As we approach another academic year, I am happy to report that the Department continues to go from strength to strength. The faculty and international standing of the Department continues to grow with the recruitment of three new world class faculty and appointment of two eminent honorary visiting professors in Lord O’Donnell and Sir John Gieve.

Our growth and international profile are also reflected in the success of our existing colleagues. So I am also delighted to report that at the last promotions round Rod Abouharb, Colin Provost and Sherrill Stroschein were appointed to Senior Lecturers. This is much deserved and a reflection of the hard work...
they all put into their respective MSc programmes and the quality of the research they have all achieved. Also pleasing for me is that news that colleagues have won prestigious awards such as David Hudson’s British Academy Mid Career Scholarship and Lisa Vanhala’s book Making Rights a Reality? Disability Rights Activists and Legal Mobilization was recently awarded the Socio-Legal Studies Association/Hart Early Career Prize.

In terms of our new hires starting in 2012/13 I would like to welcome them all to the Department and I am sure that they will add much to our academic and public policy profile.

Dr Roland Kappe joins UCL in September 2012 as a Lecturer in Political Economy in a joint appointment between the School of Public Policy and the European Social and Political Studies Programme (ESPS). Prior to coming to UCL, Roland received his PhD in Political Science from Stony Brook University in New York, working on how changing economic tides affect the popularity and survival of incumbent governments. He has recently published in West European Politics.

Dr James Melton joins the Department in September 2012 as a lecturer in British and Comparative Politics. Prior to coming to UCL, he was an Assistant Professor of Economics and Institutional Change at the IMT Institute of Advanced Studies in Lucca, Italy. James earned a PhD in Political Science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. James’ research focuses on comparative constitutional design, investigating the origins, stability and enforcement of formal constitutional texts. Specifically, he is a principal investigator on the Comparative Constitutions Project and an author on the first book from this project entitled The Endurance of National Constitutions, which won the best book award from the Comparative Democratisation section of the American Political Science Association.

Dr Nils Metternich will join the Department in January 2013 as Lecturer in International Relations at the School of Public Policy. He holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Essex. Prior to joining UCL he was a postdoctoral research fellow at Duke University (2011-2012). Nils’s research focuses on the strategic nature of international and civil conflicts and the prediction of their dynamics. His work explores why political actors choose to engage in fighting and conflict behaviour despite having societal more desirable alternatives like democratisation, economic prosperity and peace. Nils Metternich analyses the dynamics of peace and conflict with network analytic and other quantitative methods. His work has been published in World Politics and the Journal of Conflict Resolution.

The last year has been a great success in terms of the number of events organised for students and by students and faculty and as a result the international profile of the School of Public Policy also continues to grow. In the summer term alone the Department hosted international events on the Democratic Deficit and Euro crisis, Economics of Happiness, Climate Change and Litigation, Comparative Environmental Politics, How to Negotiate Under Co-decision in the EU, a political theory discussion on “From ideal principles to real politics” and a student led event on “a just intervention.” The Department also continued its annual tradition of student trips to the UN in Geneva and the European Commission in Brussels.

I am sure that 2012–13 will be equally exciting and that the Department will continue to develop its profile as a leading centre of academic and policy debates.
In this sixty second interview we quiz Dr Lisa Vanhala, British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow and Lecturer in Human Rights.

**What is your name?**
Lisa Vanhala.

**When did you join UCL?**
I joined in October 2011 as a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow. I’ll start as a full lecturer this autumn.

**What are your responsibilities in the Department?**
Research and teaching.

**What do you particularly like and dislike about your job?**
I love the autonomy. Having the freedom to pursue research projects and teach subjects that I’m passionate about is a real privilege. I’m currently interviewing environmental activists and their lawyers and I find those conversations incredibly stimulating and thought-provoking. I’m somewhat less thrilled when someone hands me a large pile of marking.

**What do you consider your greatest achievement to date?**
My first book has won a couple of prizes this year which is a nice feeling. But I’ve also just learned to stand on my head in yoga and I think that might trump the book.

**Most inspirational person that you have met whilst at UCL?**
I have found my colleagues here at UCL to be a fabulous, energetic and ambitious bunch of people but it is probably a few of my students over the last year who have taught me the most.

**Favourite location in UCL?**
I can often be found in Store Street Espresso. I’m not sure that counts as part of UCL…

**What would your ideal afternoon/evening in London include?**
A dip in the ponds at Hampstead Heath, dinner at Moro, contemporary dance at Sadler’s Wells and drinks at our local pub with friends.

**What is your favourite book?**
I love anything by Margaret Atwood before her post-apocalyptic phase. Especially The Edible Woman. I read Let the Great World Spin by Colum McCann when I spent some time in New York and I found it life-affirming so that’s a new favourite.

**What are your hobbies?**
Running, yoga and tennis. I also try to go hiking as often as possible.

**If you had not gone into academia what would you be doing now?**
I struggle with counter-factuals. I probably would have become a lawyer.

**If you could implement one policy in the world today, what would it be?**
An effective, binding climate change treaty signed up to by all major greenhouse gas emitting states. That is, a treaty that a) determines the levels of GHG reductions based on scientific evidence rather than poorly cobbled-together political compromises and b) that takes seriously the concepts of transnational and inter-generational justice.
MA HUMAN RIGHTS STUDENTS VISIT GENEVA

Sarah Christie,
MA Human Rights student (2011–12) writes:

It’s hard not to be impressed by Geneva. Nestled beside the lake of the same name and overlooked by picture-perfect snow-capped mountains, it’s home to thousands of individuals from an array of nations who have found themselves in this genteel city to work for the numerous international financial and diplomatic organisations that are based there.

For Human Rights students, the city holds special appeal. Geneva is home to the European seat of the United Nations, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the World Health Organisation, the International Committee of the Red Cross and Medecins Sans Frontieres, amongst others. After months spent studying the work and worth of such organisations through the eyes of others, thirteen of us were lucky enough to travel to the city after exams and gain an insight into the workings of such a body – the Human Rights Council – for ourselves.

We headed to the UN bright and early on the morning of 24 May 2012. Walking from my hostel along the suitably named Avenue de la Paix I was soon met by the towering country flags that line the entrance to the UN. Impressed (and intimidated) I carried on to the visitor’s gate where the thirteen of us were issued with photo IDs and a full itinerary.

We first headed to see the UK’s human rights record be assessed under the Universal Periodic Review. The UPR is a unique process which provides the opportunity for each State to declare what actions they have taken to improve the human rights situations in their countries and to fulfil their human rights obligations, with recommendations and criticisms being made by fellow States.

The process is undertaken in the aptly named ‘Human Rights and Alliance of Civilizations Room’ a grand chamber worth seeing purely
for Miquel Barcelo’s psychedelic and dramatic sculpted ceiling. Barcelo encouraged all to bring the same sense of innovation to their work that would take place in the room. “Let us not settle for the status quo”, he said “but instead be visionary, creative and bold”.

Indeed, much has been placed on the UPR as a new mechanism with great potential to promote and protect human rights; assessments, however, have so far been mixed. Recommendations for the UK included ratification of the Migrant Workers Convention and condemnation for its suspected involvement in torture and extra-judicial rendition. Of course, the true test of the UPR will be to see which recommendations the UK accepts and what action it takes before its next assessment in 2016.

Following lunch in the UN’s well-stocked cafeteria we headed to meet Human Rights Advisor to the Japanese Mission (and UCL MA Human Rights Alumni) Masataka Nagoshi. Masataka kindly lent us an hour of his time and shared his experiences working for the UN and took us through various HRC Resolutions on Syria which he had a role in drafting, explaining the subtleties behind the changing language and the delicate art of diplomacy.

Following this we met with the third Secretary to the Maldives Mission, Muruthala Moosa. Muruthala discussed frankly his country’s position on the timely issue of LGBT rights (for the near-future: opposition) and environmental policy (the Maldives’ central priority).

Finally, we met with Alex Conte from the internationally respected International Commission of Jurists. His NGO perspective was fascinating; frustration and progress with states in equal measure, it appeared. He ended by promising us a World Court within a decade.

