun may be setting on my time here at UCL, there is little doubt that my time here as an Affiliate student has been rewarding, it has been challenging but most importantly it has been transforming. With a few more places to visit and new friends to say goodbye to, it is just two short weeks left at my new home in London.
All masters students within the Department of Political Science are required to complete a 10,000 word dissertation as part of their degree. This is an integral part of the degree and gives students the opportunity to use the wide range of skills that they have developed during their studies to complete an original piece of research that demonstrates that they have mastered and can make a contribution to, their field of study. Dissertations produced by our students are often of a very high standard and can be the beginnings of work that can be published. As a result the Department wishes to recognise academic excellence and so has a ‘Best Dissertation’ Prize for each of our eight Masters programmes. The prize is awarded to the student who receives the top confirmed mark for the current academic year for each masters programme.

The 2013/14 ‘Best Dissertation’ Prize Winners and their titles were:

**MA Human Rights**
Erin Mee
How Do Britain’s Older Carers Experience Their Human Rights?

**MA Legal and Political Theory**
Bruce Easop
Securing the Social Bases of Self Respect: An Equality-Based Test for Religious Exemptions to Anti-Discrimination Laws.

**MSc Democracy and Comparative Politics**
John Macartney
The relationship between developing countries electoral systems and social protection policies.

**MSc European Public Policy**
Philipp Schroeder
Making conditionality work? Actor Socialisation through Network Governance in the European Neighbourhood

**MSc Global Governance and Ethics**
Anna Wienhues
International hazardous waste trade: What does justice demand?

**MSc International Public Policy**
Mark Lawmon

**MSc Public Policy**
James Yarde
Of the people, by the people, for the people? A study of party-positional responses to voter cues at elections.

**MSc Security Studies**
Sarah Leo
Are Covert Drones Backfiring?

Mark, Philipp, Anna and Sarah introduce their research in the following abstracts

**Mark Lawmon**
MSc International Public Policy Student, 2013–14

Do Western-Educated Leaders Matter? Examining the Effect of Foreign Education on African Leaders’ Human Rights Practices

Looking at the first level of analysis, research has firmly established that leaders matter across a range of issues. An ongoing trend of empirical studies has further evidenced that more highly-educated leaders impart even greater effects on policy outcomes. Continuing in a similar vein, this paper investigates the relationship between the foreign higher education of African leaders and their human rights practices.

I hypothesise not only that highly-educated leaders will exhibit better practices than those without higher education but that primarily as a result of norm assimilation, Western-educated leaders will have the best human rights records. Utilising an original dataset covering 163 African leaders from 1981 to 2010 and a battery of quantitative methods, I find, however, that neither highly-educated leaders in general nor Western-educated leaders significantly improve human rights. Moreover, there is some evidence to suggest that highly-educated leaders may even impart a detrimental impact on human rights.

I discuss issues of societal tension and unstable democratisation as potential explanations for these unexpected results. On the whole, it appears that state and system-level factors constrain the individual and are consistently more meaningful determinants of a state’s human rights abuses.

**Philipp Schroeder**
MSc European Public Policy Student, 2013–14

Making Conditionality Work? Actor Socialisation through Network Governance in the European Neighbourhood

The absence of a credible membership perspective for the EU’s neighbouring countries comprised by the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) and the corresponding gloomy prospects for the successful application of EU political conditionality have been repeatedly highlighted as determining factors for the ENP’s poor record in affecting change in the EU’s neighbours. In the light of nonetheless existing instances of compliance with EU rules in ENP countries, this study argues that cooperation between the EU and ENP countries departs from hierarchical modes of governance characterising EU-candidate country cooperation and more closely resembles the features of network governance.

Acknowledging that the offer of incentives in return for compliance with EU objectives is not absent in the framework of the ENP it is argued that the application of conditionality in the ENP is only successful...
If functional cooperation within networks comprising EU officials and actors in ENP countries’ administrations favours the socialisation of the latter into embracing the EU’s norms and values, in turn lowering reservations against reform along EU objectives.

The study makes use of a newly compiled panel dataset on EU cooperation projects in 15 ENP countries over the period 2005–2013. It applies fixed- and random-effects regression analyses to examine the effects of variation in the novelty of ENP countries’ institutional structures implementing EU cooperation projects, the intensity of cooperation between EU officials and ENP country administrations, the coherence of the EU’s approach to promoting its rules, as well as policy areas’ varying degrees of politicisation on compliance prospects for EU rules on the rule of law and energy diversification in ENP countries.

Controlling for country-specific time-invariant effects, auto-correlation, administrative capacity, as well as influences from other international actors, results of the analyses suggest that of all the included independent variables, only variation in ENP countries’ administrative structures implementing EU cooperation projects matters, with actors employed in novel administrative structures being more likely to act as key agents in promoting the application of EU rules in their domestic context.

Anna Wienhues
MSc Global Governance and Ethics Student 2013–14

International hazardous waste trade: What does justice demand?

This paper looks at international trade in hazardous waste from an environmental justice perspective in the context of global justice. From the starting point of pluralist internationalism, mainly two grounds of justice apply to this case: the ‘common habitation of the Earth’ and ‘subjection to the global trading system’.

From these grounds follow several principles of justice. It is argued that an egalitarian principle of justice follows from the ‘common habitation of the Earth’ ground; namely, that each individual is entitled to an equal share of ecological space.

Considerations about fair trade fall primarily under the ‘subjection to the global trading system’ ground of justice. Here it is argued, in part, that one requirement for trade to be fair is that trade gains are not enjoyed due to the exploitation of the desperate financial situation or authoritative political system of the selling country.

