The new academic year brings new students, new staff, new programmes and a new author of the Director’s Message. This year we will have to get by without our Director, David Coen. Let me start by wishing him a very productive sabbatical. Whether in Florence (EUI), Paris (Science Po) or maybe closer to home, he will have valuable time to devote to his research on business and government and lobbying the European Parliament, to return refreshed and ready for a second term as Director in 2015.

David’s first term as Director has been a period of rapid expansion for SPP. New programmes, institutes and research concentrations have built on existing strengths in public policy. In the process, SPP has attracted very talented students from all over the world and developed a research profile marked by success in publishing in the top journals and with the top academic publishers and in external funding. To make room for this extraordinary growth, we found adjacent space with the addition of Number 31 Tavistock Square last year.

Congratulations to Dr Nils Metternich for winning a highly competitive ESRC future research leader award for his work on big data and conflict forecasting. For two years running, we count a future research leader among our numbers with Dr Lisa Vanhalla’s success last year. Led by but by no means limited to the Constitution Unit, colleagues have combined this research performance with the ability to connect and communicate findings to the policy community. A recent piece in the Economist focussed on Jan-Emmanuel De Neve’s work on improving tax compliance and illustrates the contributions of department colleagues, including Professor Peter John, to what might be called the soft side of policy and how to encourage rather than enforce behavioural change.

Congratulations are due also to our successful nominees for promotion with Saladin Meckled-Garcia, James Melton, Slava Mikhaylov and Lisa Vanhala appointed to senior lecturer and Meg Russell to professor.

New staff who join us this year include Tom Dannenbaum who adds to our strength in human rights and political theory and is about to complete his PhD in Political Science at Princeton. Dr Tim Hicks, Lecturer in Public Policy and Director of the new PPE degree, comes to us from Trinity College. The BSc in Philosophy, Politics and Economics degree will have its first intake in a year’s time. Dr Lucas Leeman joins us from Columbia and takes up a quantitative methods post. Dr Lauge Poulsen, whose expertise is in international political economy, joins us from Nuffield College, Oxford and Dr Jonathan Monten will join us in January 2015 and contribute to our foreign policy and security areas. He is presently at the University of Oklahoma.

This September we expect to welcome some 400 or so masters students from around the world, from across a wide range of undergraduate degree programmes and career experiences, together with some 90 affiliate students to our undergraduate programme. We have our first intake of students on our new Executive MBA, an exciting partnership with New York University and an excellent group of research students joining our MPhil/PhD programme.

Not all learning takes place in the classroom and one advantage of our London location is the exciting line-up of outside speakers we are able to attract. Please be sure to keep Thursday evenings free throughout the term for the Department’s Policy and Practice seminar series.

Best wishes for the new academic year.

Professor Neil Mitchell
Acting Head of the Department of Political Science
In this sixty second interview we quiz Dr Marc Esteve, Lecturer in International Public Management.

**What is your name?**
Marc Esteve Laporta

**When did you join UCL?**
September 2013

**What are your responsibilities in the Department?**
Mainly teaching and research. My teaching focuses on organisational behaviour topics, such as leadership and organisational change; although I also teach more organisational theory oriented courses, such as Policy Implementation. My main research focus is on how individual characteristics influence decision making, specifically in interorganisational collaborations.

**What do you particularly like and dislike about your job?**
I definitely like the freedom to develop my curiosities. At the same time, I also enjoy the interaction with my colleagues and students. There is a really nice mix in being able to work on my own and also to collaborate with others about truly interesting topics.
What I dislike is the fame and the colossal economic wealth that comes with this job.

**What do you consider your greatest achievement to date?**
Without doubt, my greatest achievements are related with the impact of my job on students, practitioners and other academics.

**Most inspirational person that you have met whilst at UCL?**
It is really difficult to pick one single person from UCL. Honestly, I am tremendously lucky with my departmental colleagues. Since I arrived many of them have inspired me in many different ways. If I had to name one, it would probably be Professor Albert Weale. His wisdom has motivated me both professionally and personally.

**Favourite location in UCL?**
Definitely my office! I am very happy to share a really nice office with my colleague Dr Lisa Vanhala.

**What is your favourite book?**
I cannot really pick one. At this moment I am reading Inside of a Dog: What Dogs See, Smell and Know. It is a really interesting book written by Dr Alexandra Horowitz, a psychology professor at Columbia University.

**What are your hobbies?**
Essentially sports, rugby in particular. I used to play it a few years ago but now I focus my energy in supporting F.C. Barcelona. More recently, I have become a big fan of brunches and London charities. So I usually spend my weekends looking to shop for some bargains and eating around.

**If you had not gone into academia what would you be doing now?**
I always wanted to be an astronaut but I took the hard path and become an academic.

**If you could implement one policy in the world today, what would it be?**
I would very much like to see more policies promoting collaborations among public, private, non-profit and citizens in the provision of public services.
SPP STUDENTS ATTEND TATE MODERN WORKSHOP.

Tom Rutter, 2013–14 MSc Public Policy student, writes:

One of the most pleasing things about visiting Tate Modern is the variety and strength of work on display, with alternative pieces recurrently making their way into the halls of the former Bankside power station, generating debate on the subjects of politics, power and identity. Galleries and museums indeed play a crucial role in how we think about our own identities and the work on display is selected purposefully, with implicit political insinuations. This is of great personal interest to me and my MSc dissertation intends to explore such questions but with particular reference to Welsh identities and the discourses on display in the National Museum of Wales.

On two sunny days in April 2014, two groups of SPP students escorted by Dr Cathy Elliot descended south of the river for a workshop hosted by Community Curator Liz Ellis of Tate Modern, to discuss said topics and the interplay between politics, power, art and identity. The workshop took an informal and provocative approach, with the SPP contingent moving in and amongst the works of art; stopping at designated sculptures, paintings, photographs and projected image installations, to critically engage with the original modern artworks.

On first thought, this jolly spring workshop might not seem to have much to do with a Political Science department but the debates that ensued during the visit would wholly challenge such a view. Indeed, Tate Modern and all other museums and galleries for that matter, are very much sites that are intriguing for all people with an interest in politics: implicated in international relations, national identity and power.

Curatorial choices are inescapably political, in the sense that they involve a range of decisions regarding selection, exhibition and interpretation. The work on display has been picked for a reason but what reason? What message are curators at Tate Modern trying to convey? What are we being made to think about? Students from the School of Political Science pondered such questions during the visit and despite the fact that we were looking at the same works of art, we disagreed on their political implications.

One contentious part of the ‘Transformed Visions’ exhibition, which students engaged with, was to be found in a tunnel-like room with two artworks facing each other on opposite walls. Execution Squares by Hrair Sarkissian (2008) comprises fourteen large colour photographs depicting sites of public executions in Damascus, Aleppo and Lattakia. The photographs show unpopulated spaces, simultaneously exploring what is seen and what is not seen and without the artwork blurb alongside, one would fail to pinpoint where this desolate scene is located. The work is explicitly political, with a cumulative body of work that forces the onlooker to stare into the empty space left by conflict. On discovering the details of the images, perceptions regarding the installation changed, generating further debate about opinions and attitudes of the artwork when additional knowledge is provided. The other work in the room, entitled Vietnam II by Leon Golub (1973) is a three metres by twelve metres linen canvas, depicting two sides, one American, with machine guns and armored vehicles and the other inhabited by Vietnamese civilians, who are huddled in the corner to the right. The large expanse of space between the two sides offers a point of political engagement, implicating the viewer in the conflict and along the bottom edge, jagged excisions have been hacked away from the painting, echoing the violence we see in front of us, as an assault on the canvas. As one student remarked, everything in art is done for a reason and this shocking juxtaposition of artworks has been purposefully done by Tate’s curatorial team, to generate discussion on violence, morality and the de-humanization of those involved in war.