A fascinating day ended with drinks by the Lake. With much from the day to discuss, all involved agreed seeing the UN at work had been a positive, stimulating experience. Many thanks go to Basak Cali who organised the trip, accompanied us and provided insightful commentary throughout.
Lords reform is proving to be one of the UK coalition government’s biggest headaches. In principle both Conservative and Liberal Democrat partners went into the 2010 election with a commitment to introduce elections to the chamber, which at present comprises largely of appointed life peers (plus 92 remaining hereditary peers and 26 Church of England bishops). However, it was the Lib Dems who were most enthusiastic about reform; David Cameron had famously referred to it as a ‘third term issue’ for the Conservatives. In July 2012 these tensions came to a head, when 91 Conservative MPs voted against the second reading of the government’s bill. The government won the vote, thanks to the support of Labour MPs but the bill seems unlikely to make further progress.

SPP is home to one of the UK’s leading experts on the Lords and its reform, Constitution Unit Deputy Director Dr Meg Russell. She began researching the topic in 1998, when Labour had just come to power on a similar promise of reform. Her first book, Reforming the House of Lords: Lessons from Overseas (OUP, 2000) drew comparative lessons about ‘bicameralism’ (i.e. two chamber parliaments) to inform the UK debate. She acted as a consultant to the Royal Commission on Lords reform in 1999-2000 and was then seconded full-time to work for Labour’s Robin Cook MP when he pursued Lords reform as Leader of the House of Commons. For the last decade she has switched her attention to watching the Lords as it is now and its impact on the policy process. She is therefore well-placed to predict what will happen next and to suggest what should happen to the House of Lords.

Speaking just after Cameron’s rebellion, Dr Russell confessed that she was not at all surprised by what had happened. “For anyone who had been watching Lords reform for a while, you could see this coming” she said. “Labour’s time in government showed that reaching agreement on reform is very difficult; Labour were split on the question and quite clearly so were the Conservatives”. In a 2009 article in the Political Quarterly (‘House of Lords Reform: Are We Nearly There Yet?’) she set out some of the reasons why reform is so difficult to achieve. For example, while many believe in principle in election, many also fear the consequences. In particular, she says, “most people believe that replacing the Lords with an elected chamber would make it far more assertive in challenging the Commons and demanding policy changes from government”. Government MPs are understandably cautious about taking such a step, while many believe in principle that it would be wrong to threaten Britain’s tradition of ‘strong government’.

Dr Russell’s research on the Lords itself has been influential in informing this debate. In a 2010 article in Political Studies (‘A Stronger Second Chamber? Assessing the Impact of House of Lords Reform in 1999, and the Lessons for Bicameralism’), she demonstrated how Labour’s seemingly modest reform of removing most hereditary peers had already resulted in a more confident and effective Lords. From 1999-2012 the chamber inflicted over 500 defeats on government, forcing it to back down on key policies such as restricting trial by jury and detention of terrorist suspects. As she remembers “at the time many commentators suggested that Labour’s reform would weaken the chamber because most of the hereditaries expelled were Conservatives. In fact, it gave peers greater confidence to challenge government because the chamber’s party balance became much more proportional and its composition was thus easier to defend than before”. In fact, in 2003 Dr Russell had written another Political Quarterly article (‘Is the House of Lords already Reformed?’ [Online]) suggesting that the key change was not the introduction of election but the arrival of proportionality in the Lords.

So what does she believe will happen now? “Well, it certainly looks like the government’s bill for an 80% elected second chamber is dead”, she says. “It’s unlikely that Conservative MPs will compromise so the question is whether Nick Clegg will do so. Introducing election is controversial among MPs but there are other changes that probably could attract widespread support. For example removing the remaining hereditary peers and cleaning up the appointments process to greatly reduce the Prime Minister’s patronage powers”. But wouldn’t this just be tinkering, when more profound reform is needed? “Not really”, she suggests, “for one thing, most people are actually quite happy with what the House of Lords does”. She adds, “the 1999 reform was seen as timid and yet it had a profound effect in terms of creating more confident and better respected chamber. A further small change, to make the appointments process more fair and transparent, might well have a similar effect”. Indeed “ironically, Nick Clegg might even go down in history for having achieved it”.

Dr Meg Russell
Constitution Unit Deputy Director and Reader in British and Comparative Politics
(UCL, Department of Political Science)
People call it charity… IPAS calls it responsibility!

Zahara Choudri, MSc Global Governance & Ethics & Head of Charity and Fundraising of UCL IPAS (2011–12)

Last November, I was able to take part in the organisation of HRH Mosaic’s International Summit in Doha, Qatar, which brought over 90 delegates between the ages of 25-35 from over 15 countries including: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Egypt, Indonesia, Iraq, Jordan, Malaysia, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Turkey, UAE and the UK. The Summit’s aims for the delegates were: 1) to develop leadership ability and an aspiration to be an agent of change 2) to develop understanding of key global issues and inspire positive thinking to address them. This is where I was fortunate to meet such fascinating people from all walks of life who achieved so much so early in their journeys.

One individual I was particularly inspired by was Korvi Rakshand, the founder of JAAGO Foundation in Bangladesh. JAAGO works to provide an international standard of education to impoverished children from families that have an average daily income below $2 per day. This is done through Free-of-Cost Schooling with an international standard education curriculum. Currently every third child in Bangladesh is doomed to live below the poverty line. As time goes by, Bangladesh is slowly losing its educated population and the number of poor people who have no means to help themselves increases daily.

Korvi decided that he would use his education and his skills to bring about a change for the impoverished children of Bangladesh. He understood that, for most people, charitable acts are temporary and often unsustainable. Korvi was determined to bring betterment to the lives of these people in the long term. He realized that if he were to make a positive contribution to the development of his nation, he would have to come up with sustainable initiatives that could rebuild Bangladesh. Korvi had some fellow University students and friends who shared the same views and values. Together they set off on a mission to combat poverty by creating an educated future generation.

Today, JAAGO Foundation is a well-known youth-based organization in Bangladesh, which focuses mainly on battling illiteracy and malnutrition in children and on rehabilitating them to better environments and social conditions, with three branches supporting over 600 children.

The passion and dedication of Jaago for universal education motivated me to raise money for Jaago to help build their fourth school in Chittagong. The idea of students from UCL IPAS a society that was a part of a world-class institution working together to help build another institution truly excited me. Since the closing of the campaign, it is still such an unbelievable feeling that the construction of the school has begun and in a matter of months there will be children running to a school because of our fundraising efforts.

The campaign was a huge success; raising, £10,316.75! Which well exceeded our £6,000 target. From the launch of the
campaign in January to the closing in July we were fortunate to have support from SPP particularly David Hudson and Rodwan Abouharb. Rodwan took part in our memorable departmental 10k run in Richmond Park and arrived bright and early along with over 40 other students. Myong Hun-Oh allowed us to have a truly global campaign, by creating our amazing campaign videos, giving us global reach, from America to Oman. The videos help to depict the importance of our campaign and drove IPAS, with over 70 students in the department getting involved and developing this “Yellow Jaago Fever”

The Jaago IPAS fundraising committee were just brilliant, each of them were dedicated, focused and driven by the cause. We worked as an amazing team, helped each other in the planning of events to getting us into local newspapers!

I was fortunate to gain official support from Manchester City Foundation, who sent us a signed David Silva Shirt, which was presented to Abdul Akbari, who was a player in the winning football team from our joint Social and Charity Football Tournament in Regents Park. Francesca Roettger Moreda really motivated students to sign up for the tournament, with a great turnout on the day despite the weather! Our amazing on-campus bake sale, beat a UCL Union record by raising the most money in one day (£715.57), which lead us to be invited by the Union to highlight the success of our campaign. Analisa Low really supported the event, along side the entire fundraising committee and other students from SPP allowing us to exceed our expectations of our bake sale.