When applied to hazardous waste trade from developed to developing countries these principles have several implications.

Firstly, the developed country has a duty to reduce its waste production and to support—financially and technologically—the developing country due to the risks entailed in dealing with hazards.

Secondly, the developed country has an entitlement to transfer some of its waste to another country if and only if, its territory is not ‘large’ enough to provide its fair share of ecological space (which takes here the more specific form of pollution absorption capacity).

Thirdly, if the developed country has no such entitlement, then, depending on whether the developing country sells some ‘spare’ ecological space or some of its own ecological space entitlements, there are several implications. In both cases, procedural fairness regarding international trade rules and rule making needs to be in place.

In the former case, development support needs to be provided for the developing country if it is in financially desperate circumstances. Furthermore, the developing country’s political system must grant its citizens some minimal possibilities to influence the decision to trade in hazardous waste. In the latter case, the developing country cannot be in any financially desperate situation and it needs to have a democratic political system.

In conclusion, from a global justice perspective hazardous waste trade does not need prohibition. Rather depending on the circumstances of the trade partners several requirements need to be met for the trade to be fair.

Sarah Leo
MSc Security Studies Student 2013–14

Are Covert Drones Backfiring?

The deployment of armed drones outside of armed conflict, as a weapon of counterterrorism, has increased dramatically in the last decade. In particular, the covert drone campaigns led by the US in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, have caused loud outcries, not only from civil society and the public but also from experts within the UN and governments. It is a strategy shrouded in secrecy with thin evidence of its effectiveness.

In this paper, I theorise that the use of covert drones outside of armed conflict is an ineffective strategy in counterterrorism and may lead to an increase in terrorist activity. The hypotheses of this paper will be tested through a geospatial analysis of drone strikes in Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia, by comparing the occurrence of a terrorist attack, its severity and casualty numbers before and after a drone strike, both on a national, as well as a grid-cell level.

This study concludes that the use of drones in counterterrorism do not indicate a decrease in terrorist activity. In all three countries, drones seem to increase the likelihood of an attack, both on a national as well as on a local level. While not all results of the nationwide analysis were statistically significant, the grid-cell analysis has shown an increase in the likelihood of a terrorist incident in all three countries. In Pakistan and Yemen, the estimates indicate an increase in both the severity of terrorist attacks as well as the number of fatalities caused in these incidents. Drone strikes seem to decrease the severity of attacks and resultant number of fatalities in Somalia, however, the more people die in drone strikes the further terrorist activity is heightened. Generally, on a grid cell level, it can be witnessed that an increasing number of drone deaths, lead to an increase in attack likelihood, severity and number of fatalities caused.
INTERNATIONAL PANEL ON SOCIAL PROGRESS AT UCL

UCL's Institute for Global Governance is a key partner in a new major international initiative, the International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP).

The International Panel on Social Progress (IPSP) is gathering hundreds of experts worldwide, with the aim of producing a report on the state of social progress by 2017. This report will review the state-of-the art knowledge accumulated in all relevant social sciences and in the process organise a global debate with decision-makers, actors and all interested citizens. The final report will be addressed to all social actors, movements, organisations, politicians and decision-makers, with the aim to provide them with the best expertise on questions that bear on global social change. IPSP is fully independent from political parties, governments and organisations with a partisan agenda. While IPSP will primarily work for the dissemination of knowledge to all relevant actors in society, it also aims to foster research on the topics it will study and help to revive interest for research in social long-term prospective analysis.

The themes covered by the Panel are wide-ranging and include:

- Democracy and Citizenship
- Poverty, Inequality and Well-Being
- Global Risks, Resources
- Markets, Finance and Corporations
- Private and Public Governance
- The Future of Work
- Violence, Peace and Security
- Global Health
- Religions and Secularisms
- Gender-Family-Reproduction-Sexuality
- Urban Issues, Urban-Rural Relations
- Education, Communication and Media

Four cross-cutting themes will, in addition, be woven through the report:

1. Technology and Innovation,
2. Globalisation,
3. Social Movements,
4. Identity/Community.

The Panel has an Honorary Advisory Committee, a Steering Committee, a Scientific Council and a Secretariat. The composition of the Committees reflects the various disciplinary and regional components of global social research. The Honorary Advisory Committee is composed of distinguished moral and intellectual leaders who have lent their support to the panel. The Committee is chaired by Professor Amartya Sen, recipient of the Nobel Prize in economics and renowned scholar and intellectual. The Steering Committee is composed of a dozen scholars of diverse origins and disciplines, who combine first-rate scholarship and experience in research management. It makes the general strategic decisions, selects the co-chairs of the Scientific Council and with the co-chairs, selects the members of the Scientific Council, who are world recognised experts in anthropology, economics, demography, geography, history, management, philosophy, political science, psychology and sociology.

The work of the IPSP can be followed at www.ip-socialprogress.org

UCL's Institute for Global Governance is the only UK-based IPSP partner, in close association with the School of Public Policy. The IGG builds on UCL's track record as a recognised global leader in cross-disciplinary scholarship and research and engages with policy-makers, practitioners, civil society and other actors to promote informed public debate on possible solutions to global societal challenges. Its key research themes (global justice and equity, global economy, global institutional change and democracy, global security and global environmental sustainability) directly relate to the concerns of IPSP.

The IGG will host the IPSP Political Science Authors' meeting in 2016. This will draw on UCL's considerable expertise in the areas covered by the report. Colleagues in SPP will be closely associated to this initiative at all stages and will play a key role in the drafting of the report.

Watch this space!