National and local galleries play a crucial role in how we think about our own identities and how we view other identities and cultures across the world. Tate Modern is no exception, shaping public discourse.
about national identities and cultures. Tate Modern and all of those working for the gallery are thus active agents helping to shape and reimagine political identities, memories and cultures. It falls to the viewer however, to interpret the pieces selected for display and as Liz Ellis reminded students during the visit, there is no right or wrong answer; no definitive meaning behind a sculpture or short film, we must make knowledge claims for ourselves and defend our own interpretations. I therefore highly recommend that you visit the Tate Modern and slowly progress through the gallery space, selecting one artwork and rigorously consider why it has been selected and what we are being asked to think about. Thus, measured and thoughtful discussions will allow gallery-goers to debate the discourses on display regarding our own identities and those of other nationalities or cultures on display. Happy viewing!

Many distinguished practitioners and academics visited our Department last year to speak for our Policy and Practice Seminar Series, which take place every Thursday at 5.30pm. Martin Davidson, Jonathan Powell, David Cowling, Jack Straw, Professor Michael Jacobs, Professor Robert Laslett, Sir Stephen Wall, Nicola Sturgeon, Sir Roderic Lyne and many more have shared with our students and visitors their time and expertise in their fields, such as diplomacy, EU issues, world politics, parliamentary development, special advisers, terrorism, election coverage, global governance, environmental policies, public policy and more. The attendance and enthusiasm with which the audience received the talks was enjoyable and together it was a grand way to lead to this year’s series.

The schedule for this academic year is being finalised and some of the highlights for this term will be Dame Nicola Brewer, talking about being an ambassador in South Africa, Sir Kenneth Keith talking about the challenges of the International Court, Srdja Popovic on non-violent movements and many more.

The events are open to the public and they will be taking place every Thursday at 5.30pm, starting from the 2nd of October, with a special panel on the future of the European Union. You can find the series schedule by visiting our website at: www.ucl.ac.uk/spp/seminars or checking our online registration page at: www.uclsppeventbrite.com

Stay up-to-date with all the SPP news and upcoming events; follow our Twitter account at: www.twitter.com/uclsppeventbrite and like our Facebook page at: www.facebook.com/ucl.politicalscience

You can also check our LinkedIn group; search for UCL Department of Political Science.

Nicola Sturgeon, Deputy First Minister of Scotland
PERSONAL REFLECTIONS ON ELECTION MONITORING IN UKRAINE.

Bernard Quoroll LLB Sol.
Postgraduate MA student in the UCL School of Public Policy writes:

“We have to save our system so our system can save us.”

These were the exact words of my interpreter in the North Eastern Ukraine oblast of Sumy, (a town about the size of Nottingham), where I was recently deployed to help monitor the Presidential elections on 25th May. I was then deployed on again to Konotop, a much smaller community, two hours by car from Sumy and only a few kilometres from Ukraine’s Russian neighbour.

The people of Sumy oblast mostly speak Russian but that does not describe their national loyalties. Many people switch language between Russian and Ukranian in mid-sentence. Many families have relatives living elsewhere in the former Soviet Union and vice versa. It can be very confusing to outsiders looking for a simplistic way of visualising allegiance. They are not simply Russian to the East and South and Ukranian to the West and that is without considering other ethnic loyalties such as the Muslim Tatars. In the former Soviet Union everybody was a Soviet citizen and depending on which Soviet state one lived in, would also be a subject of that state. Whenever a Soviet citizen moved from one former SU state to another, (s)he would automatically become a subject of the state (s)he moved to, whilst remaining a Soviet citizen. So there is still an important difference between citizenship and nationality, which complicates any understanding of loyalties on the ground.

On the day before the election a long convoy of vehicles raucously toured the district, sounding horns and waving the national blue and yellow flag to represent the sky and the vast fertile arable plains. They were defiantly making the point that they live in Ukraine, notwithstanding the tensions not many kilometres further south in Luhans’k and Donets’k where it was not safe to monitor in depth.

We are trained how to behave at check-points usually to be found at the perimeter of cities or towns. These ranged from doglegged piles of abandoned sandbags to heavily fortified structures, quasi-military vehicles and metal caves where people in improvised uniforms could sleep overnight. In this area they were manned by stern and sometimes bored looking young men carrying white painted sticks. There were very few Kalshnikovs in sight but that does not mean there were none to hand. The advice was always the same. Drive slowly and steadily into the chicane, follow instructions, do not take photographs and most of all do not try to avoid check-points or perform a U turn in front of them. We were always treated politely and waved through with a nod. One of the other teams engaged in a conversation and was invited to take a photograph but they did not get quite what they expected. Instead of an anonymous picture of sandbags and fortifications, displaying the grim reality of life in Ukraine, the self-defence force insisted on a joint group photo of smiling guards and monitors.

Our monitoring task was shared with 900 other volunteers from all round the world so each of us individually was a very small cog. It was not the largest group to be sent in recent years (there were 1500 in 2004/5 when I monitored in the Crimea, (alas now closed to Ukraine) but not far short. Each monitor is matched to an international partner (in my case a very efficient Dutch woman judge) and we are supported by a local interpreter and driver.
But what did my interpreter, a young married office worker mean by being “saved”? It is a familiar anthem in other places I have monitored over more than ten years – Bosnia, Kosovo and Kazakhstan to name a few. Most of the people I have observed, whether they are undertaking polling duties in local election precincts or the people themselves exercising their franchise, seem to me to see the election of an honest and effective government as their best hope for a good life. Manifestos in Ukraine are rudimentary - roughly along the lines of “I will be pro (or anti) better links with Europe (or Russia)”, condemning corruption or promising big changes but not very specifically. Hope is placed in the man or occasionally woman who promises these things. The substantial majority who voted for an ostensibly non-political president this time, may hope that his chocolate derived billions will better immunise him from corruption after a succession of politico’s. That is certainly what some people said to me after the result had come in. It may also represent a triumph of hope over experience. Whether this is a new beginning or just the same old same old remains to be seen but still they come out and vote. The Maidan at the time of writing is calmer now than when I visited in 2004/5. Independence Square is still peppered with makeshift structures and there are billboards neatly filled with photographs of the dead but the cafes are open for business and the tensions seem less.

Contrast all this with UK elections. The systems employed in the countries I have observed are quite sophisticated, arguably more so than the UK where identity cheating is easy and easier still after the introduction of postal voting. Problems in post conflict countries are in my experience more often associated with what goes on in or nearer the centre where ballot returns are collated, than out in the polling places. The UK’s centre is safe. Ukraine’s voting and counting procedures this year have been provisionally lauded by the OSCE as “transparent and largely in line with procedures”. There is more to do, particularly in the arrangements for handling the receipt of protocols after the poll but year-by-year it is often possible to see improvements as countries progress toward civil society with advice from the OSCE. It may be controversial and there is insufficient space here to justify my assertions but I do not think our voting system (as opposed to our counting system) would stand up to the same level of scrutiny. Couple this with the growing problem of declining numbers voting, so that even modest cheating can shift a result and we have something to worry about. Perhaps Ukraine can teach us something about fair elections?