Lastly, Etihad Airlines kindly donated two flight tickets to Bangladesh allowing two members of the committee to visit Korvi, see the school and to meet the amazing children who are currently attending schools funded by Jaago. I selected Myong Hun-Oh and Yoni Amais to represent our committee and visit Jaago. Yoni raised over £1,500 and Myong allowed us to have a truly unique campaign.

Jaago sent the following statement to sincerely thank the students that took part in our campaign “The students of UCL IPAS have been wonderfully cooperative and the work they have done could not have paid off better! The astonishing amount raised has helped us build a brand new school for underprivileged children in Bangladesh. We are very grateful to the entire UCL IPAS team for all of their hard work and enthusiasm. This campaign has gone a long way in bringing us closer to our goal of rebuilding Bangladesh”.

May I also take this opportunity to thank each member of the Jaago Fundraising Committee, who allowed me to carry Korvi’s vision and his inspiration of giving a child the most precious gift, education. Without such an amazing team, we wouldn’t have been able to have such a successful campaign, which ran for only six months! Finally, the IPAS board itself, The president of IPAS Madjar Navah, who was equally driven by the campaign, as well as the entire IPAS Board, who were constantly supportive of Jaago’s vision. Thank you all!
‘JUST INTERVENTION?’
LEGAL AND POLITICAL THEORY FORUM 2012

Nat Rutherford,
2011-12 MA Legal and Political Theory student writes:

On 6 June 2012, the 2012 Legal and Political Theory Forum was held at UCL, on the subject of military and humanitarian intervention. The event was orchestrated by a group of students on the MA Legal and Political Theory programme and chaired by Nat Rutherford, a student on the programme.

The title of this year’s forum, ‘Just Intervention?’, was not only ambiguous, as it was intended to be but also, according to one of this year’s panel, downright confused. Fortunately, the discussion managed to avoid the alleged flaws of its title, with panelists Dr Laura Valentini (UCL), Dr Avia Pasternak (Essex), John McDonnell (Labour MP) and Prof Chris Brown (LSE) providing stimulating and contrasting analysis of military intervention, both in practice and in theory.

Chris Brown discussed the conceptual distinction between ‘just’ and ‘justified’ intervention, favouring the latter term and encouraged suspicion towards any intervention that threatened the self-determining fate of communities.

Avia Pasternak challenged the view that intervention is justified only when we are shocked or appalled by the humanitarian violations we see, instead preferring a more dispassionate assessment of basic human interests.

John McDonnell demonstrated his political science credentials in discussing theories of jus ad bellum and jus post bellum in connection with recent interventions, before going on to propose an independent intervention commission as a means to depoliticise decisions on intervention.

Laura Valentini advocated extreme caution in engaging in intervention, even in seemingly justified cases and drew a distinction between the moral principles that ought to regulate intervention ideally and the laws that we should adopt in a non-ideal world.

The issue of practical limitations and obligations, initially raised by Laura, repeatedly came to the fore of the discussion. How, for example, do the financial limits of the British military affect our thinking about intervention, considering that there are so many countries where egregious human rights violations occur?

There was something of a divide here, with Chris and John defending a realist position, whilst Avia made a sharp distinction between theoretical moral obligation, which is deaf to practical limitations and feasible real-world policy, which is sensitive to these practical constraints. This division signified two opposing positions about the proper role and practice of political philosophy, rather than a disagreement about intervention itself, as all the panelists agreed that it was actually impossible to intervene in all the places we should, at least with the current international and domestic constraints remaining in place.

A wide variety of points were discussed, including the difficulties of exporting liberalism, the value of imposed autonomy, conflicts between democracy and humanitarian intervention and cultural relativism, on which John McDonnell commented that ‘one person’s jihad is another’s just intervention’.

Unfortunately, there is not enough space here to summarize the details of what was said, nor to mention the valuable contributions of the audience, suffice to say that humanitarian and military intervention is far more complex than ‘just intervention’. Thanks go to all of the speakers, especially Laura Valentini, who helped to refine the topic and to Gulzaar Barn, Lizzie Greenhalgh, Mark Harrison, Fergus Mutch, Temi Ogunye, Camelia Sadeghzade and Danielle Tobin for organising the event.
MSc EPP ANNUAL STUDY TRIP

Laura Skoratko and Aurore Kullak, MSc European Public Policy students (2011–12) write:

Rising bright and early to catch the Eurostar over to Brussels, a group of MSc European Public Policy students, along with programme director Dr Sarah Wolff, embarked on a busy day of meetings in Europe’s capital. The annual study trip’s goal is always to bring students studying the European Union closer to the everyday functioning of the institutions and outside actors in Brussels. It is a chance for students to meet and exchange with ‘Eurocrats’, lobbyists and media in order to gain a clearer sense of work and life in Brussels.

After arriving at Gare du Midi, there was little time to store some luggage before hopping on the metro to Trône station – where the European Parliament is located. At European Parliament (EP), we were welcomed by a very enthusiastic Mr Kanaras who briefed us on EP procedures and inter-institutional relations after the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty.

Ms Apap, working as part of the IMCO (Internal Market and Consumer Protection) Committee secretariat, then briefed us on her most recent work on a new strategy for consumer policy and the EP’s input into the EC’s Consumer Agenda 2012. All of us were quite engaged with her work and had some tough questions about transparency in the lobbying of consumer standards and even policy drift!

Following the two presentations, we were able to take a quick peek at the Brussels plenary (as most of the full plenary sessions take place in Strasbourg) where technicians were installing a new sound system. We were also given insight into the somewhat difficult task of translating MEP speeches into 23 languages – with the less spoken languages sometimes needing to be translated into English, French or German before other booths can translate into their respective language.

In the afternoon, we walked to 61 rue du Trône where we met with four speakers who exposed the group to the functioning and output of their respective professions:

- **Jesse Scott**, Head of Environment and Sustainable Development Policy Unit, Eurelectric
- **Sanjeev Kumar**, E3G: Third Generation Environmentalism
- **Dominique Ostyn**, Senior Manager Communications & New Media: EurActiv.com
- **Karolina Stasiak**, Mauritania Desk Officer from the EEAS

Following the tour, we enjoyed a nice lunch in the European Parliament canteen and an even nicer coffee in a café in Place Lux.
During the two hours we received an in-depth panorama of what it looks like to work in the European Capital. It was a chance for us Master’s students – but also young professionals and Europhiles – to listen to their working experiences and their ongoing projects.

From an independent not-for-profit organisation to the European External Action Service, it was an enlightening series of information, advice and encouragement that was genuinely relayed.

After the meetings at rue du Trône, we went for a well-deserved drink in a surprisingly sunny Place du Lux.

Between the songs and excitement of our neighbours watching the European Championship, we were able to chat with some former UCL students about having a career in Brussels as well as in Europe.

We do not know if it was the aura of the European Parliament just next door or simply the Belgian air but this ‘European’ journey gave to most of us an even greater envy to be part of Brussels and the European machinery.

It was in this cosmopolitan vibe and a potential Polish victory against Greece that we said goodbye to Brussels...

goodbye and see you soon!


Dr Sarah Wolff, 2011-12 MSc European Public Policy Programme Director, writes:

The LISBOAN Erasmus Academic Network awarded on 11th of May its 2012 award for Outstanding Research to the book co-edited by Sarah Wolff, Flora Goudappel and Jaap de Zwaan on ‘Freedom, Security and Justice after Lisbon and Stockholm’. This award praises the collaborative efforts of the contributors, practitioners and academics, whose hard work have turned this project into a reality. The award distinguished the book for its contribution to the state of the art of research on the Treaty of Lisbon and its implementation.

The book’s objective is to understand whether the Area of Freedom, Security and Justice is becoming a reality and how is it governed. It is indeed a fascinating policy field that has repercussions on the daily life of European citizens, EU’s external relations and for the construction of the EU as a polity. It is in this context that the book provides a fresh look on the AFSJ. Lisbon and Stockholm have acted as catalysts in a rather young policy field, compared to other EU policies. The book looks at various fields including fundamental rights, the freedom of movement of persons, European citizenship, migration, asylum, policing, criminal law and EU internal security. It also analyses the evolution of JHA governance, the key role of member states when it comes to agenda-shaping and implementation but also the increased role of national parliaments and the European Parliament.