Professor Cécile Laborde
IPSP Steering Committee member
and Professor of Political Theory, UCL Department of Political Science

Dr Tom Pegram
IGG Deputy Director and Lecturer in Global Governance, UCL Department of Political Science
When in a gallery, the average person spends about three seconds looking at a piece of artwork before moving on. Those three seconds are deemed sufficient for us to grasp the essence of a painting, giving us time to assess our aesthetic reception, identify our personal stance and perhaps momentarily elaborate on a particularly striking feature of a painting or a sculpture. I must confess this was my generic approach towards artwork on my visits to galleries, one I am now ashamed of but after a workshop through my International Development and Public Policy (POLS6007A) module at Tate Britain organised by Dr Cathy Elliott (UCL Department of Political Science), my perception has changed dramatically.

As a fan of art, I was curious to see how development and politics were reflected in it. I anticipated an art collection aimed directly at development, perhaps a juxtaposition of representative images, paintings or collages from what is regarded as “developed” and “developing” countries. Instead, all I got was a stool, paper and a pencil.

“Look at this painting”, said Liz Ellis, a curator at Tate Britain, as she led us to The Iron Forge by Joseph Wright of Derby “and tell me your first impressions. What do you see as the most striking feature?” The colour – I thought to myself and did not give it much further thought. My coursemates, however, adapted a much more analytical approach. “The people seem very clean”, someone said. “There are books hidden in the corner.” Ideas began flowing and each shed a new light on the message of the painting. Suddenly I became aware that the author’s intention was not only to create a “nice” painting using careful brushstrokes and contrasting colours to attract attention; it was also to portray the necessity of a working class family and to elevate the beauty of their craft. Karen Knorr’s series Belgravia by is a beautiful collection of black and white images accompanied by clever, ironic captions. The lack of authentic humane elements represented in them sheds a shocking light on class and wealth during the beginning of Thatcherism.

In art, development is not expressed as an objective mathematical calculation but rather as an insider scope on how the notion of development is reflected in everyday lives and the variety of possibilities to express it is endless. An encouragement to first systematically parse an artwork and focus on each element separately before judging the entire product provided me with a more complex understanding of the entity, which is a truly rewarding experience.

I expected an exhibition that made us look critically at our misconceptions about development. These expectations have not only been fulfilled but by far exceeded so the next time you find yourself in a gallery, take a moment to delve deeper into a painting – you never know what you might discover!
CONFERENCE ON DE FACTO STATES

Dr Kristin M. Bakke, Senior Lecturer in Political Science, UCL Department of Political Science

On September 11 and 12, scholars, policymakers and practitioners working on and in so-called de facto states came together at UCL to discuss questions related to security and governance. The project grew out of Dr Kristin M. Bakke’s ESRC-funded project on “After the War Ends,” which investigates state-building in de facto states born out of violent struggles.

De facto states are discrete territorial regions that aspire to separate from the internationally recognised states that they are officially part of. As such, de facto states are sometimes referred to as “breakaway regions” by their “parent” states. De facto states possess domestic sovereignty in the sense that they control and administer most or all of the territory they claim (this is what makes them stand apart from other separatist regions) but de facto states do not have international legal recognition as states. Rather, they become unrecognised states or partially recognised states, entities denied international legal sovereignty by all or many members of the existing community of states.

Despite the lack of international legal recognition, many de facto states have proven to be remarkably enduring (think of Northern Cyprus and Taiwan). In the post-Soviet region, Abkhazia, Nagorno Karabakh, South Ossetia and Transdniestria have survived as unrecognized or partially recognized states since the early 1990s, as has Somaliland in Africa. In Asia, Tamil Eelam functioned like a de facto state from 1986 to 2009, when Sri Lankan forces regained control of the territory and in the Middle East, Iraqi Kurdistan has, more or less, functioned like a de facto state since 1991. Per one count (by Nina Caspersen and Gareth Stansfield), we have seen the emergence of 21 de facto states since World War II and recent events in eastern Ukraine, as well as IS(IS)’s emerging control in Iraq and Syria, have brought fore the question of whether we are witnessing new de facto states in the making.

De facto states are not, by definition, born out of violent struggles but most are, as existing states are generally reluctant to let part of their territory go without putting up a fight. As a result, both scholarly and policy interest in de facto states is often tied up with questions related to security, conflict resolution and post-war governance. The conference at UCL situated de facto states within these wider questions.

For a long time, neither scholars nor policymakers outside de facto states knew much about their inner workings. The assumption was often that these were unstable and crime-ridden entities. However, many de facto states have developed institutions of governance and provide public goods to the population within their boundaries. Like recognised states, they do so to varying degrees and an emerging body of work has begun to analyse these dynamics. From a policy perspective, regardless of whether one wants de facto states to be integrated into their parent states or gain full international recognition, an informed debate about how these political entities function and how they are (or are not) prepared for either integration or independent statehood is important. The fate of de facto states matter not only for the population within these entities and their parent states but for regional and international stability.

