A LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

Welcome to the second issue of *Inspires*, the alumni magazine of the University of Oxford’s Department of Politics and International Relations (DPIR).

In this issue we have sought to bring you a further selection of articles which we hope convey the scale and breadth of our teaching and research activity and, more particularly, the value and impact of this activity as we engage with the world in and outside of the Academy. As with the inaugural issue, we hope that the content of *Inspires* will find resonance across the alumni community, both with those who studied with us as undergraduates and as graduates.

We were very pleased to receive feedback on the inaugural *Inspires*, which was on the whole very encouraging! There were a few expressions of surprise that we have taken the initiative now to communicate with our alumni, especially as we have been out of touch for so long. There were responses, positive and negative, to individual articles, which we passed on to the relevant authors. By far the most popular feature, if your letters and emails are an accurate reflection, was: Life after PPE. We have followed this up in this issue with ‘Life after PPE: Focus on Singapore’, which we hope shows the international scope of the degree. Many of you have sent alumni profiles of your lives ‘after PPE’ (or indeed ‘after DPIR if you undertook graduate study with us’), which are now online (www.politics.ox.ac.uk), do please keep these coming! The podcast on PPE (More Personal Reflections) has also proved enormously popular on the University’s podcast website, iTunesU (http://itunes.ox.ac.uk), with 5,800 downloads to date.

It has been a great pleasure to correspond over the year with alumni, and we do hope you will continue to send us suggestions for future content, as well as perhaps volunteering to contribute to future issues yourselves. There will be an electronic newsletter which will be circulated in Michaelmas term – if you have suggestions for content, including details of your publications, please do send these to us: alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk. You are most welcome to join our alumni networks on Facebook and LinkedIn, which are a valuable way of keeping the alumni community in touch throughout the year. We hope to see you in person at the Oxford Alumni Weekend (14-16 September 2012) and at our DPIR Alumni event on 1-2 March 2013.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Kate Candy and David Hine
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Head of Department Stephen Whitefield looks back on a busy and productive year for the department, and outlines our aims and aspirations for the year to come.

Welcome to the 2nd Edition of Inspires, the magazine for all alumni of the Department of Politics and International Relations. And to all those who read and studied Politics and International Relations in Oxford even before the foundation of the Department in 2000, we still claim you as one of us!

We have had a busy year running outstanding academic events open to our alumni. Some of you may have attended the University’s Annual Alumni Weekend last September and heard the fascinating debate on inter-generational justice between Mark Philp, Adam Swift and Simon Caney. You may also have attended a meeting in London when David Hine and Mark Philp spoke on the very topical issue of standards in public life, or at least what we might do to improve them. If you didn’t make either of those events – or the brilliant speech by Ambassador Thomas Pickering who gave the 2nd Annual Fulbright Lecture – you missed out! But you can catch up on Ambassador Pickering’s lecture at http://podcasts.ox.ac.uk/. Do please come along to the Alumni Weekend next September as well as to our Departmental alumni event in March 2013 – details are on the back cover. And, of course, keep in touch via our website - http://www.politics.ox.ac.uk.

Our energies in the Department over the last year and in the year ahead are concentrated on a few key strategic concerns. First, we have been gearing up for the 2014 Research Excellence Framework (REF) assessment. Second, we have conducted a ‘size and shape’ review of our academic staffing and will move forward to implement it. Third, we have finished a thorough review of our graduate masters and doctoral programmes which we will also be taking forward. Fourth, we have continued to build our fund-raising and development capacities.

I think it is worth reminding you that the Department’s number one priority is to increase the amount of financial assistance that we give to our research students. We lag behind not only the top US universities in this regard but increasingly European ones too. And because we must ensure that we can recruit the best research students to study Politics and International Relations in Oxford, we must find ways to provide adequate financial support. You can certainly help us to make progress. But let me say a few words about how each of our four strategic concerns fits with our priority: properly to fund our students.

The REF is one of the principal sources of Departmental funding, along with income from fees from graduates and undergraduates, what we get from research projects, and what we have in trusts and endowments. REF income is based upon the Department’s performance, as judged by a national panel of our peers, in terms of the excellence of our research and its broader societal impact (hopefully for the better). Oxford Politics and International Relations is among the strongest in the UK – and strongest of all on our preferred indicator, which is that we have the largest group of top-ranked researchers of any Politics department in the country. I have no doubt that we will perform very strongly again in the 2014 exercise, but to ensure that outcome we have been investing heavily in new appointments and seeking to recruit the strongest academics in an increasingly competitive environment.

We expect to get a financial return on that investment and of course the strength of our faculty is a large part of what makes Oxford such an attractive place for students. But the REF requires resources upfront and it requires careful planning of our future staffing.

Hence, the ‘size and shape’ review. The takeaway headline from that was that we are roughly the right size and could perhaps be slightly smaller. We were able to identify areas of particular staffing need, not only for the REF but also for graduate supervision and undergraduate teaching, which is informing the recruitment we are currently doing. But we also thought that there was some scope for full-time staff reduction with retirement and people moving to posts elsewhere and, crucially, we decided that savings from any reductions should be used, in line with our number one priority, to provide additional resources for graduate studentships.

Of course, it is not just funding and faculty that attracts the best students but the quality of our programmes as well. Oxford is understandably small-c conservative about its degrees. PPE in particular remains a flagship and our MPhils remain in great demand from students around the world. But we are aware of the need to make sure that they remain attractive, and in particular that we get the balance right between the substantive interests of our students to study particular areas of the world and specific political issues and the increasing demands of prospective academic (but also other potential) employers for graduates in particular to have strong professional and methodological skills. That balance is not the same for all kinds of students – some need more methods training than others – and the balance changes over time. So, we have been looking this last year at the content of our graduate programmes across, with full consultation with our current students and recent graduates, and aim to make some changes in the year ahead.