For further information:


www.asser.nl/publications.aspx?site_id=28&level1=14485&id=4409
PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH GLOBAL POVERTY: EXPLAINING SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT

To what extent do UK citizens support action on global poverty, such as giving international development aid and why? Dr David Hudson (UCL, Department of Political Science) has recently been awarded a prestigious British Academy Fellowship to carry out a programme of research answering this question.

Successive UK governments have committed themselves to reach the long-standing international aid target of 0.7% of GDP. The decision of the current government to ring-fence aid spending in the context of widespread budget cuts elsewhere has sorely tested public support. Survey evidence tends to show high but dwindling support for giving money overseas but the evidence also reveals widespread confusion among the public about how much aid is actually given – estimates vary wildly! Furthermore, it would be true to say that beyond the headline data about levels of support, policymakers and researchers know precious little about why and under what conditions people do and don’t support development aid.

A recent and important report by Andrew Darnton and Martin Kirk on UK public attitudes towards global poverty argues that, ironically, the development sector has succeeded in undermining support by presenting giving money as the solution. In the report – called Finding Frames (http://findingframes.org) – the authors propose an alternative approach to engaging the public in development issues. Instead of framing development as a problem that charitable giving can help resolve, it’s better to understand people’s underlying values and how people respond to different presentations of global poverty; for example is addressing global poverty a matter of charity or justice, do people support aid for others or themselves, do people act out of sympathy or empathy, to what extent are these frames filtered through notions of ‘us’ and ‘them’?

Building on the insights presented in Finding Frames the research will provide evidence on (1) what drives individual attitudes, (2) how global poverty is framed in the media and (3) how different frames affect individual’s attitudes.

(1) There are many claims why citizens do (not) or should (not) support government expenditure overseas, e.g. moral beliefs, perceptions of corruption and fraud or economic recessions triggering ‘home first’ instincts. While oft-asserted there is no systematic and simultaneous study of these competing claims. Drawing on cross-national survey data the first leg of the research will utilize hierarchical modeling techniques to determine the relative influence of individual and country-level factors in determining support for development aid.

(2) The second leg will use recent advances in automated content analysis to carry out a longitudinal analysis of how global poverty and development assistance are framed in UK national newspapers, i.e. whether giving aid is a self-interested or altruistic act, whether poverty is caused by corruption or international inequalities. The data will reveal the key frames, how they change over time and the extent to which particular frames tend to be associated with certain types of actors or political persuasions.

(3) The final leg of the research project examines how individual attitudes and frames interact through using experimental techniques. Individuals will be asked a series of questions about their position on global poverty and development. This will be followed by randomly assigning them a different short film to examine if and how alternative ways of presenting global poverty affect (or not) individual attitudes towards development aid.
The British Academy Mid-Career Fellowship is for the Fellow to use time freed from normal teaching and administrative commitments to complete a major piece of research. Importantly, awards are judged on both the excellence of the proposed research and on the capacity of the applicant to communicate with a broad audience. Applicants are asked in their proposal to set out specific plans for the dissemination of their research to a broad audience, in addition to publication in the usual academic press and journals.

The project builds on Dr Hudson's previous research (co-authored with Jennifer vanHeerde-Hudson) on public support for development. David gave oral evidence on these issues to the UK Parliament's International Development Committee in March 2009 as part of the Committee's investigation into 'Aid under Pressure: Support for Development Assistance in a Global Economic Downturn.'

Workshop and policy roundtable on climate change litigation, policy and mobilization

On April 26th and 27th 2012 Dr Lisa Vanhala (Lecturer, Department of Political Science, UCL) and Professor Chris Hilson (Reading University) hosted a conference at the British Academy on Legal Mobilization and Climate Change. Lisa reports on the origins and outcomes of the workshop.

Climate change is one of the most pressing issues on the policy agenda today and the courts are emerging, according to the New York Times, as new "battlefields in climate fights". Much focus has been placed on international efforts to find legal solutions to mitigate and adapt to the challenges of climate change. However in the face of frustration at the slow pace of progress under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, scholars have increasingly noted that transnational efforts are being complemented by national and local level action by activists, regulators and judiciaries. Lawsuits addressing the causes and consequences of climate change, such as the expansion of airports, the reliance on coal-powered energy production and the destruction of the habitats of endangered species for example, are increasingly apparent on the dockets of international, national and sub-national courts. A two-day workshop held at the British Academy in April explored this growing phenomenon.

The idea for this event emerged in 2010 while sitting on a park bench in Lincoln's Inn Fields. Chris Hilson and I were both doing research on the growing number of lawsuits and legal actions that were being brought in the name of climate change around the world. We wanted to bring together scholars working in different disciplinary approaches and focusing on different regions to leverage the power of comparative analysis. With funding from the British Academy this workshop brought together leading scholars and practitioners from around the globe to explore: a) the causes of individual and collective actors mobilizing legal norms and processes in various areas of climate change policy; b) the factors that contribute to a docket that includes climate lawsuits; and, c) the impact of climate change litigation on policy and corporate behaviour.

The workshop consisted of two components. First, an academic workshop over a day and a half that brought together scholars from Australia, Canada, the U.S., India, France, Germany, Sweden and the United Kingdom to consider the growth of climate change litigation in individual jurisdictions, in the European Union and across countries. The scholars engaged with different disciplinary approaches including law, political science, sociology and geography. Despite the diversity of papers several overarching questions ensured coherence in the discussion: how should we define the concept of climate change litigation? Is it when a court judgement refers to climate change or when one of the participants does? Are we moving to a new phase of climate change litigation scholarship? Is it time to consider legal actions beyond just whether they fall on a pro- or anti-regulation side? How should we define the concept of "reactive climate litigation"? While some would like to include civil disobedience efforts and prosecutorial responses within their understandings of how climate change enters the courtroom others felt this was a mischaracterisation of climate change activism.

The second component consisted of an afternoon policy roundtable. This was chaired by Professor Richard Macrory of UCL Laws and Lisa Vanhala. The sessions brought together key stakeholders in climate change litigation activity from government, the private sector and NGOs.
with legal experts and academics. The public roundtable was a fruitful and inspiring if at times sobering discussion of the barriers that litigants face in the courtroom.

Participants debated: what role do the courts have in clarifying the rights and responsibilities of greenhouse gas emitters? Can courts help stakeholders to secure governmental protection from climate-related harm? Is climate change litigation forcing governments and businesses to adopt more climate compatible policies and practices? Issues touched upon included transnational litigation, the use of litigation by corporations, the emergence of developing nations as jurisdictions that might see a rise in climate law suits and the growth of litigation about adaptation to climate change. The Policy Roundtable was over-subscribed with more than 90 participants registered. At least one attendee has blogged about the event (for the Climate and Development Knowledge Network and more details of the discussion can be found here: http://cdkn.org/2012/05/postcard-from-london-rising-tide-of-climate-change-litigation

As a next step the academic participants are putting together a special issue of the papers from the workshop for the journal Law & Policy. The workshop also laid the groundwork for continued collaboration. We are grateful to the British Academy for funding and hosting the event.

List of Practitioner Participants:
Peter Kellett, Environment Agency
Richard Lord, Brick Court Chambers
Gita Parihar, Friends of the Earth
Joss Saunders, Oxfam
Jasper Teulings, Greenpeace International
Kristin Casper, Greenpeace International
Niall Watson, WWF-UK
Kate Harrison, Harrison Grant Solicitors
Frances McCartney, Patrick Campbell Solicitors
Michael Schwarz, Bindmans LLP
David Wolfe, Matrix Chambers
Laura Gyte, Friends of the Earth

Academic participants:
Sanja Bogojević, University of Lund
Hari Osofsky, University of Minnesota
Jacqueline Peel, University of Melbourne
Lavanya Rajamani, Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi
Gerd Winter, University of Bremen
Liz Fisher, Oxford University
Graeme Hayes, Aston University and Sciences Po Rennes
Lisa Vanhala, UCL
Chris Hilson, University of Reading
The European Parliament currently reviews its internal rules on how to negotiate legislation under the EU’s co-decision procedure. Under co-decision, Parliament, representing the people of Europe and the Council of Ministers, representing the Member States, need to reach agreement before legislation can enter into force.