The UCL conference was organised around six panels, which addressed questions related to governance, security, the role of third parties, de facto states’ relationships to their neighbours and wider international community, displacement and human rights, as well as reconciliation. Each panel featured a mix of researchers, practitioners and policy-makers, to facilitate discussion among people who are interested in—and knowledgeable about—de facto states from different perspectives. The conference featured speakers working on and in several different de facto states and (post-)conflict situations—Abkhazia, Iraqi Kurdistan, Kosovo, Nagorno Karabakh, Transdniestria and Somaliland—and with expertise and experience related to governance, peace-building, mediation and conflict management, border changes, demographic changes, human rights and reconciliation.
The conference began with a discussion about governance, featuring a presentation based on comparative survey evidence from Abkhazia, Nagorno Karabakh, South Ossetia and Transdniestrria, by John O’Loughlin from the University of Colorado and Gerard Toal from Virginia Tech. Liana Kvarcheloya from the Center for Humanitarian Programs, an NGO based in Abkhazia, followed up with an insider perspective on governance in Abkhazia. Donnacha Ó Beacháín from Dublin City University provided an overview of election dynamics in the post-Soviet de facto states and Mira Sovakar from Conciliation Resources discussed the nexus between governance and peacebuilding.

The following panel addressed questions related to security. Kristin M. Bakke from UCL made an argument linking governance and security to internal legitimacy in the post-Soviet de facto states. Natella Akaba, Chair of the Public Chamber in Abkhazia, gave a presentation about the war in Abkhazia and its lingering effects and Tabib Huseynov from Saferworld discussed the tensions between security concerns and legitimacy in Abkhazia and Nagorno Karabakh. Professor Gareth Stansfield from the University of Exeter talked about the Kurdistan Region in Iraq and the ways in which the recent threat of ISIS has shaped the Kurdistan de facto state.

The first day of the conference ended with a panel on the role of third parties. Stefan Wolff from the University of Birmingham drew on both his research and practical experience in illustrating the challenges of mediation, concluding that mediation only works if the parties want it to work. Keith Shannon, Deputy Director of the Eastern Europe and Central Asia Directorate at the UK FCO, talked about his experience with mediation and contact programmes in Transdniestrria, based on his previous work as the UK Ambassador to Moldova. Roy Reeves, CMG, drew on his experience working for the OSCE and the EU, talking about the role of international governmental organisations in conflict management. Craig Oliphant from Saferworld concluded with a discussion about the role of confidence building from an NGO perspective.

The second day of the conference kicked off with a panel on de facto states’ relationships in the neighbourhood. Lee Seymour from the University of Amsterdam gave a presentation on the consequences of border changes, arguing that adherence to existing borders might be destabilising. Arda Inal-Ipa, from the Center for Humanitarian Programs in Abkhazia, gave an in-depth account of Abkhazia’s relationships to Russia, Turkey and Georgia, arguing for de-isolation. Azu Abdullayeva, Co-chair of the Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly in Baku, discussed the independent Civil Minsk Process and its role in conflict settlement in Nagorno Karabakh. Gentian Zyberi from the University of Oslo concluded the panel by talking about some of the challenges facing Kosovo, which is now recognised by nearly 110 states in the international system.

The second panel of the day addressed questions related to demography, displacement and human rights. Monica Duffy Toft from the University of Oxford gave a presentation on the relationship between demographic transitions and political conflict. Karen Ohanjanyan, Coordinator of the Nagorno-Karabakh Committee “Helsinki Initiative-92,” drew on his experience in discussing displacement, human rights and dialogue on the Nagorno Karabakh conflict and Juliet Schofield from International Alert gave the audience an in-depth account of developments related to demography, dependency and (de-)isolation in South Ossetia.

The conference concluded with a panel on dialogue and reconciliation. Melanie Garson from UCL discussed the relationship between reconciliation and the durability of peace agreements. Margarita Akhvlediani, Director of Go-Group Media in Tbilisi, drew on her experience in discussing practical observations with respect to reconciliation in the Georgian-Abkhaz context and Dmitri Gavrilov from the Information Resource Center “Common Home” in Tiraspol talked about his work on reconciliation in the Moldova-Transdniestrria context. Michael Walls from UCL gave a presentation about Somaliland, highlighting the role of clan relationships and dialogue. The panel concluded with a discussion of the role of civil society in moving forward the reconciliation process, by Rachel Cogg from Conciliation Resources.
On Thursday the 30th of October, Srdja Popovic, executive Director of CANVAS gave a talk at the School of Public Policy, as part of the Policy and Practice Seminar Series. Srdja Popovic was one of the founders and key organisers of the Serbian nonviolent resistance group Otpor! Otpor!’s campaign to unseat Serbian president Slobodan Milosevic found success in October 2000 when hundreds of thousands of protestors converged upon and took over the Serbian Parliament, effectively ending Milosevic’s rule. After the revolution, Popovic served a term as a member of the Serbian National Assembly 2000–2003. In 2003, Popovic and other ex-Otpor! activists started the nonprofit educational institution the Centre for Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies (CANVAS). CANVAS has worked with people from 37 countries, including Zimbabwe, Burma, Iran and Venezuela, spreading knowledge on nonviolent strategies and tactics that was used by the Serbian pro-democracy movement to other non-democratic countries.

Srdja Popovic was interviewed by Chris Rogers, MSc student at the School of Public Policy and IPPR’s Head of Editorial. You can find this and more by visiting IPPR’s blog at blogs.ucl.ac.uk/ippr/

Before you were engaged in non-violent action, what was your background?

I was engaged in a rock band and this was very anti-war and anti-establishment at the time Milosevic was building his nationalist case and then when I went to university I was engaged in the first year of my studies, which coincided with the first big student protest in 1992. In 1992 we cut our teeth and in 1996-7 we were leading movements after the stolen elections and in 2000 we won.

Was there an event that got you involved?

It was the mix of a few things: being a young person in Serbia in the 90s, and especially coming from this generation which remembered the good old days. You look and there is this crazy guy who gives you guns and says: “go to Croatia and kill people because they are Croats” and you say, “that’s what I am” and he says “no, you are a Serb” because nationalism didn’t really matter when I was a kid and it only started to matter when I was 18 or 19. This was a very schizophrenic situation for my generation so my generation was either sucked into war or forced to emigrate. This was the biggest brain drain in history – 200,000 young people left the country so for us it was more a matter of necessity than courage.