My monitoring partner and I are still corresponding with our local team. They are brimming with pride that they have done something to help the stability of their country. That contrasts strongly with the circumstances of my Muslim Tatar interpreter in Simferopol in 2004/5, recently denied that opportunity. We have learned some humility again this year but also shown our small team and their fellow citizens that people elsewhere are interested in and supportive of their dreams. That alone makes the effort seem worthwhile.

Bernard was a returning officer for English elections over a seventeen year period, in three different local authority areas. He has presided over every kind of election, including Parliamentary Seats and a European Election Count Centre. During a thirty year period, he has undertaken or supervised every role in our election process.
MA HUMAN RIGHTS STUDY TRIP TO GENEVA.

Mark Edwards, 2013–14 MA Human Rights student, writes:

The 2013/14 MA Human Rights students travelled to Geneva in April 2014 for the annual study trip to the United Nations. The trip was organised by UCL MA Human Rights Programme Director, Dr Lisa Vanhala and thanks to a Faculty award this year, students who might not have been able to afford this experience were able to attend, making the turnout higher than years before. The two-day agenda included observing the Universal Periodic Review of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Portugal, critical discussions with diplomats and international NGO leaders and some professional networking. As we witnessed first-hand the international community’s formal approach to addressing human rights issues, by networking with the professionals we were able to map out our professional future in being a part of that process.

After witnessing the global review of the DRC’s significant notable human rights troubles as well as Portugal’s unique human rights challenges, students critically engaged the United Nations human rights systems with diplomats, experts and NGO professionals. Notable among these were Senior Human Rights Advisor for the UK mission to the United Nations in Geneva Bob Last and Marc Limon, Executive Director of Universal Rights Group and Sohair Riad of the Cairo Insititution for Human Rights. These professionals challenged us to interrogate the global legal framework in which human rights issues are address. A fundamental issue we found ourselves exploring was, if the common goal for all involved in the global system is improving human rights for everyone - in problematic states like the DRC and in less troubled states like Portugal as well – the concern must be whether systems like the UPR works effectively towards realising that goal. Again this year, we had the unique privilege of exploring that core issue with these and dozens of other professionals in Geneva – the city at the heart of monitoring human rights around the world.

In addition to in-depth debates about formal human rights systems, we also networked with human rights professionals, including UCL MA Human Rights Alumni. Whilst we discovered about the typical day in the life of working in places like international human rights organisations and diplomatic offices, we heard dozens of stories about the steps it took to get hired in the international human rights field. That education in the pragmatic aspect of working in the human rights field was a massive help in focusing our future plans after our academic time at UCL. After all, we’re most eager to apply our studies at UCL in improving human rights for everyone in our world.
NEWS FROM THE UCL CONSTITUTION UNIT.

Special Advisers Handbook

In March, The Constitution Unit published *Being a Special Adviser*, the latest product of our Special Advisers project. Compiled by Hilary Jackson, it is full of useful advice and practical tips, with the core being a series of hard hitting contributions by eight special advisers on how to make the most of the Whitehall machine without being ground down by it. We produced the handbook in response to a common complaint from all the Special Advisers we interviewed that they have no induction or training and are simply thrown in to sink or swim. Hilary Jackson and David Laughrin are now preparing a wider range of resource materials for Special Advisers which can be used in training programmes and which can also be accessed online.

On 28 March, the Handbook was launched at a seminar at the Institute for Government, which also launched the IfG’s publication *In Defence of Special Advisers*, by David Willett’s former Special Adviser Nick Hillman.

Report on financial privilege

In March, The Unit also published *Demystifying Financial Privilege*, a report by Meg Russell and Daniel Gover. In situations where the Lords pass a legislative amendment that has tax or spending implications, MPs may reject it on the basis of their ‘financial privilege’. Convention suggests that the Lords should not then insist on its proposal. The practice became particularly controversial in 2012, when financial privilege was invoked to overturn defeats inflicted by the Lords to the Welfare Reform Bill (including on the benefits cap and so-called ‘bedroom tax’). The episode led to widespread confusion, including complaints that the process had been abused by the government for political gain.

Our report is based around interviews with key actors and a detailed examination of how financial privilege has operated in practice between 1974 and 2013. As well as clarifying the process, it makes a number of recommendations for reform, including that the Commons should publish a clear and public definition outlining the extent of financial privilege. Speaking at the report’s launch in the House of Lords, respected Crossbencher Lord Pannick commented that ‘the Constitution Unit, Meg Russell and Daniel Gover have done a very great service in identifying the principles of financial privilege’. He added: 'I hope the report will encourage the Commons’ authorities to look again at their procedures. At the moment, the procedures are indefensible'.

New data from the Comparative Constitutions Project

The Comparative Constitutions Project (CCP) released two new data sets in April – available for download here. The first data set is an update to the CCP’s Chronology of Constitutional Events. In addition to making a number of minor changes to previously released chronology data, the CCP added constitutional events that occurred from 2007 to 2013. The second data set is a major expansion of the CCP’s data on the Characteristics of National Constitutions. The original release of these data (version 1.0) included only the contents of each constitution in force in 2006. The expanded data (version 2.0) contains all of the ‘cleaned’ data available from the project. This includes data from more than 8,000 country-years and for 1,258 variables.

Constitution Unit staff promotions

In July, it was announced that Meg Russell was awarded a Professorship and James Melton was appointed as a Senior Lecturer. We would like to congratulate them both and wish them the best in their new roles.
LIAISING WITH BRUSSELS.

Lenka Niederschuh, 2013–14 MSc European Public Policy student, writes:

After an early start by taking the 6.50am train to Brussels, the annual study trip of the MSc European Public Policy programme was a great opportunity of getting to know the city that some of us will soon be working in, to listen to interesting speakers that gave us insights on their work and burning issues of their field and was rounded off by meeting UCL Alumni that have forged their careers with jobs in Brussels. Special thanks go to Dr Christine Reh, EPP Programme Director, who makes these great days with various impressive guest speakers possible and to the Department for generously funding the trip.

Our ambitious schedule started off at the European Parliament (EP) where we first met Ryan Meilak, Conférencier at the EP, who gave us a general introduction to the work of the Parliament with a special focus on committee work but primarily talked about the consequences of the latest European elections and the post-election situation. He elaborated on UKIP’s struggle of forming a political group (requiring 25 MEPs from seven member states) and the political implications of them succeeding in doing so, such as a bigger platform for Nigel Farage in terms of speech time. Moreover, Ryan let us in on plans for an ‘American-style’ inauguration ceremony for the next Commission President in front of the European Parliament. Any political scientist can understand this symbolism as a clear signal of who is in charge and leaves one wondering what David Cameron thinks about this idea.

Later on during the first part of our day we were joined by Felix Lutz from the International Trade Committee, who spoke about the increases in international trade agreements since the EP has become a co-legislator through the Lisbon Treaty in 2009 and current negotiations and procedures of the International Free Trade Agreement (TTIP) between the European Union and the US. Following this, we were guided into the ‘hemicycle’ which is an exact replica of the plenary hall in Strasbourg where all parliamentarians meet once a month.