Over the last decade, an ever increasing percentage of laws have been adopted at first reading; such “early agreements” account for 77% in the on-going parliamentary term. Early agreements are praised for their efficiency and swift policy-responses. Yet, to be adopted at first reading, legislation is routinely pre-agreed by a restricted group of decision-makers from Parliament, Council and European Commission in a secluded and informal arena, known as “trilogue”.

Actors inside and outside Parliament therefore criticise the legislative process for lacking transparency, inclusiveness and visible political contestation. Against this backdrop, the European Parliament currently discusses how trilogue negotiators should be mandated and controlled; how information flows can be guaranteed; and whether and how the plenary should be involved at the early stages of negotiation.

Intervening at a crucial moment in the reform debate, Christine Reh (SPP, University College London) and Lukas Obholzer (European Institute, LSE) recently launched a policy-brief at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) in Brussels. Part of Christine Reh’s ESRC project on The Informal Politics of Co-Decision, the brief critically assesses the status quo and the suggested reforms against the benchmarks of efficient law-making, transparent legislation and visible and inclusive deliberation. Given Parliament’s role as a guarantor of EU legitimacy, the authors put a premium on inclusiveness and transparency and suggest a set of rules designed to maintain efficient negotiation for technical proposals; facilitate effective decision-making on urgent files; and strengthen the overall legitimacy of the EU’s legislative process.

A workshop on the subject was held with key decision-makers from Parliament, Council and Commission at CEPS in April 2012 and the policy-brief was launched in Brussels on 10 May 2012, with Andrew Duff, MEP and Una O’Dwyer, former Head of Co-Decision in the European Commission, acting as panelists.


More information on the project can be found at: www.ucl.ac.uk/spp/research/esrc-project
The Constitution Unit is the largest research centre within the School of Public Policy. It is the UK’s leading centre for the study of constitutional reform and has a long track record of conducting high-quality research and influencing policy debates through publications and events.

Unit Director Professor Robert Hazell and Deputy Director Dr Meg Russell teach courses within SPP and act as supervisors for students’ dissertations. They are currently leading research projects on special advisers, judicial independence and parliament.

SPP students are welcome to attend the Unit’s monthly seminars and part-time students may also be interested in our internship programme (see below).

Full details of the Constitution Unit’s activities can be found at: [www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit](http://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit)
New Publication

The Politics of Coalition: How the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Government Works

The Constitution Unit has completed a year-long action research project examining the workings of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition. The Unit interviewed over 140 key individuals about the Coalition and the impact coalition government has had upon Westminster and Whitehall. This led to a book, The Politics of the Coalition: How the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition Works, being published by Hart Publishing in June 2012.

The Politics of Coalition covers the period from the Coalition’s formation to the end of 2011. The Coalition has confounded British expectations of coalition government as unstable and indecisive: it has been bold and harmonious. At the Centre, various informal decision-making forums have emerged to deal with coalition issues but there has also been a revival of formal Cabinet government. In the departments, there was robust argument but ministerial teams worked well together.

The picture was less harmonious in Parliament. There have been high levels of rebellion and resentment in the Commons; and several defeats in the Lords. In spite of this, the government remained in control.

House of Lords Reform

During the battles that raged in June over House of Lords reform (see article on page 6, House of Lords Reform: What Will Happen and What Should Happen), the Constitution Unit’s Dr Meg Russell provided a useful video summary of what options are left to the government as they return to discuss the bill at committee stage in the Commons in September. See www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/constitution-unit-news/130712

For the Unit’s other work on parliament, see www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/research/parliament

Special advisers: aiding responsive government, not unaccountable government?

The Constitution Unit has recently begun a 15 month-long project examining the role and functions of special advisers (spads) from 1997 till the present day. Very little is known about special advisers, temporary civil servants who are appointed to provide political and/or expert advice to ministers. This project asks: who are special advisers; what do they do; and how can their effectiveness be improved? We aim to remedy the lack of an evidence base through the construction of a database and semi-structured interviews. This project is funded by the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust. The project team consists of Robert Hazell, Ben Yong and Peter Waller.

Ongoing updates on the project are available here: www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/research/special-advisers
Constitution Unit Autumn Seminar Series

The Constitution Unit holds monthly seminars on a range of topical UK constitutional issues. The autumn 2012 programme is as follows:

The Politics of Coalition

The Constitution Unit’s Prof Robert Hazell and Dr Ben Yong will discuss the findings of their recently published book on the UK coalition government’s first two-years in power.

Date and Time: Wednesday 10 October 2012, 1.00 pm
Venue: Council Room, SPP

Redesigning Press Regulation: Lessons from Overseas

Lara Fielden (Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism) will discuss how other countries have addressed press freedom and regulation, in the context of the UK’s Leveson inquiry.

Date and Time: Tuesday 13 November 2012, 6.00pm
Venue: Council Room, SPP

The Role of the House of Lords in the Parliamentary Process

Baroness D’Souza (Lord Speaker) will discuss her vision for how the House of Lords can best play a role in the UK’s democratic process.

Date and Time: Thursday 6 December 2012, 6.00pm
Venue: Council Room, SPP

Sign up for all our events on our website and find videos and presentations from previous seminars at: www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/events

Internships

Part-time current SPP students and SPP alumni may be interested in applying for the Constitution Unit internship scheme. Interns are invited to assist in one of the Unit’s project streams, which currently include special advisers, parliament, comparative constitutions, judicial independence and constitutional and administrative law.

Please find details at www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/aboutus/internships
Leaverhulme Research Fellowship and Research Fellowship at Hanse-WissenschaftsKolleg (HWK), Delmenhorst awarded to Professor Richard Bellamy

Richard Bellamy has been awarded a Leverhulme Research Fellowship to complete a book for Cambridge University Press on A European Republic of States: Cosmopolitanism, Republicanism and the European Union.

The project addresses the question of which set of political arrangements is capable of providing the EU with democratic legitimacy? The aim is to compare liberal cosmopolitan and republican responses to this question. The objectives are: a) to show how a model of international democracy based on cooperation between democratic states can be grounded in a republican theory that takes freedom as non-domination as its core value; b) to argue that this view has both normative and empirical advantages over liberal cosmopolitan theories of global democracy as an account of democratic legitimacy in the international arena.; and c) to use the EU as a case study to illustrate this argument.

Given the Euro crisis, this is clearly a highly topical issue. Whereas many have argued that the crisis offers an opportunity for yet further political integration, Richard contends that it more plausibly shows the limits of a cosmopolitan form of integration. However, it offers the opportunity to return to and deepen the original goal of the EU to produce ‘an ever closer Union of the peoples of Europe’ rather than a European people.

The book is being written with Richard’s long term collaborator on European issues, Dr Dario Castiglione of Exeter University. He will continue as Director of the European Institute until August 2013 but spend a part of the academic year as a Visiting Professor in Exeter. From September 2013 to June 2014 he will be a Research Fellow at the Hanse-Wissenschaftskolleg (HWK) in Delmenhorst. Other than doctoral supervision, Richard will be bought out from teaching and administrative duties in the department over this period.
The Volunteering Services Unit is one of the biggest volunteering departments in the UK. We work with over 300 projects in the local community and have been supporting UCL students with their volunteering in London for over ten years.

There are three main strands to our work – our innovations programme supports student-led initiatives, our one-off events programme provides opportunities without an on-going commitment and our brokerage service works with local community organisations to provide roles for students throughout the year.

As a student in the Department of Political Science, volunteering is a great way to pick up an insight into civil society and gain experience of working with different types of people. You’ll make new friends and improve your chances of getting decent paid work too but most of all, you’ll be making a difference right here in London.