You were engaged in politics, what caused you to move on?

I was engaged in politics at a very young age. I was running for city council when I was 23 with the Democratic Party. I was also a member of the party of the Serbian opposition leader and probably one of the cleverest people I’ve ever met, Zoran Đinđić and I went into parliament in 2000 and served as his advisor but he was killed in 2003. He was my biggest positive inspiration and Milosevic was my biggest negative motivation. However, at this time he was in The Hague so my two main motivations for getting involved in Serbian politics were gone. That was one half of the coin. The other half was the idea that other groups in the world might benefit from what we have done and being more of an activist and revolutionary in a politician, I’m not a super person to sit in parliament. You can find this and more by visiting IPPR’s blog at blogs.ucl.ac.uk/ippr/

One of the common problems groups face is the ‘collective action problem’ – how would you say you managed to get so many people to act together? strategy and then the tactics. This is very important because it builds the identity of the group and at one point the group becomes your second self and you can’t imagine your life without this struggle.

Building all this stuff can sound very complicated. In Serbia, it came organically because we effectively had this guy who was screwing our lives and from a very normal life we came to a point when we were at war with the whole world. My mother was almost killed in a NATO bombing in 1999. Plus for young people it’s really thrilling and young people are normally at the cutting edge of these revolutions because they are always trying to change the world, they have a lot of time and they don’t have a lot of things to lose: they don’t have families, loans or property so I assume for a young person, it is easier to turn the life to activism than for someone who is already established. However, young people by themselves are not enough.
What would you say was the single most influential thing that you did in the protest movement?

Several things were important; one of the things I think we did completely successfully was creating this idea of individual resistance. Serbs are a very individualistic nation and we are not very good at following leaders and authorities. And OTPOR itself means resistance so it’s like the Serbs are very good at doing things in spite of things so if you want to make Serbs do A, try to prohibit him from doing it. We were trying to structure the movement around the national mentality of being very tough towards authorities and putting this into individuals really gave a boost to so many different ideas that mushroomed.

The Occupy protests in London did eventually fail but what one thing would you tell them?

I would ask them “If you were the king for the day, what is the society you would imagine”. Meaning: have a clear vision of tomorrow and second, please tell me how to get there in three sentences. For us it was easy, we wanted to be part of the European Union, part of the normal world and we wanted freedoms. These are the three sentences.

How are we going to get there? We are going to defeat Milosevic in the elections. We’ll get young people to vote so however much he stole, we’ll get more and if we caught him stealing everybody will be on the street and we’ll throw him out.

Occupy didn’t have this answer, I don’t think their issue was a problem of formulation but it was about a lack of an idea. What do we want to achieve? I think Occupy had another big problem: they were anti-structural. If you want to build a movement you need some kind of structure.

The Occupy movement continued re-questioning what they were going to do and why they were there which will lead to endless debate. The problem is that then the normal people and the ‘cool people’ you really love in the movement are going to leave this senseless debate because the world is changed by doers. Not by those who have opinions.

---

**REPRESENTATIVE AUDIT OF BRITAIN**

Dr Jennifer vanHeerde-Hudson (Constitution Unit, UCL), Dr Rosie Campbell (Principal Investigator, Birkbeck) and Dr Wolfgang Rudig have won funding from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) to study parliamentary candidates and MPs for the 2015 general election. The Representative Audit of Britain (ES/L016508/1) brings together eight scholars, from seven British universities, to examine key questions relating to Britain’s political class across key areas:

- Gender
  Campbell, Prof Sarah Childs, Bristol & Prof Joni Lovenduski, Birkbeck
- Electoral competition
  vanHeerde-Hudson & Dr Caitlin Milazzo, Nottingham
- Race/ethnicity
  Dr Maria Sobolewska, Oxford & Campbell
- Political careers
  Campbell, Dr Peter Allen, Queen Mary & vanHeerde-Hudson
- Candidates in comparative perspective
  Rudig & vanHeerde-Hudson

Against the backdrop of partisan dealignment and broader disengagement with politics, the project will combine biographical, socio-demographic, electoral and attitudinal data on candidates and MPs to answer a range of topics, including: examining and comparing the career trajectories of British politicians; the professionalisation of the political class; the relationship between socio-demographics, routes into Parliament and career trajectory; the representation of working class and BME communities and wider debates on representation; understanding elite v. public attitudes on key issues such as taxation, immigration, Europe and the provision of public services; the role of gender and political recruitment; and socio-demographics, electoral competition and outcomes.

In addition to providing rigorous analyses of the 2015 general election cohort, the project extends the 1992 British Candidate/British Representation studies (1997–2010) and Candidate Study (2010) allowing comparisons over time; facilitates elite v. mass comparisons by linking with the British Election Study; and international comparison via the Comparative Candidates Survey.