After a brief lunch break in the sun on Place Lux, we then changed scenery and wandered on towards Rond-Point Schuman which can be understood as the ‘second centre’ of Brussels’s European Quarter where the head offices of the European Commission and the Council of European Union are located. Right next to the institutions, we had booked a room in the European Commission’s “Europe Info Europa” building, in which we welcomed three more guest speakers. These were Pierpaolo Settembri (European Commission, General Secretariat), Anja Fiedler (European External Action Service), and Jesse Scott (Eurelectric). Pierpaolo Settembri gave us a lecture on his involvement in the preparations of the G8/G7 summit in Brussels, a novelty, as it was the first time not to be held in a member state of the G8/G7, due to the crisis in Ukraine and the illegal annexation of Crimea. Pierpaolo also talked about his current work on possible extensions of sanctions towards Russia, which could go beyond freezing assets of Russian key figures but are not sure to be used yet. Our second speaker of the afternoon, Anja Fiedler, advanced our knowledge on the development of the External Action Service (EEAS), which slowly seems to be overcoming the challenges of being newly formed in 2009 and which member states are starting to view less as a 29th foreign ministry and more as an asset. Particularly in countries where embassies are closed down for political reasons, the EEAS allows them to keep representatives in the country on their premises. Moreover, in politically tense situations, the EEAS considered a more neutral player by third countries and
helps to maintain political dialogue. To round off the picture we were in the end joined by the lobbyist Jesse Scott, who explained to us the credentials of successfully lobbying in Brussels and how it’s become possible that a green lobbyist works with the electricity sector.

All the speakers delivered inspiring insights that refined our picture of what work in and with the European institutions is like in practice, which is why this trip has truly enriched our study experience on the course. After this well-harmonised canon of speeches, we headed back to Place Luxembourg where we met former EPP and SPP students to discuss strategies on how to score the dream job in Brussels over a glass of delicious Belgian beer. With a few of us staying overnight, we enjoyed the rest of the beautiful day in the sun, and explored Brussels even further on the next day.

Whether we will end up working in Brussels or not, this day was a great opportunity of listening to first-hand experiences, getting to know the ‘capital of Europe’ and to finally not just learn about the European institutions but to actually see them!

VISIT TO THE FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE.

Alice Vincent, Head of Events, IPPR, writes:

On 19 March 2014, Alice Vincent, Head of Events of IPPR took 18 students to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO). We had a full programme for the afternoon. Martin Garrett, Research Analyst in the Americas Directorate and former diplomat at the FCO welcomed us in the impressive Commonwealth Offices of the FCO. We were told we were sitting on chairs from the original East India Company from the 18th Century! Martin gave us a fascinating talk about the ‘Development of Diplomacy’. The oldest representatives that could be termed as diplomatic envoys were from the Holy See although the French boast the oldest Foreign Ministry. Charles James Fox was the first British Foreign Minister in 1783. Taking us through to present day diplomacy there are around 46000 people representing British interests overseas and the types of activities that embassies engage in has mushroomed.

David Quarrey, Director for the Near East and North Africa Directorate, joined us for an informal Q&A session. Mr Quarrey is the FCO’s most senior adviser on Middle East policy. His previous occupations include Private Secretary to Prime Minister Tony Blair and heading the UK Mission to the United Nations Security Council in New York. The Q&A covered topics ranging from counterterrorism as a British foreign policy priority in the MENA region, Britain’s business interests and whether they clash with its democratic values and human rights principles and how British energy dependency in the Middle East shapes its foreign policy decisions.

We also extensively discussed British foreign policy on Syria and the necessity of having a united international voice, in particular from the Security Council. We noted this could become even more difficult given the potential isolation of Russia resulting from its behaviour in Crimea. Overall, it was concluded that foreign policy is always more successful when support is directed at principles and processes rather than personalities and parties.

To conclude our afternoon, Martin Garrett took us on a historic tour around the FCO. We saw some of the impressive staircases and hallways, we met Chancellor George Osborne’s cat ‘Freya’ who has her own Wikipedia page and is rumoured to be a spy. Finally, seeing Foreign Secretary William Hague passing by really was the final icing on the cake.
PRIVACY, SECRECY AND SURVEILLANCE.

Anna Clart, 2013-14 MA Legal and Political theory student writes:

On 22 May, the Legal and Political Theory course hosted a forum entitled ‘Privacy, Secrecy and Surveillance.’ The event may have lasted 2 hours but it was clear after the first 15 minutes that the seating arrangement would be symbolic: From the audience’s perspective, opposite sides of the table dovetailed perfectly with their inhabitants’ relative, ideological affinities.

The event began with some short summaries. After Professor Ben Bowling, who served as an eloquent and balanced moderator, gave his introductory remarks, each of the four speakers briefly outlined his or her stance towards the topic.

Professor Sorell, who researches politics and philosophy at the University of Warwick, underlined two trends: First, that surveillance is becoming increasingly decentralised, as ordinary individuals spy on each other with greater frequency and second, that the state surveillance of the future will be more focused on places than people. He concluded with a passionate defence of the British government, saying that he detests the term ‘surveillance state’ because it unfairly lumps the UK in with the likes of the Stasi. Using this term, he said, is a ‘casual vilification of our institutions.’

Amber Marks, a barrister and current lecturer of law at Queen Mary, went next. ‘In my field,’ she said, ‘security is very much about security from state coercion.’ The key point, she argued, is the rule of law: Any interference on the part of the state must be justified. This is usually the case for traditional methods such as wiretapping – unfortunately, many new surveillance technologies are unregulated but can give as much or more information as the old, regulated methods. In effect, the government is now treating everyone as criminals but without giving us the legal safeguards that criminals have traditionally been afforded.

Mark Harris, director of the ‘Don’t Spy on Us’ campaign, agreed with her. While he conceded that the UK is not the same as the Stasi, he argued that the government is breaking international norms and in a way that is, sometimes, more intrusive than the old East German methods. Like Amber Marks, he underlined that the government does not want this to change: ‘It took a private contractor to whistle blow on these programmes for us to have an open debate… I think we live in a surveillance state.’

Lord Carlile, a barrister and Liberal Democrat member of the House of Lords, went last, swinging the focus from privacy to security: ‘[O]ne of the first duties of a state,’ he argued, ‘is to protect its citizens’ – a duty that the UK government has fulfilled admirably. He referred to his personal experience in handling confidential security material, pointed out that there have been no suicide bombings in this country since 7/7 and argued that if the government did go too far, it would simply be voted out of office. He conceded that there was room for improvement but stressed that security measures would never be perfect: ‘This is art, not science.’ He was more concerned with corporate than state intrusions, contending that ‘[w]e’ve surrendered far more of our privacy than the public sector ever invades.’

With these introductory summaries out of the way, the question round began. Professor Bowling and members of the audience covered a wide a range of topics, including the right to be forgotten, the dangers of surveillance information falling into the wrong hands, the difference between internet and in-person surveillance and the reliability of inferences drawn from Big Data. The speakers used each question as a springboard for lively debates with their fellow panellists.

Two of the most hotly contested questions concerned the implications of Big Data for ordinary citizens. Professor Bowling kicked off the question round by asking whether the use of Big Data means that we are now all under surveillance.
Mike Harris answered in the affirmative, pointing out that it’s very difficult to opt out of state surveillance. Professor Sorell and Lord Carlile answered more or less in the negative. Sorell underlined the vast differences between different types of technology: The ubiquitous CCTV, for example, is often not even hooked up to a national network. ‘The mere existence of CCTV does not make this a surveillance state.’ Carlile argued that mass surveillance actually helps ordinary citizens by reducing the number of people under suspicion: ‘[T]he local cop used to round up all the burglars in town…because of the use of CCTV, they will round up far fewer people.’