You’ll get loads of support and advice from both the Volunteering Services Unit and the student-run Volunteering Society. Here’s what we do:

**Volunteering Services Unit**
- 1-to-1 advice sessions to help you choose the ideal project
- Ongoing support from our staff
- Innovations Programme (student leadership scheme)
- Personal Development Programmes
- One-off events
- Weekly e-bulletins with new one-off events and on-going opportunities
- Helpline on 0207 679 2512

**Volunteering Society**
- Meet other student volunteers
- Swap ideas
- Amazing socials and charity fundraising events
- Information on volunteering abroad
- UCLU Volunteering Magazine
- Regular Wednesday afternoon meetings

The Next Step...
- Have a look at our web pages, [www.ucl.org/volunteers](http://www.ucl.org/volunteers)
- Drop in and see us on the first floor of the UCLU Lewis’s Building at the top of Gower Street.
- Email us at volunteering@ucl.ac.uk
- Come to our Volunteering Fair on Thursday 4th October from 12-3pm in the South Cloisters, where there will be over 50 different stalls to browse and the opportunity to talk to a selection of our partners directly.

Professor Peter John started a debate on the LSE Impact of Social Science blog with his post, ‘How relevant is UK political science? A riposte to Matthew Flinders and Peter Riddell’: [http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2012/04/17/political-science-relevant](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2012/04/17/political-science-relevant). Mat Flinders from the University of Sheffield replied to the Riposte with his ‘You don’t need a weatherman to know which way the wind blows: a response to Peter John on the relevance of political science’: [http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2012/04/25/response-matt-flinders-political-science](http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2012/04/25/response-matt-flinders-political-science). The website has a number of other posts in reaction to the debate. The debate is being reproduced in the Political Studies Association magazine, Political Insight, for publication in the autumn. To continue the debate, Mat and Peter are editing a special issue of Political Studies Review with a number of invited contributions.
BASAK ADDRESSING SUPREME COURTS IN TURKEY

Dr Basak Cali, our Senior Lecturer in Human Rights, was on planes to her homeland a bit more than usual in May and June 2012. This was because she was invited to deliver two talks before two of Turkey’s Supreme Courts on the relationship between the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights and the domestic supreme Courts.

The first talk in May took place in the Turkish Constitutional Court and focused on the right to privacy and right to family case-law of the European Court of Human Rights and how the Strasbourg Court approaches decisions of the domestic supreme Courts when addressing a right to private life violation allegation.

The second talk in June took place before the Turkish Military Court of Cassation and the Turkish Military Supreme Administrative Court on the authority of human rights judgments before Supreme Courts.

Basak says that her audiences were tough and not always convinced that the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights should have direct effect in domestic courts. In response she said that her “ESRC-funded research into the comparative analysis of the perceptions of the authority of the European Court of Human Rights by domestic judges helped me immensely in both mapping out the relationship between these institutions and discussing the circumstances under which a domestic Court may rebut the authority of a human rights judgments.”

Basak further notes that interacting with domestic judges is a great experience for an international law academic: “We may not always have been in agreement but the audience was very receptive to my thesis that domestic judges ought to approach disagreement with Strasbourg as exceptional and show in each and every case why they are unable to follow a particular judgment.”
BOOK ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr Lisa Vanhala
Making Rights a Reality? Disability Rights Activists and Legal Mobilization

Lisa Vanhala’s book Making Rights a Reality? Disability Rights Activists and Legal Mobilization was recently awarded two academic prizes. Earlier this year Lisa received the Socio-Legal Studies Association/Hart Early Career Prize. The monograph was also recently recognised as the Best Book in Comparative Politics for 2010 and 2011 by the Canadian Political Science Association. The monograph was published last year by Cambridge University Press.

The CPSA described the book as making “a major theoretical contribution to our understanding of the politics of disability rights, the judicialization of politics and social movement theory. Vanhala presents a strong argument for ‘why, when and how some groups are more likely than others to rely on strategic litigation as part of their overall logic of action’…. Using a socio-logical-institutional approach, she develops a rich, in-depth analysis based on extensive interview data.”

Dr Sherrill Stroschein
Ethnic Struggle, Coexistence and Democratization in Eastern Europe (Cambridge University Press)

Problems of democracy are magnified in societies divided on ethnic religious lines, particularly where groups are mobilised into parties. Due to majority rule, minorities should be less willing to endorse democratic institutions where they persistently lose elections. These problems should hamper democratisation, but Eastern Europe contains several states that navigated these problems during the 1990s.

In Romania and Slovakia, sustained protest and contention by ethnic Hungarians in Romania and Slovaks brought concessions on policies that they could not achieve through the ballot box. Ethnic protest in these states made each group accustomed to each other’s claims and aware of the degree to which each could push its own.

Ethnic contention became a de facto deliberative process that fostered a moderation of group claims, allowing democratic consolidation to slowly and organically take root. Such moderation took place even after a violent riot between Hungarians and Romanians in 1990, showing promise for other democratising states.
NEW STAFF

The Department would like to welcome the following new staff:

Dr Roland Kappe
Lecturer in Political Economy

Dr Roland Kappe joins UCL in September 2012 as a Lecturer in Political Economy in a joint appointment between the School of Public Policy and the European Social and Political Studies Programme (ESPS).

Prior to coming to UCL, Roland received his PhD in Political Science from Stony Brook University in New York, working on how changing economic tides affect the popularity and survival of incumbent governments. He also holds an MA from the University of Konstanz in his native Germany and has worked for the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris.

Roland’s research interests include comparative political economy, political psychology and political methodology. He is especially interested in combining models of economic and retrospective voting with more realistic assumptions about human behaviour based on research from psychology. Roland’s methodological interests lie in the analysis of time series and panel data and agent-based modelling.

Additional research projects of his include a recent article on how party politics shape higher education spending in Germany’s federal system and an investigation into the robustness of commonly used predictors of the size of the welfare state.

Dr James Melton
Lecturer in British and Comparative Politics

James Melton joins the Department in September 2012 as a lecturer in British and Comparative Politics and a member of the Constitution Unit.

Prior to coming to UCL, he was an Assistant Professor of Economics and Institutional Change at the IMT Institute of Advanced Studies in Lucca, Italy. James earned a PhD (’09) and a MA (’05) in Political Science from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He also holds a BA (’03) in Political Science from Illinois Wesleyan University.

James’ research focuses on comparative constitutional design, investigating the origins, stability and enforcement of formal constitutional texts. He is particularly interested in how the design of formal constitutions contributes to economic, political and social development. James is a principal investigator on the Comparative Constitutions Project and an author on the first book from this project entitled the Endurance of National Constitutions, which won the best book award from the Comparative Democratisation section of the American Political Science Association.

Dr Nils W Metternich
Lecturer in International Relations

Nils W Metternich is Lecturer in International Relations at the School of Public Policy. He will join the Department in January 2013 and...
holds a PhD in Political Science from the University of Essex. Prior to joining UCL he was a postdoctoral research fellow at Duke University (2011-2012).

Nils W Metternich’s research focuses on the strategic nature of international and civil conflicts and the prediction of their dynamics. His work explores why political actors choose to engage in fighting and conflictual behaviour despite having societal more desirable alternatives like democratisation, economic prosperity and peace. Nils W Metternich analyses the dynamics of peace and conflict with network analytic and other quantitative methods. His work has been published in World Politics and the Journal of Conflict Resolution.

Nils W Metternich is excited about joining one of the leading political science departments and contributing to its success. He is looking forward to collaborative research activities, inspiring student interactions and positive relationships with academic and administrative staff members.

I graduated from Brunel University in 2008 and went on to work as a Student Support Officer at Hobsons, a company involved with international student recruitment. I then went on to work at the Royal Veterinary College as a Postgraduate Administrator. I really enjoy working with students and am delighted to be given the opportunity to join the School of Public Policy.

In my spare time, I love to cook but given my sweet tooth not much time is spent on main meals, for me it is all about the dessert! I really love to bake and I attend courses in the hope I will eventually perfect my cupcake skills. I also love going to the theatre and am currently learning to swim, better late than never! My other main love is Ireland as it is where my family are from, I have lots of great memories from holidays there and I still get excited about going back and take any opportunity I get to visit.