The 28 month project kicks off in January 2015. It sits alongside our related project, Parliamentary Candidates UK (parliamentarycandidates.org), providing analysis of parliamentary candidates from 1945 and timely analysis of the 2015 general election.
NEWS FROM THE UCL CONSTITUTION UNIT

New Publication: The Political Costs of the 2009 British MPs’ Expenses Scandal
Edited by Jennifer Hudson

In May 2009, the Daily Telegraph began publishing un-redacted expenses claims made by British MPs showing how and the extent to which, some MPs took advantage of an unregulated expenses system. This study examines the evolution and political consequences of this 2009 British MPs’ expenses scandal and argues that despite claims at the time of a revolution in British politics, it in fact had a limited, short-term impact. Beginning with the efforts of journalist Heather Brooke and the role of the Freedom of Information Act in exposing the scandal, the book examines the scandal’s electoral impact and how it affected public perceptions of wrong-doing and probity amongst politicians. It also notes the many opportunities MPs had to reform parliamentary expenses and gives special consideration is given to the media’s role in reporting the scandal but also to the role of Independent Parliamentary Standards Authority in reforming expenses.

Click here to order online and use code PM14THIRTY for a 30% discount.

New Release of Constitute, now including the UK’s written “constitution”

The Constitution Unit is pleased to announce that a new version of Constitute is now available online. The new version has many new features and includes a number of new constitutions, including that of the UK. This will provide a tool for comparing extant UK constitutional laws with constitutional texts from across the globe.

Last year, we launched Constitute, a website for reading, searching and comparing constitutions from across the world. The Constitute site is host to the English language text of almost every national constitution currently in force. It not only provides users with free and easy access to these texts but by drawing on data collected by the Comparative Constitutions Project (CCP) over the last nine years, it also facilitates powerful, topic-based searches of over 300 common constitutional themes.

Since the launch of Constitute, we have been accumulating feedback from our users and have now launched a significantly improved site. Among the new features on the site are the ability to compare two constitutions side-by-side, the ability to pin more items, improved sharing of constitutional provisions and for researchers, better access to the data underlying the site (for a full description of new features, see here).

For our users in the UK the most significant new addition is the inclusion of the UK’s constitution on the site. As arguably one of the most influential and historically significant constitutions in existence, any tool for comparing the constitutions of the world was incomplete without the inclusion of the UK.

Take a look at the new Constitute site here and view the UK’s written constitution on Constitute here.

For more on how the UK’s written constitution was defined and codified, see the Constitution Unit blogpost here.
Avia Pasternak (Lecturer in Global Ethics and MSc Global Governance and Ethics Programme Director, UCL Department of Political Science) recently co-edited a special issue in the Journal of Applied Philosophy (with Ed Page, Warwick University) on benefitting from injustice.

This issue (volume 31 issue 4, November 2014) brings together several contributions that offer a novel approach to addressing injustice. Traditionally, it has been thought that when an injustice occurs, it is the duty of its perpetrator to address the plight of the victim, for example, by offering compensation for harm. Some suggest that the responsibility to remedy injustices can also fall on agents that possess superior capacity to remedy the undeserved disadvantage suffered by the victims.

This special issue focuses on a new and different approach. It suggests that our efforts to identify those who are responsible to address an injustice should include agents who find themselves in a position of advantage as a direct result of the injustice. Such ‘beneficiaries of injustice’ have not played a role in bringing the injustice about and yet, that they benefit from an activity that is unjust implies they have special duties to surrender (or ‘disgorge’) the benefit, in compensation to those who have been made worse by that activity.

The ‘beneficiary-pays’ principle, if correct, has far reaching implications: it can ground duties of current beneficiaries of past injustices (colonialism, racism, the subordination of women) to compensate the descendants of victims who find themselves in disadvantage as result of these past wrongs (e.g. descendants of slaves in America). It can also contribute to our understanding of the proper distribution of duties to address climate change that will predictably deliver adverse consequences for vulnerable populations while also being traceable to activities that generated huge benefits for other populations.

But the beneficiary-pays principle has been met with criticism. Many are not persuaded by the moral intuitions that underlie it. Others point to the difficulties involved in tracing ‘unjust benefits’ or highlight the unreasonable burdens that the principle imposes on agents who have become dependent on benefits which, unbeknownst to them, were or are sourced in injustices.

The special issue brings together some of the leading authors on the beneficiary-pays principle, in an attempt to investigate these challenges and offer new insights on the moral intuition that ground the principle and its conceptual and applied limits.

It includes contributions from Christian Barry, Daniel Butt, Bashar Haydar, Clare Heyward, Robert Goodin, Avery Koler, Holly Lawford-Smith, Gerhard Øverland and Avia Pasternak.

Dr Slava Mikhaylov, MPhil/PhD Programme Director reports:

Accepted or forthcoming publications

Christobal Bellolio has published a new book in Chile titled *Ateos fuera del Closet* (Atheists Out of the Closet) published by Penguin Random House. Official presentation of the book took place at the International Book Fair in November in Santiago. Although it is not strictly an academic essay – rather for general public – it has been widely covered in the news and it has some broad connections with his research. Since its appearance two weeks ago, it has been in the non-fiction top ten of sold books in Chile.

http://papeldigital.info/lt/2014/10/18/01/paginas/098.pdf

Conference Presentations

Christiane Andersen presented a paper called ‘Mapping the Indian Ideological Landscape – a Computerised Content Analysis Approach to India’s Political Parties 2004–2014’ at the King’s India Institute Graduate Forum Conference at KCL. The topic of the conference this year was ‘Rethinking Contemporary India’. Christiane’s paper tackled the challenge of scaling the Indian party system, which – given its high degree of fragmentation, complex social cleavages and strongly localised political issues – is usually said to defy familiar notions of simple Left-Right axes. I used Wordfish software to estimate latent dimensions of partisan conflict in manifestos from the three most recent general elections, with highly satisfactory results.
NEW STAFF

The Department would like to welcome the following new staff:

**Nidhi Chaudhary**
Teaching Fellow in Public Policy Economics and Analysis

I joined the School of Public Policy in September 2014 as a Teaching Fellow in Public Policy Economics and Analysis (PUBLG005). I join the school from the University of Cambridge where I am currently finishing my PhD focusing on development economics and public policy.