Later on, an audience member asked about the potential for arbitrary interference that mass data provides: If the state always could use that data to examine us, isn’t that in itself a violation? Professor Sorell said no: ‘If a lot of data is lying dormant on a CCTV camera, [and] no one ever looks at it,’ that does not necessarily count as an intrusion. If it is not acted upon, it does not matter. Mike Harris disagreed, arguing that the Czech Supreme Court recently recognised that the mere fact that data is being held will change public behaviour and thus both infringes upon our freedom of expression and invades our privacy. Amber Marks added that this is also the opinion of the European Court and contended that the practice is not only intrusive because you might change your behaviour but also because you don’t know when or how the data is going to be used, especially since laws might change in the future.

The forum ended the way it began – with Professor Sorell and Lord Carlile on the one hand and Amber Marks and Mike Harris on the other, holding fast to their respectively approving and disapproving stances on the UK’s approach to privacy, secrecy and surveillance. Ultimately, it was this diversity of perspective that made the forum a lively and thought-provoking event.

To any moderator, speaker or audience member who may be reading this, a hearty thank you goes out to you all.

---

**FIND YOUR FUTURE: DISCOVERING, DEVELOPING AND MARKETING YOUR POTENTIAL.**

Helen West, UCL Careers Consultant, writes:

For very few people the best possible choice of career simply pops into their head without any external effort. For the majority of us, a serious, active effort is essential if we are to make an informed and sensible choice. The range of choice can be exciting as well as daunting.

I returned to the UK after years working abroad, to undertake a postgraduate degree as a mature student. I re-entered the workplace not only with an additional qualification but also with greater self-awareness. This subsequently led to a more focussed job search, identifying satisfying employment opportunities.

After joining a European Management Graduate Programme for a FTSE100 company, I later took up a business development role at a leading international law firm in London. For the following seven years I worked internationally as a Director in the Study Abroad industry: creating; staffing and managing programmes across Europe, India and Latin America. Each step acted as a springboard for the next opportunity.

I now have the privilege of working with committed postgraduates at the School of Public Policy; supporting them in identifying their preferred path (whether further study or employment) and in marketing themselves appropriately and successfully for their own next steps. Together, we make the most of the multiple resources available at UCL including the special careers programme designed for SPP students (networking alumni evenings; CV building; getting internship experience) as well as one-to-one sessions, applications advice and dedicated postgraduate careers talks, to help enable Masters students to plan and develop their own career.

I look forward to working with you.

---

Helen West, Careers Consultant, UCL Careers
Helen.l.west@ucl.ac.uk
THEORY IN PRACTICE: USING SIMULATIONS IN TEACHING.

Melanie Garson, Christine Reh and Lisa Vanhala, lecturers from the UCL Department of Political Science write:

Why do actors’ bargaining positions become fixed in international conflicts, potentially leading to escalation and violence? Why is it so difficult for the European Union to speak with a single voice on the global stage and to manage crises effectively? Why can the international community of states only reach lowest common denominator solutions in response to the dangers of anthropogenic climate change?

These questions are at the core of our teaching on international conflict and security, the EU’s role in the world and global environmental politics; in class, we analyse empirical evidence and apply competing theoretical explanations to find a response. But we also seek to bring contextual reality to the theories and data studied—through negotiation scenarios that simulate current attempts at peacebuilding, the EU’s crisis management or a specific round of UN climate talks. Such simulations are a student-driven (and fun!) way of deepening the players’ substantive knowledge, of applying theoretical arguments to the practice of international relations and of becoming familiar with bargaining processes and strategies; simulations also allow students to develop critical thinking, train negotiation skills, produce policy-briefs, gain confidence in public speaking, lead and work as part of a team.

International Security & Conflict Resolution (Melanie Garson)

There are many approaches to teaching International Relations, however in the undergraduate International Security course and the Masters Conflict Resolution & Post War Development course, we use simulations aimed at exploring the ease at which bargaining positions become fixed and can lead to conflict escalation; we also work with the presentation of policy briefs, debates and the design of the codes of good practice for peacebuilding to create a greater understanding of the practice of international relations.

The seminars are structured around the introduction of the simulation, small group work to prepare the simulation, the enactment of the scenario and the debrief with peer feedback. Occasionally, longer simulations might be distributed before the seminar and require some additional preparation. After the initial shock of having to be facebook/twitter/internet free for an hour, the students soon thoroughly commit themselves to the task that has been set and enjoy both an academic and socially productive experience. Students have the opportunity to synthesise their prior knowledge, their set readings, the lecture and their personal interests to provide a meaningful contribution to the seminar experience. Ultimately, these scenarios propel all the students in a seminar group to fully engage and to really think out of the box. The creativity unleashed never fails to impress! Above all, there is usually no shortage of laughter whilst gaining a sophisticated understanding of aspects of international relations at work and simultaneously building a toolbox of practical skills useful for any subsequent career.

European Union Foreign Policy (Christine Reh)

With the crisis in Ukraine as the topic, this year’s simulated meeting of the EU’s Foreign Affairs Council was happening in real time: originally tasked to focus on a comprehensive review of the EU-Ukrainian relationship and the possibility of imposing sanctions on Russia, the negotiators met on 6 March 2014, shortly after Russia’s annexation of Crimea. Most participants represented one of the EU’s member states; the foreign ministers were skilfully chaired by the High Representative, ably assisted by the External Action Service and competently advised by the Commissioner for EU Enlargement.

Following the opening tour de table, negotiations focused on the EU’s political and humanitarian response to the crisis, as well as on Ukraine’s long-term relationship with Europe. The negotiations mirrored reality in many ways: “normative power Europe”, evoking arguments about the EU’s democratic principles and commitment to international law met with national interests, driven...
by energy dependencies and domestic audiences; coalitions were built issue by issue; compromise emerged through more inclusive yet less precise texts; the well-informed Commission used both its expertise and budget lines to gain the lead role in providing financial assistance and in promoting long-term reform in Ukraine. It was the task of the High Representative to reconcile the competing positions on Russia and to muster financial support against the backdrop of tight national budgets—and just like in the “real world”, the chair’s task became easier and the suggested solutions more creative as the deadline for reaching a deal approached.

The game closed with a debriefing by Gergely Polner—who sat through many “real world” Council meetings as the spokesman for the 2011 Hungarian EU Presidency—and with a much better understanding of why it is so difficult for the EU’s member states to send unified, clear and decisive messages in foreign affairs.

Global Environmental Negotiations (Lisa Vanhala)
A key feature of the undergraduate course on Global Environmental Politics is the negotiation simulation that happens in the second half of the term. Climate Diplomat is a multi-stakeholder role-play that simulates the international negotiations to develop an arrangement to extend or replace the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The role-play incorporates actual materials from previous UNFCCC negotiations. Students play one of the following roles: the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS), Brazil, China, European Union, India, Japan, United States or COP Presidency (Meeting Chairperson). Decisions under the UNFCCC and the Kyoto Protocol are made by consensus, not majority vote. In some ways this makes the hurdles to agreement much more difficult. Over the years some groups have managed to achieve agreements—often in very creative ways—that move the global community toward preventing dangerous climate change whereas other groups have failed to achieve a consensus.

After the simulation we spend time debriefing about what happened during the negotiation and consider what prevented reaching a stronger agreement. If a group did not reach an agreement we discuss what constraints the students faced in their role, whether those constraints were political, economic, scientific or something else and whether those constraints could be changed. We also consider the negotiating techniques that participants employed that hindered or helped to reach an agreement. Each year we have had NGO representatives who attend the negotiations come to observe our student simulations and answer questions about how the negotiations are playing out “in the real world”.

OFFICIAL LAUNCH OF THE UCL INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC POLICY REVIEW.