I look forward to meeting you all in the coming few months.

I joined the department in May 2012 as a Postgraduate Course Administrator.

Rebecca Kevane
Course Administrator

I graduated from Keele University with a BA Hons in English Literature and Philosophy in 2004 and then completed an MA in Romantic and Sentimental Literature (1770 – 1830) at the University of York in 2006. My specific area of interest was Lord Byron and gender politics.

At the moment, I am dividing my time between working at SPP and adjusting to a new life in London. I am really excited to be part of the SPP team and I hope to make a positive contribution to the School in the future.

Previously, I worked at York St John University as a Senior Administrator in the Faculty of Education and Theology and prior to that as an Administrator in the Registry (Student Records) department, both at York St John and Sunderland University.

I joined the Department as full-time Receptionist/Administrative Assistant at the end of August this year.

Katerina Syriou
School Receptionist/Administrative Assistant

I graduated from York St John University with a BA Hons in English Literature and Philosophy in 2004 and then completed an MA in Romantic and Sentimental Literature (1770 – 1830) at the University of York in 2006. My specific area of interest was Lord Byron and gender politics.

At the moment, I am dividing my time between working at SPP and adjusting to a new life in London. I am really excited to be part of the SPP team and I hope to make a positive contribution to the School in the future.

I joined the Department as full-time Receptionist/Administrative Assistant at the end of August this year.
FROM IDEAL PRINCIPLES TO REAL POLITICS

Dr Valentini organised a political theory workshop in the Department of Political Science. ‘From Ideal Principles to Real Politics: Methodological Perspectives in Political Theory’ took place on 18–19 June 2012 in the SPP Council Room.

Lior Erez and Guy Aitchison-Cornish, PhD Doctoral Candidates at the Department of Political Science, write:

In recent years, political theorists have become growingly interested in the methodological aspects of the discipline, specifically in questioning the role of political theory and the relation between abstract theories and the real world of politics. The two-day workshop brought together speakers from varying theoretical persuasions to debate these central questions, as well as over eighty attendees from universities across the UK (particularly London and Oxford).

Two camps in the debate were clearly present. In what one might call the ‘utopian’ camp, Zofia Stemplowska (Warwick) analysed the relationship between ideal and non-ideal theory in Rawlsian thought and argued that despite common critiques, the more abstract level of theory is a fundamental part that cannot be dispensed with. David Estlund (Brown) presented a more radical position, arguing that the standards of justice are designed for a utopian world where we assume all moral requirements are complied with and that a theory of justice should therefore ignore ‘bad facts’.

The ‘realist’ camp, on the other hand, presented a case against the overly abstract. Jonathan Wolff (UCL) challenged what he called ‘the naïve model’, according to which political theory is merely an applied form of abstract philosophy. Wolff argued that we ought to begin our theorising from where we are now and suggested a model of political theory which is particular and pointing to specific values neglected by public policy, rather than striving for some holistic truth.

Kai Spiekerman (LSE) presented a model for a realistic normative theory and discussed the place of feasibility constraints, which he argued to exist both on the individual and collective level. Robert Jubb (UCL) introduced Bernard Williams’s critique of Rawls, arguing that political theory is categorically distinct from ethics and should be focused on questions of stability and civil order. Jubb argued, however, that Williams and Rawls (properly understood) are more similar than is commonly thought.

Some speakers chose to apply different methods on the range between utopianism and realism to address specific questions. Mark Stears (Oxford) argued for a realistic yet hopeful account of radical democracy, which places much emphasis on passion, doubt and a sense of togetherness. Laura Valentini (UCL) asked whether it can be said that we have a duty to create just global institutions, given that there isn’t an agent capable to fulfil this duty.

Finally, Constanze Binder (Rotterdam) addressed the problem of policy cycles in Amartya Sen’s comparative approach. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the debate was not settled by the time of the closing statements.
RESEARCH GRANT UPDATE

Congratulations to the following members of staff who have successfully secured the following grants:

Dr David Hudson
has been awarded a British Academy grant entitled ‘PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT WITH GLOBAL POVERTY: EXPLAINING SUPPORT FOR DEVELOPMENT’ this is due to begin on 01-Jan-2013 and run for 12 months. This project aims to carry out original and high-impact research, using appropriate quantitative methods on survey, text and experimental data, to provide answers to the questions such as: ‘To what extent do UK citizens support action on global poverty and why? To what extent are attitudes driven by an individual’s knowledge and values? To what extent are these personal attitudes shaped by how global poverty is framed in the media and public sphere?’

New research project on Special Advisers
Professor Robert Hazell and the Constitution Unit have been awarded funding by the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust for a project on Special Advisers. The Rowntree Reform Trust funded the first Special Advisers in the 1970s, who became known as ‘chocolate soldiers’, and more recently ‘spads’. They have come to be seen as malign figures—‘people who live in the dark’, with the focus on a few well-publicised controversies, and a tiny number of spads (eg. Alastair Campbell or Andy Coulson). But in fact we know very little about special advisers: who they are and what they do has not been documented.

So this project asks: who are special advisers; how are they appointed; what do they do; and how can their role and effectiveness be improved? It is difficult to understand the role of special advisers in government and their impact without having a proper evidence base from which to work. We aim to remedy this through the construction of a database and interviews with special advisers, their ministers and civil servants.

We hope to move the policy debate on from a largely negative attitude to accepting the presence of special advisers in government and a more constructive discussion of how to improve their effectiveness.

The project will run for 15-18 months until autumn 2013. The project team consists of Robert Hazell, Ben Yong, Peter Waller, Brian Walker (who all worked together on the Unit’s coalition government project last year) and an intern, Max Goplerud. For further details see the project website at www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/research/special-advisers
PhD PROGRAMME NEWS

Dr Slava Mikhaylov, MPhil/PhD Programme Director reports:

Accepted or forthcoming publications

   * This is the co-authored introduction of the upcoming Special Issue "Gramsci and Religion" of the journal.

   * In this article in Japan's quarterly journal read by the wider public, I wrote how the media reported the Japan disaster 2011, focusing on their use of “scientific” discourse and its paternalism to prevent people from objecting it. I then discussed the role of the social constructivist view to call for a wider discussion about the related issues - e.g. about the potential harm of the nuclear accident about which the natural scientists have not yet established a well-grounded theory.

Media coverage

Noha Aboueldahab was interviewed by UCL about her research and experiences at the 2011 protests at Tahrir Square.

The UCL News Podcast is available here: http://soundcloud.com/uclsound/ucl-news-podcast-tahrir-square and there will be an edited version of the interview transcript in the form of an article in the next UCL Alumni magazine 2012.

Conference presentations


Barbara Sennholz-Weinhardt organised the interdisciplinary workshop “Shadow banking, financial innovation and regulation” on 23 and 24 February at SPP. It is part of an ongoing project of the Working group on regulation, which she is co-leading, of the EU funded COST Action IS0209 “Systemic Risk, Financial Crises and Credit”. Political scientists and economists from Romania, Germany, France, Austria and the UK presented work in progress on the regulation and architecture of shadow banking and its linkages to the banking sector and the real economy.
The EITM Methods Course, July 2012, University of Mannheim

Niheer Dasandi, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science writes:

In late June, I was able to attend the Empirical Implications of Theoretical Methods (EITM) course at the University of Mannheim in Germany, thanks to funding from the SPP Advanced Training Fund. The five-day course was geared towards providing graduate students and junior faculty with the opportunity to develop their ability to integrate formal models (e.g. game theoretic models) with advanced statistical techniques (e.g. maximum likelihood estimation and Bayesian inference).

The course brought together graduate students, post-doctoral researchers and junior faculty from universities across Europe; and was taught by Professor Randall Calvert and Professor Andrew Martin from the Washington University, St. Louis. The subjects covered were often fairly complex and we covered a number of different methods in a very short space of time. This was possible mainly because of the excellent quality of the teaching. Both course instructors took the time to focus on the intuition behind the different methodologies and to answer questions that the participants had. They also used relevant examples throughout the course to help participants clearly grasp the different concepts.