My research interest lies in public policy analysis and this is reflected both in my postgraduate research and eight years of work experience in consulting, academia and government organisations in India and the UK. My doctoral research looks at diversity of learning mechanisms by which firms in the Indian software sector have developed and accumulated their innovative capabilities over time. The research also systematically analyses the role of institutions and public policies in supporting innovation and growth in the Indian software sector.

I have recently been engaged in a research project commissioned by Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to evaluate the impact of non-hypothecated research funding by the government to English universities. Prior to this, I have taught architecture related subjects and worked on various urban development and public sector reform programmes at the national and state level in India.

**Jess Duggan-Larkin**
PGTA/Teaching Fellow in International Law and Human Rights

I joined the School of Public Policy in October 2014 as PGTA / Teaching Fellow in International Law and Human Rights. I am currently completing my PhD research in the Faculty of Laws here at UCL. My research considers how human rights obligations affect the international actions of states and is supervised by Dr Jeff King, Professor Jane Holder and Dr Saladin Meckled-Garcia. My doctoral research is supported by an ESRC studentship.

Prior to commencing the PhD, I worked for the Equal Rights Trust, on international equality and non-discrimination advocacy and projects. This work followed my completion of an LLM in International Human Rights Law at the University of Essex. I am originally from Australia where I worked for a number of Australian government departments, including the Attorney-General’s Department, on human rights and indigenous policy issues. I hold an LLB and BA from the Australian National University.

**Dyi Huijg**
Teaching Fellow in Qualitative Research Methods

In the second term I will work as a Teaching Fellow on the Introduction to Qualitative Methods course. Data collection and data analysis processes fascinate me. As a PhD Candidate in Sociology at the University of Manchester, I am working on a ‘methodological dissertation’. In my doctoral project I intend to understand how ‘intersectional agency’ at the junction of opposite positions in power relations can be thought. On the basis of the phenomenological conversations I had with racially privileged young feminist activists from São Paulo (Brazil), I explore how individuals’ agency operates at the intersection of structural advantage (on the axis of race, class etc) and structural disadvantage (on the axis of gender, class, sexuality, age etc) in order to generate agentic action and/or inaction. I develop and employ different qualitative data processing tools to see what they can do for the conceptualisation of ‘intersectional agency’.

In Manchester, I have taught before on the Qualitative Research Methods course and I am very pleased to be working again in this field at UCL. As I started my undergraduate in the field of International Relations and Latin American Studies, I look forward to working in the Political Science Department now.
Eleanor Knott  
Teaching Fellow in Qualitative Research Methods

I will be joining the Department as a teaching fellow for the MA qualitative methods course. I am a PhD candidate (expected 2015) in Political Science at the Department of Government, LSE. Before joining LSE, I studied for a BA/MA in Geography at Jesus College, Cambridge, an MA at the School of Slavonic and Eastern European Studies (UCL) and an MRes in Political Science from LSE.

I am interested in state and society relations in post-Communist and post-Soviet cases, in particular questions of ethnic identity, kin-state relations and policies of dual citizenship and quasi-citizenship. My dissertation explores Romanian and Russian kin-state policies in Moldova and Crimea from a bottom-up perspective where I look at questions of ethnicity and citizenship based on fieldwork I conducted in 2012-2013. In particular I am interested in the implications of using citizenship and quasi-citizenship as part of kin-states’ policies and how these can be studied from a bottom-up perspective, i.e. via immersive methods with non-elite actors.

I chaired the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism (ASEN) 24th Conference, Nationalism and Belonging, in 2014 and currently chair ASEN’s seminar series, Everyday Nationalism, Everyday Ethnicity. I teach comparative politics in the Department of Government at LSE and have also taught at the School of Slavonic and Eastern European Studies, at UCL.

Blog: eleanorknott.wordpress.com  
Twitter @ellie_knott

Christiane Bjerglund Andersen  
PGTA in Qualitative Research Methods

Christiane is a PhD student at the School of Public Policy. Her research focuses on coalition politics, in particular the strategies of Indian regional parties in national coalitions. She commented on the Indian general election for Danish broadcast media in 2014.

Christiane previously worked for the European Council on Foreign Relations in London, where she was part of the Asia team. She’s also worked for the Ministry of Refugee, Immigration and Integration Affairs and the Royal Danish Embassy in New Delhi but she started out as a Formula 1 writer for a motorsports news site and occasionally still misses it.

Christiane will be teaching seminars in Introduction to Qualitative Methods in the spring semester 2015. She has previously taught Introduction to Political Science seminars at Copenhagen Business School.

Dr Elke Schwarz  
Teaching Fellow in International Organisations

Elke Schwarz completed her PhD in International Relations at the London School of Economics in 2013. Her research is predominantly theory-oriented and focuses on political violence, military technologies and ethics. She also holds an MA from King’s College London in International Conflict Studies. In addition to being a Teaching Fellow at UCL, Elke convenes the MA course in International Relations at Anglia Ruskin University in Cambridge.

In her academic work, Elke is interested in the ethics of military drones and lethal robots in three interlinked strands of research: the first one aims to contribute to the ethical, legal and political debate on the use of drones and seeks to bridge the ethical aspects at stake with future policy, specifically aimed at EU policy on the topic. The second strand draws on an interdisciplinary and philosophical approach to engage more deeply with role of the human in accelerated contexts of technological developments, with an emphasis on Lethal Autonomous Weapons (LAWs). The third aspect of her research contributes to developing theoretical explorations of the shifting nature of warfare today, focusing specifically on addressing and unravelling just war traditions and the ethics of warfare that have hitherto served as a basis for justifying the use of force.