The UCL International Public Policy Review is pleased to announce the launch of its yearly journal, Volume 8 No.1 (ucl.ac.uk/ippr/magazine).

IPPR provides a forum for debate and discussion in the fields of global governance and international public policy. The journal aims to be vibrant, timely and engaging and publishes research and innovative commentary from within the UCL School of Public Policy’s postgraduate community and the broader University of London, as well as academics and policy-makers.

The 2013–2014 issue features an array of submissions within the areas of conflict and post-war development, institutional design and global justice, environmental governance and political economy. In addition, a special feature section highlights the work of experts in the field such as Professor Ian Goldin, Director of the Oxford Martin School and Vice-Chair of the Oxford Martin Commission for Future Generations, and Steven Rathgeb Smith, Executive Director of the American Political Science Association.

“We are thrilled to bring this yearly voice that seeks to be the premier research resource for students, academics and policy-makers that contributes to the advancement of international public policy-making and global governance research. For this issue, we have pushed ourselves to deliver high-quality research, with an overall cross-disciplinary emphasis that will speak to anyone interested in public policy issues in an age of increasing globalization.” Saskia Kok, Head of Editorial.

The IPPR 2013–2014 issue was launched on Wednesday, 18 June 2014. Copies of the journal are available online at www.ucl.ac.uk/ippr and www.blogs.ucl.ac.uk/ippr. Keep up to date with news and information about future publications by liking us on Facebook: facebook.com/UCL.IPPR
**PhD PROGRAMME NEWS.**

Dr Slava Mikhaylov, MPhil/PhD Programme Director reports:

**Forthcoming publications**

**Media coverage**
Orlanda Ward and Javier Sajuria wrote a piece for The Conversation UK with a comparison of the tone of coverage of the party leaders in both newspaper on Twitter, the week before the European elections. The link is here: [https://theconversation.com/twitter-oblivious-to-farages-media-mauling-as-eu-polls-open-27042](https://theconversation.com/twitter-oblivious-to-farages-media-mauling-as-eu-polls-open-27042)

**Conference Presentations**
Manu Savani presented a paper “Can commitment devices change behaviours and deliver public policy goals?” detailing her first field experiment at EPSA on June 21.

Manu also presented a poster at the ESRC Research Methods Festival in Oxford, July 8-10, and was lucky to attend Professor Gary King’s keynote speech on internet censorship in China.

Heleen Jalvingh presented her paper titled “Democracy and the EU: Under what conditions can national parliaments play a role?” at the PADEMIA conference. PADEMIA is an academic network on parliamentary democracy in Europe, in which UCL participates via the European Institute. Their first conference took place on 12–13 June in Brussels with the motivation to establish a Europe-wide network of 56 academics from 31 countries to promote research in the field of parliamentary democracy in Europe. The conference consisted of workshops organised along the key themes of PADEMIA.

“Tweeting Alone: An Analysis of birding and bonding social capital in online networks”. Paper co-authored by Javier Sajuria, with Jennifer vanHeerde-Hudson, David Hudson, Niheer Dasandi and Yannis Theocharis. It was presented in the last annual conference of the European Political Science Association in Edinburgh.

**Summer schools**
Matthew Godwin attended the Institute for Qualitative and Mixed Methods Research at the Maxwell School, Syracuse University in New York. A two week, intensive course led by some of world’s top methodologists, Matt was able to present his work as well as network with PhD colleagues from across North America and abroad.

**Employment**
Florian Ostmann was a Visiting Assistant in Research at the Global Justice Program at Yale University from 1 March to 30 April and since 11 July until 12 September he is visiting the School of Philosophy at the Australian National University.

Javier Sajuria has been hired as Associate Lecturer in Quantitative Methods at Birkbeck, University of London. This is a teaching position and Javier will be in charge of the Intermediate Quantitative Methods course for the MSc students at the Department of Politics.

**Brilliant Club**
Over the past term Manu Savani has been teaching A level students a bespoke syllabus on behavioural public policy as a Brilliant Club tutor in Hounslow. It’s been good fun discussing nudge theory with 17 year olds, who for their final assignments are designing their own nudges to improve their school and neighbourhood. Manu recommends the Brilliant Club experience to any PhD students looking for something a bit different that gets them out of the SPP bubble and who are committed to improving access to higher education.

In recent years, political theory has become ever more sensitive to the host of normative questions arising from the fact of globalisation. In particular, the fact that we are all becoming increasingly connected through global economic processes raises questions about our responsibilities to one another – questions that traditional theories of responsibility often struggle to answer. For instance, do we have distinct responsibilities as participants in the global economy? If so what kinds of responsibilities are they? What might be the grounds of these responsibilities? And how might such responsibilities differ for different actors, such as citizens, consumers, states and corporations?

These were the sorts of questions occupying the thoughts of those at the one-day conference hosted by the School of Public Policy on ‘responsibility in the global economy’. The event, which was organised by PhD students Sara Amighetti, Maeve McKeown, Florian Ostmann and John Wilesmith, brought together a number of speakers from European and American universities to present their latest research on the topic, as well as over 50 attendees.

Dr Elizabeth Ashford (St. Andrew’s) began proceedings with a keynote speech on the idea of conceptualising severe poverty as a systemic human rights violation. She argued that ongoing patterns of behaviour that foreseeably and avoidably inflict severe harms, such as the economic deprivation that results from current global economic structures, constitute systemic human rights violations. As such, she concluded that all agents within these institutional structures who have the means to do so are under a shared duty to bring about and comply with new institutions that avoid these severe harms.

Continuing this focus on responsibility within structures, the first panel session saw Janelle Poetzsch (Ruhr University Bochum) arguing that corporations that rely on sweatshop labour are responsible for upholding and benefitting from unjust structures. She concluded that the writings of the late political theorist Iris Marion Young provide us with the best model to theorise about responsibility in this context. Melanie Brazzell (Humboldt University of Berlin) was also sympathetic to Young’s account of shared responsibility within structures but she noted that Young’s work is missing a systematic account of justice and attempted to rectify this by way of a charitable reconstruction. Kristian Hoyer Toft (Aalborg University) wrapped up the first session with a discussion of new Marxist challenges to the liberal idea of corporate social responsibility, and a consideration of different possible liberal responses.

The attendees filed back from the lunch break – and a brief introductory meeting with Jeremy Bentham -- to hear Sabine Hohi (University of Zurich) arguing for a contribution-based account of consumer responsibility. In contrast to the earlier presentations, she questioned the scope of Young’s account of shared responsibility, arguing that individual consumers need to be morally accountable for their choices. Jan Willem Wieland (VU University Amsterdam) asked if consumers are to be blamed for the harmful consequences of their choices and contended that any viable answer requires an assessment of whether or not they care enough about these consequences. Finally, Nina Van Heeswijk (University of Gothenberg) interrogated the concept of consumer duties, questioning whether they are best understood as humanitarian duties or duties of justice.

Sara Chant (University of Missouri) kicked off the final panel session of the day with an account of collective moral responsibility. She argued that certain conditions often satisfied by governments and other collective agents mean that although no individual in these groups is morally responsible for the action of the group, the group as a whole can be held morally responsible. In a similar vein, James Dempsey (University of Warwick) argued that corporate wrongdoing is often the result of a deficient organisational culture, for which a wide range of organisation members are responsible, rather than just a few senior executives. Dimitrios Efthymiou (University of Southampton) finished the session with a discussion of state responsibility in the EU, arguing that we should categorise member states into different types based on how well-ordered they are, and then restrict relative responsibility-ascriptions to states within each type, rather than across types.