The key objective of the course is to provide participants with a better understanding of how we can better use theory and qualitative analysis to inform the statistical analysis of political outcomes. This objective was definitely met. Perhaps the best evaluation of the course is that I came back to London looking forward to the prospect of doing a research project in which I could employ the methods I had just been taught.
This is an abbreviated text of an inaugural lecture delivered 31 January 2012. The full text can be found at: www.ucl.ac.uk/spp/people/albert-weale

I want to express and explore the implications of one proposition that has come to seem increasingly obvious to me throughout my professional career as I have studied the process of public policy. That proposition is that ideas matter in public policy.

Health Technology Assessment

I take as my first example the work of the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). The fundamental question that NICE seeks to ask of any intervention is whether that intervention represents value for money and so can be judged cost-effective. Suppose for example that a new anti-cancer product is invented that delivers on average to a group of patients an additional five years of perfectly healthy life at a total cost of £100,000 per patient. In that case, the drug is delivering an additional five years of life at a cost of £20,000 per year per person. At this level of cost, NICE would regard the drug as being cost-effective. Such an intervention is thought to represent a good collective buy for the National Health Service. This relationship between costs and benefits at the margins of existing therapies is an ‘incremental cost-effectiveness ratio’.

An important complication arises when considering variations in the quality of life associated with different interventions. Interventions may deliver improvements in the quality of life as well as increases in the length of life and a sound cost-effectiveness analysis should make allowance for the quality, as well as the length, of life delivered by an intervention. Thus, an agency like NICE needs a measure of the benefit provided by an intervention, a measure that needs to take into account both added years of life and any gain in the quality of life. So is born the idea of a ‘quality-adjusted life-year’ as a measure of benefit.

The force of NICE’s cost-effectiveness analysis was shown in its early years when it determined that Relenza, a flu treatment developed by Glaxo Wellcome (now GSK), did not offer value for money and so it should not be reimbursed by the NHS. It was not good value for money because it was expensive and only reduced symptoms by one day. In the more formal language of NICE, the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio of Relenza was above any reasonable threshold failing to deliver enough quality-adjusted life-years for the cost of the product.

The first point to make about the NICE policy paradigm is that it marks a change from the traditional medical ethic by which health care practitioners and the health care system are charged with doing the most that they can for each patient without reference to the implications of those actions for other patients. A test of cost-effectiveness, by contrast, implicitly requires those responsible for health care not only to focus on the interests and well-being of the individual patients whom they are treating but also on the implications of treatment given to any one person for others.

The second point to make about NICE paradigm is that it involves not just one concept – like that of the quality-adjusted life-year – but a web of concepts and ideas bound together with one another. The idea of the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio cannot be understood without also understanding the ideas of economic cost and health care benefits, where the
latter are cashed out in terms of quality-adjusted life-year. The concept of the quality-adjusted life-year in turn cannot be understood without understanding how it is constructed from a set of preference-orderings derived from samples of people confronted with different combinations of pain and functionally impaired states. And the rationale of the framework cannot be understood without some familiarity with ideas of opportunity cost and cash-limited budgets. Each element in the network of concepts is defined by reference to other elements in the network.

Two Types of Analysis

When we study the role of idea in public policy, we can take one of two points of view. These points of view are not mutually exclusive but in their characteristic form they are logically distinct in structure and character. The first point of view is when we are concerned with the explanation of why political systems exhibit the policy institutions and patterns that they do. From this perspective, we may be intrigued for example as to why a number of countries have developed institutions for the assessment of the cost-effectiveness of health care technologies, as they have, which, though they may differ in institutional detail, nonetheless resemble one another in function. We have effects in which we are interested and our analysis sets out to determine their causes. In this explanatory mode, our interest in ideas is as one possible cause among others. However, there is another mode of enquiry. In this mode, we are not starting with a set of policies or policy institutions as effects as seeking to identify their causes but instead we take the policies or the policy institutions as causes and try to work out their effects. A health technology assessment agency, like NICE, is established. What have been its effects? In policy analysis, we ought to be concerned with more than just an account of what effects have followed particular causes. We ought also to be concerned in how well policies are performing in terms of political principles and social values that have human interest.

When proponents or advocates of a particular point of view advance the claim for the merits of their policies, they are making a claim to their policies being supported by reasons and reasoning. Policy reasoning is more than the political equivalent of the supporters of two football teams seeing who can out-chant or out-shout one another. For it to be reasoning, there has to be a practical inference from a set of considerations to a government policy. Policy reasoning is more than a push or prod in a certain direction verbally expressed. It is instead intended to supply a chain of inference between decision premises and action, pre-supposing evidence. Of course, both the decision premises and the evidence may be contested. But this is compatible with the claim that what is in principle at issue is reasoning involving what John Stuart Mill referred to as ‘considerations capable of determining the intellect’. We can always ask of any particular piece of reasoning in relation to public policy what it is about that reasoning that warrants its assertion.

The Democratic Intellect

Those who you who are familiar with Scottish academic traditions – and after all everyone who claims to be educated should have some acquaintance with Scottish academic traditions – will recognise the allusion to George Elder Davie’s book The Democratic Intellect in my title tonight (Davie, 1961; see also, Davie, 1986). The idea contained in Davie’s story is that there are types of civic cultures that favour the open discussion of matters of collective political concern as distinct from those that are hierarchically ordered, a conception of civic culture which in the case of Scotland, Davie claims, is derived from the Presbyterian inheritance and which showed itself educationally not only in the willingness of senior professors to conduct ‘examinations’ – that is to say discussion classes - with their pupils but even to accept that the pupil might be able to criticise the professor’s position (Davie, 1961: 16). Such a democratic intellect is not to be taken for granted but to be constructed as a legacy.

Those of us who work at University College London, established in the spirit of Benthamite radicalism, should understand as much as anyone the power of political ideas. Bertrand Russell once said that he was brought up to believe that Bentham taught that people ought to make soup of their dead grandmothers and it was only when Russell was older that he came to see that in the forty years in which Bentham’s ideas held sway between 1830 and 1870 the country became a much happier place. Criminal penalties were reduced, slavery was ended in Jamaica, the Corn Laws were abolished, compulsory education started in 1870 and the beginnings of the mass franchise were set in train. Russell might have added that public health measures were initiated and higher education was opened on a non-denominational basis at UCL, as Élie Halévy noted in The Growth of Philosophical Radicalism. To work in a university established on the principle of non-discriminatory access to those with the ability to benefit is to live a life in one form of the democratic intellect. To be able to profess in such an institute is a privilege.
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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:

I recently returned to the UK after spending two years working for the equivalent of the Cabinet Office in Abu Dhabi, the capital of the United Arab Emirates (UAE). While Abu Dhabi enjoys considerable oil and gas reserves resulting in one of the highest GDP per capita in the world, it is in reality a developing country. Many government departments are only a few years old.

My role was to report to the ‘Executive Council’ on the performance of government departments in realising the ambitious ‘Abu Dhabi 2030 Vision’ (a plan for developing the country). During my time I learnt a number of lessons from a public policy perspective.

In the UK we often feel that the ambition of public policy makers is curtailed by the given resources (money), in reality, as I learnt, there are other ‘softer’ barriers. The resources available in Abu Dhabi were considerable but the absence of a softer infrastructure to aid public policy formulation and implementation hampered delivery. Having worked as a civil servant in Whitehall, I can now appreciate how lucky we are to still have a professional civil service of dedicated people.

As Abu Dhabi is a fledgling country, its capacity and capability with respect to government administration is still in its infancy. However, counter intuitively because of plentiful resources, public policy is formulated and implemented through an over reliance on management consultants and expats of varying degrees of effectiveness (no doubt myself included!). Therefore, while the presence of resources was aiding the development of ‘hard infrastructure’ it was also preventing the development of an effective softer infrastructure to formulate and implement public policy.

Early next year, I will be travelling to six cities in the USA to examine the city mayoral system of governance.

If anyone wishes to contact me I can be reached on ash27vit@yahoo.co.uk.
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