She is also a contributing author to the award-winning International Relations Blog The Disorder of Things.
Dr Domna Maria Michailidou
Teaching Fellow in Public Policy Economics and Analysis

I joined the Department at the beginning of this academic year as a Teaching Fellow in Public Policy and Economic Analysis (PPEA). I completed my PhD in the Centre of Development Studies, University of Cambridge just before joining UCL. My thesis investigated the causes of financial crises in middle-income economies, focusing on Brazil, Mexico and South Korea in the 1990s.

It addressed a key question in financial and development economics: Does financial liberalisation, when concurring with high levels of international liquidity and flexible or absent capital controls, inescapably lead to financial crises?

Through a statistical comparative analysis of all types of financial injections my thesis drew conclusions on the inescapability of events such as financial fragility, volatility and failure following emerging markets’ rapid financial liberalisation. My work extends to the current international crisis. I have been focusing on both the implications of the current crisis to emerging economies’ business cycles and the dynamic relationship between the Eurozone debt crisis and international financial institutions. Being from Greece and studying such a topical subject, I have a deep interest in ongoing but unresolved economic challenges facing the Eurozone crisis.

For the past five years I have supervised undergraduate students on the development economics paper in the Economics Department at Cambridge University, taught Macroeconomics to EMBA students in the Judge Business School and lectured MPhil students on financial markets in the Centre of Development Studies. I have very much enjoyed interacting with a pool of very different students and teaching a variety of economics modules. It has made me enthusiastic about teaching and encouraged me to pursue it further. I am delighted to have joined the Department and so far I have very much enjoyed interacting with the diverse community of students. I am looking forward to these coming months!
PAST STUDENTS
WHERE ARE THEY NOW?

Since the launch of the first Tavistock Times in the summer of 2008, we have been kindly contacted by many past students informing us of their progress since leaving the Department. A progress report follows:

Louisa Bartolo
MSc International Public Policy, 2012–2013

After completing an undergraduate degree in the social and political sciences at Cambridge I took two years out of academia – two years in which I worked first as a journalist and then travelled to India for three months to volunteer – which included carrying out independent research at an inspirational Bangalore-based centre for children living with HIV. My decision to apply for the MSc in International Public Policy at UCL was born of my desire to build a solid foundation in quantitative and qualitative research methods. I approached my postgraduate studies differently to my BA degree: My focus was very much on getting the right ‘hard skills’ for employment. I did not know at the time exactly what that employment would look like but I suspected that it would be research-heavy – and probably outside of a strictly academic setting.

Notwithstanding my decision to approach the course very ‘instrumentally’, I could not help becoming deeply passionate about a number of the modules – and especially my thesis. The year at UCL – the combination of rigorous academic training and living in cosmopolitan, buzzing London – broadened my skillset and outlook. The fact that I also did a four-month research internship with the UCL Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology whilst at UCL contributed to my employability and kept me connected to the world of work. By the time I finished the degree I was still not completely sure of where I would end up – but I felt confident and excited about what the world had to offer.

Having completed the degree, I went on to do some report-writing work for my country’s health ministry (coordinating the compilation of the strategy document for primary health care policy). Following this deeply enriching experience, I did a three-month research internship for the World Health Organization in Geneva – which was unforgettable. After finishing the internship I took up full time employment as an analyst with Deloitte Malta. I have now been at Deloitte for seven months – two months of which have been spent on secondment in the Deloitte Luxembourg office, working in consulting for the European Institutions. As an analyst, my research skills are absolutely critical to everything I do.

The decision to study at UCL – at the time a result of rational calculation but with a heavy dose of gut instinct and hope – turned out to be a very good decision indeed. I hope that everyone who has the privilege of studying there makes the most of all the rich opportunities it affords.

Daniel O’Callaghan
MSc Public Policy, 2012–2013

I graduated from UCL in 2013 with an MSc in Public Policy. Since leaving SPP I have worked in a couple of different roles and across various policy areas.

Having specialised in economics and political science while completing the Philosophy, Politics, Economics and Sociology (PRES) programme at Trinity College Dublin, I chose the MSc at UCL as I believed that it would allow me to hone my skills in the specific area of policy analysis and management. I was not disappointed as the course gave me the opportunity to improve my research and analytical ability, attend some excellent policy events/conferences and meet some great people.

During my time at SPP I was able to secure a part-time internship with the think-tank Policy Network. While balancing study and work was a challenge, I found the experience to be immensely beneficial in preparing me for the job search post-UCL. While at Policy Network I researched and analysed European financial regulation, democratic renewal and economic innovation.
Having left SPR, I worked as a policy analyst with the Institute of International and European Affairs (IIEA), one of Ireland’s leading think tanks. At the IIEA, I led the Institute’s research on economics with a wide ranging brief including European economic governance, economic policy in Ireland and Europe and international financial regulation and taxation.

In Spring 2014, I joined the Irish Government Economic and Evaluation Service (IGEES) based in the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform as an economist. In this role I am a member of a new cross-government economic service which provides economic and policy analysis to each of the government departments. Currently, I am on a two year secondment to the Department of Transport, Tourism and Sport.

My MSc at UCL was an important period in the early stage of my career. It opened up many doors and gave me the opportunity to develop and improve important skills. I am excited about my future career path and I will always look back fondly on my time in Tavistock Square as a significant, challenging and fulfilling step.