Speakers and attendees then embarked on a short journey to the evening panel discussion, which invited practitioners and activists to set out the concrete steps that we might take to create a responsible global economic order. Philip Booth (Institute of Economic Affairs) began the discussion by arguing for free trade under the effective rule of law, as opposed to fair trade or “utopian” global regulation. Peter Frankental (Amnesty International) argued that although the activities of corporations are increasingly tainted with evidence of human rights violations, the usual response is for these organisations to pursue cosmetic changes, as company law does not force them to fundamentally alter their behaviour. Ashok Kumar (International Union League for Brand Responsibility) argued that the free market does not work, and neither does the idea of corporate social responsibility. Rather, he advocated the Marxist solution of workers withdrawing their labour alongside a call for consumers to change their behaviour in order to forge a responsible economic order. Alessandra Mezzadri (SOAS) argued that the norms of corporate social responsibility fail to deal with the realities of modern workforces. As such, she argued that “the business of business is business” and we need to go back to the drawing board and put more emphasis on state regulation. Finally, Michael Solomon (Profit Through Ethics) also argued against traditional models of corporate social responsibility, instead favouring a more rigorous system of scoring profit-seeking firms along a number of ethical dimensions. Needless to say, a lively discussion ensued among panellists and audience members, which continued long after the closing statements.
USING DESIGN TO CHANGE BEHAVIOURS IN EUSTON SQUARE GARDENS

Manu Savani, current Political Science Research Degree student, writes:

I was 3 months in to my PhD, after 9 years away from academia and I told myself I needed to get a better sense of how researchers think, brainstorm and collaborate.

So I took part in the UCL Grand Challenges Behaviour Change Research Prize workshop in January 2013, which invited graduate students and junior researchers from across UCL to design innovative solutions to change behaviours and improve wellbeing.

The twist was that we were working towards a dragons’ den-style presentation to a panel of professors who would award up to £10,000 to the teams with the most impressive pitch.

I was lucky to be part of the winning pitch, which went something like this. Living in London we have every opportunity to meet and engage with other people. But it can also inspire loneliness, with its ‘non-places’ that discourage us from developing a sense of connection to our surroundings and by extension to those we inevitably share those spaces with. Think train station concourses, motorways and airports, for example.

Tapping into our team’s expertise on architecture and design, we wanted to investigate whether design interventions can change the way people connect with a non-place and others in it and whether they can enhance social connectedness and wellbeing.

We were awarded £8000 to design and install an ‘architectural gesture’ at our chosen site, Euston Square Gardens. People usually spend less than 30 seconds on the site, crossing the walkway from station to main road.

A perfect example of ‘non-place’ – who hasn’t taken the same route, head down, headphones on, with the single aim of reaching the other side without bumping into anyone or breaking stride?

Our designers were UCL students Ivana Petrusevski and Deyan Nenov. They constructed a number of connected standing pins or sPins, which were designed to encourage passers-by to brush them as they walked by much like they might brush their fingers against tall grass. Nudging the sPins stimulated a pleasant tinkling sound and light display.

The message was simple: show curiosity in your surroundings, and you have an instant, sensory reward, for yourself and your fellow commuters. To get a real sense of it, take a look at this short video: www.youtube.com/watch?v=k_PVkN_qxeU

We studied the space using ethnographic observation and interviews (n=40) with passers-by in the weeks before and during the installation in October 2013. The ball of each sPin collected ‘touch’ data, sensing the number and pressure of interactions. A conservative estimate suggests there were over 660 individual interactions on the weekdays and over 1000 interactions on the weekend of the Bloomsbury Festival. Many more individuals paused, took photos and speculated with their friends and colleagues on the nature of this new-fangled ‘art’.

There was no doubt the installation got people talking about and physically
engaging with, Euston Square Gardens. Interview data suggested that social connectedness, momentary wellbeing and life satisfaction showed modest increases during the intervention relative to the previous week.

While quantitative results were not statistically significant, they are suggestive that design principles can prompt us to feel more connected to the space around us, however transient the experience or unappealing the space; this interpretation mirrors the findings of the ethnographic analysis.

The project was successful in testing a unique research design and the potential applications of such design principles for improving social connectedness and cohesion give food for thought.

I gained new skills by undertaking ethnography and some fantastic insights into academic collaboration; particularly how to build a coherent mixed-methods approach that takes advantage of diverse skills and epistemological backgrounds to answer a shared research question. My thanks go to Ian Scott and UCL Grand Challenges for this valuable opportunity.

This article draws on the main project report “Social (re)connection: choreographing architectural gestures in urban spaces” prepared for UCL Grand Challenges Human Wellbeing in May 2014. The team was led by Principal Investigators Dr Claire McAndrew and Dr Sonali Wayal.

NEW STAFF.

The Department would like to welcome the following new staff:

Dr Adriana Bunea
Marie Curie Research Fellow

Adriana joins the Department as a Marie Curie Research Fellow. She was awarded a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship for Career Advancement for a period of twenty-four months to research EU lobbying across policy areas and lobbying venues, starting in September 2014.

Before joining UCL, Adriana was a Max Weber Fellow at the European University Institute (2013-2014) and a Fulbright-Schuman Research Fellow at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2012-2013). Adriana completed her PhD at Trinity College Dublin in September 2012 with a dissertation on EU lobbying entitled “Lobbying Brussels: Interest Groups’ Demands and Networks in EU Environmental Policy”.

In her published work, Adriana examined key aspects of EU interest groups’ lobbying behaviour such as the articulation of policy preferences, the formation of lobbying coalitions and the achievement of policy demands. Her research also investigated the EU interest intermediation system from the perspective of the plurality of interests represented and articulated demands and it analysed the structuring of interest groups’ inter-organisational networks. During her Fulbright-Schuman fellowship, in collaboration with Professor Frank R. Baumgartner, Adriana conducted a systematic analytical review of the studies of EU lobbying and interest groups from the perspective of theories, research designs and bibliographical sources employed currently in this scholarship.

Dr Tom Dannenbaum
Lecturer in Human Rights and Director of the MA in Human Rights

I am delighted to be joining the Department this September. As a political theorist and a lawyer, I engage in interdisciplinary work on the normative and conceptual disruptions caused by two deeply interconnected and powerful trends in contemporary international law: its moralization and its progression to an increasingly multi-layered and vertical, as opposed to flat and horizontal, orientation. My objective is to engage in empirically informed normative analysis of the law’s content, structure and foundations in the context of these fundamental transformations of its character and purpose.

My work to date has confronted a series of specific questions and challenges resulting from these trends, primarily in the context of armed conflict, international criminal law and human rights. These include questions regarding the normative posture of the soldier in the post-Nuremberg legal order, the philosophical basis for the punishment of atrocity crimes committed through the state and the proper framework for dealing with wrongs arising out of the lawful cooperative enterprises of multiple states or international organisations.

I am joining the Department from Yale Law School, where I have been a Visiting Lecturer in Law and a Robina Foundation Visiting Human Rights Fellow for the past two years. I received my JD from Yale in 2010 and my undergraduate degree from Stanford University. I received my PhD in political theory from Princeton University in 2014.

I look forward to meeting those of you I have yet to meet and engaging in discussion, debate and collaboration.

Dr Tim Hicks
Lecturer in Public Policy

I join UCL as a Lecturer in Public Policy this summer, 10 years after completing the MSc in European Public Policy at SPP. It will be great to be back!

After graduating from UCL, I went on to receive a DPhil in Politics from Nuffield College, Oxford. From there, I moved to Trinity College, Dublin, first as a Research Fellow and latterly as an Ussher Assistant Professor.

My research interests are at the intersection of comparative politics and public policy, with a focus on ‘developed democracies’. Currently, my work is based around three projects. The first is on the politics of schooling – especially relating to school choice and privatisation. The second is collaborative with Alan Jacobs (UBC) and Scott Matthews (MUN) and looks at the connections between economic inequality and political inequality. The third is collaborative with Lucy Barnes (Kent), where we are studying the impact of the Great Recession on attitudes towards redistribution and the welfare state.

At SPP, I’m excited to be taking on the role of Director of the new undergraduate degree in Philosophy, Politics and Economics.
Margarita Gelepithis
Teaching Fellow in Public Policy

I am very happy to be joining the department this September as Teaching Fellow in Public Policy. I will be teaching three postgraduate courses – Theories and Actors of the Policy Process (PUBLG074), Agenda Setting and Public Policy (PUBLG039), and Making Policy Work (PUBLG013). I join the department from the London School of Economics, where I completed my PhD and an MSc in European Political Economy. Prior to this I studied Philosophy, Politics and Economics at the University of Durham.

My research interests lie in political economy. In particular, I am interested in the comparative political economy of the welfare state. My doctoral research explained trends towards more universal coverage in market-heavy pension systems, showing how private-heavy public policies can generate unexpected political dynamics. More recently, I have turned my attention to the political economy of education, and the effects of labour market dualisation on individual preferences and welfare state change.

Dr Lucas Leemann
Lecturer in Quantitative Political Science

I am very excited to join UCL’s political science department in August. I will be a lecturer in quantitative political science, a position that was created for the new Q-step Centre at UCL. I will mostly be teaching quantitative methods and hope to once in a while also be able to teach a class in comparative politics. I just graduated from Columbia University where I received my PhD with a major in comparative politics and a minor in quantitative methodology. In comparative politics I am interested in the origins of institutions and European democratisation as well as direct democracy. In quantitative methodology I focus on measurement (ideal point estimation with IRT and preference estimation with MrP) as well as in modelling (multilevel models and Bayesian statistics).

My dissertation looks at the introduction of direct democracy in the 19th century in Swiss cantons, its usage in the 20th century on national level and its political effects nowadays. My research has been published so far in Journal of Politics, Political Analysis, Swiss Political Science Review and Electoral Studies. I look forward to starting at UCL.

Dr Stephen Jivraj
Lecturer in Population Health

Stephen joined UCL in June 2014 as a Lecturer in Population Health. He is based in the Department of Epidemiology and Public Health and is a member of the UCL-IOE Q-Step Centre, an ESRC investment to promote a step-change in quantitative social science training. He will be teaching quantitative methods to undergraduates from three new degree programmes in Politics, Philosophy and Economics, Quantitative Human Geography and Population Health. Stephen has previously held research posts at the Institute of Education and the University of Manchester. He completed his PhD in Social Statistics at the Cathie Marsh Centre for Census and Survey Research, University of Manchester in 2011. His research interests are migration, ethnic and national identity, area effects, later life wellbeing and longitudinal analysis. He publishes on these issues in population geography and health sciences journals and is currently working on an edited volume on ‘Ethnic identity and inequalities in Britain’.

Monica Barbone
Institute of Global Governance Administrator and Department of Political Science Research Administrator

I joined the School of Public Policy at the end of April 2014 as Administrator for the Institute of Global Governance and Research Administrator for the Department of Political Science. Prior to this I worked at King’s College London, Institute of Pharmaceutical Science, for 5 years, as Institute Administrator.

I graduated with a BA Hons in Politics in 2002 at the University of North London. My main interests were the rise of the neo-right movements at the end of the 1990s and their connection in Italy to the neo-fascist ideology. Politics remains one of my passions to this day but when I am not occupied with such thoughts, I organise rock gigs under the name of Teiresias promotions.

For the short time I have been with SPP and IGG, I can say that I am truly enjoying my role and hope to be able to positively add to the Institute and the Department.
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:

Lucy Peacock
MSc in Global Governance and Ethics, 2012–13

Since completing my MSc in Global Governance and Ethics, I went straight into work with peacebuilding charity Concordis International, taking on a variety of roles before being offered the job of Fundraising and Communications Coordinator, a position I have held since October 2013. Concordis is a small organisation, and with only five members of staff in our UK office it’s fair to say that I’m kept busy!

As is common in this sector, I started work at Concordis with a two-week volunteering placement researching and sorting funding applications in July 2013. This in itself gave me vital experience, as I am now responsible for the creation and submission of tailored applications for core funds from various Trusts and Foundations. What is more, I spend time working closely with our Programmes Manager in the submission and subsequent follow-up of project-specific grant applications for the development of new peacebuilding projects. Aside from grant applications, I am responsible for the planning and delivery of Concordis’ annual programme of fundraising events including supporter evenings and our annual conference.

Alongside fundraising, my communications responsibilities include maintaining and developing relationships with a network of individual, church, corporate and institutional supporters, managing the website and social media and designing, preparing and distributing printed promotional materials and reports. This aspect of my role is particularly interesting, as it requires detailed knowledge of our peacebuilding programmes and regular contact via Skype with our teams in South Sudan and Mauritania. It can be demanding since the language used in this sector is often specialist, however I enjoy the challenge of communicating the impact of what we do to a variety of audiences. Focusing on conflict resolution during my degree has particularly helped in this regard and I am certain that I would not be where I am today without the knowledge and skills gained throughout my MSc.

Mari Tunby
MSc International Public Policy, 2010–2011

Having taken a year out to work as a student adviser following an MA in Public Administration at the University of York, I decided that the UCL International Public Policy programme would be helpful in strengthening my skills in research methods – as well as furnishing me with five years of higher education recognised as a masters level criterion in the Norwegian labour market (I’m originally from Norway). However, after having finished my degree at UCL I decided to stay in the UK – battling the UK post-crash job market instead!

I learnt a couple of things from the year or so I spent juggling freelance work and unpaid internships before I moved on to fulltime (paid) and fairly degree-relevant work. For example, as a European citizen, I saw how privileged I was compared to my non-European peers who came too late to benefit from the post-study work visa. Since UCL is such an international university, it was sad to see friends with great qualifications having to leave after graduation to apply their skills elsewhere.

Since I pursued a UCL masters degree to improve my chances in the job market rather than with the ambition of an academic career, I found the support offered by the UCL Careers Service to be exceptional. I’d never experienced such professional, practical and patient support from a university careers centre before.

After having built up experience and contacts in London I was offered a job as a policy adviser at the business organisation CBI – through LinkedIn. My role at the moment involves leading the organisation’s project on long-term public service reform in the run-up to the general election. Policy analysis plays a considerable part in it but the day-to-day project management requires understanding of commercial, political and media dynamics, where learning by doing seems to be the best policy.

SPP Group of 2013–14

The Department would like to take this opportunity to wish our entire 2013–14 student cohort every success in their future careers and encourage students to keep in touch with the Department.

FUTURE EDITIONS OF TAVISTOCKTIMES.

TAVISTOCKTIMES is published three times a year with the next edition due to be published in January 2015.

Ideas for future articles should be sent to: Helen Holt (h.holt@ucl.ac.uk) before the end of October 2014

Contributions from past students are especially welcome keeping the Department up to date on their progress since leaving UCL.