Finally, we have continued with fund-raising. Part of that has involved responding to the Oxford University Press challenge fund – known locally as the Teaching Fund – in which some £80 million has been set aside by the University to match against private donations to fund existing joint college-university tutorial positions. Essentially, if a tutorial post costs £2 million to endow, the Teaching Fund will add £100K to a donation of £1.2 million. The Department is working with some colleges to leverage the Teaching Fund to support fellowship opportunities in Politics and International Relations. And we are delighted to have received pledges of £1.2 million from extraordinarily generous donors at Christ Church which will trigger Teaching Fund support and will endow the post held by Eddie Keane. Readers will want to know that the Department will use the financial benefit of Teaching Fund success to further support our main priority to increase studentships and bursaries for our research students!

So, I hope you will see the various ways in which we are moving to meet our studentships needs with our own resources. Please consider helping us to recruit and retain the best students with a donation of your own.

Stephen Whitefield
Head of Department, Professor of Politics, University Lecturer in Politics, Rhodes Pelczynski Tutorial Fellow in Politics, Pembroke College
Oxford is no stranger to China. The University’s connection with the country began over four hundred years ago, when the Chinese scholar Shen Fuzong arrived in Oxford in 1617. The first of his kind, Shen Fuzong’s presence in Oxford was distinguished, and his work laid the foundation for the future relationship between the University and China. Over the years, academics at Oxford have seen a major growth in the analysis of Chinese studies, and the University’s strategy. Oxford's academics comment on China in venues from the World Bank to the BBC to the Foreign Office.

At the start of the twenty-first century, the situation has changed utterly. In the western world, only a couple of institutions – most pre-eminently Harvard and Berkeley – can rival Oxford for the academic coverage of China. The Institute for Chinese Studies, under Oriental Studies, and the Contemporary Chinese Studies programme in SASS have been instrumental in raising the profile of Chinese studies here. Some forty or so postholders across the University teach on aspects of China modern and ancient; from the sociology of public health to the archaeology of the 'oracle bones' with which the ancient Chinese sought to tell the future. A combination of major grants from funders including the Leverhulme Trust, philanthropic donations, and strategic funding of posts by the University have seen a major growth in the analysis of China, as it moves from a peripheral to a central place in the University’s strategy. Oxford’s academics comment on China in venues from the World Bank to the BBC to the Foreign Office.

As late as 2000, there was no position in the Department dedicated to the teaching of Chinese politics. Over the past decade, not one but three postholders have grown in the subject. Vivienne Shue, Leverhulme Professor of Contemporary Chinese Studies, along with Patricia Thornton and myself, have supervised numerous graduate students, and offered popular graduate and undergraduate courses every year. Meanwhile, Rosemary Foot, Swiss Professor of the International Relations of East Asia, has long written and taught on the growing role of China in international society. The retirement of Professors Shue and Foot opens the opportunity for fundraising for new chairs in the domestic and international politics of China, along with funding for graduate scholarships, essential if Oxford is to continue to grow its profile in these areas.

And growing that profile will continue to be a key task. For whatever the precise path of the Xi Jinping leadership in the ten years to come, there is no doubt that China’s economy, politics, and culture will continue to grow in significance – and if Oxford is to maintain its reputation as a centre for the study of the most important trends in world politics, it must keep China at the centre of its vision.
How the British Vote

James Tilley asks whether politicians really have taken, or ever will take, ‘class out of British politics’

When I was studying PPE in the 1990s, I dimly remember both left and right claiming the end of class politics. John Major, shortly after taking over leadership of the Conservative party in 1990, wanted to produce a ‘genuinely classless society’, and by 1997 John Prescott, then deputy leader of the Labour party, claimed that in essence this aim had been met: ‘we’re all middle class now’. While most pronouncements by politicians can, in my opinion, be safely discarded as only loosely in touch with any facts, the consensus now in academic circles is that British politics, although clearly not British society, is indeed approaching a classless state. Not in terms of income groups still have the same interests. By analysing surveys collected between 1964 and 2010, which interviewed over 100,000 people in total, we show that these differences between social ‘groups’ interests are reflected in their ideology. To put it bluntly, poor people want redistribution and rich people do not, and this has not changed over time. What has changed is the fact that Tony Blair did indeed take class out of British politics by shifting the Labour party to a much more centrist position in the 1990s. We show this is the case by analysing the manifestos of the parties over time, in essence counting the number of phrases that support economically left-wing policies and comparing that to the number that support economically right-wing policies. The central movements by both main parties, but particularly Labour, have meant that the choice that voters face in terms of the policies that parties are offering them is much less clear. This means that voters are less likely to vote on the basis of their ideological beliefs (which are informed by their self-interest) and this leads in turn to less distinctive tribes of Labour and Conservative voters.

The answer to the second question is related to the answer to the first. And the implications cover both changes in how voters decide between the major parties, and also whether they support those major parties at all. Regarding the latter, as the major parties have become more similar, we have seen increasing electoral volatility and an increasing vote for minor parties (in 2010 parties outside the big three got nearly 10 per cent of the vote compared to less than 3 per cent in 1992). We have also seen decreasing turnout which is concentrated among exactly that group which is now most poorly represented by the parties. Poorer people in Britain have always been less likely to vote than richer people, but this difference has generally been rather small. Yet by 2010 nearly 50 per cent of the poorest fifth of the population did not vote, compared to only 15 per cent of the richest fifth. Perhaps more importantly though, if voters are no longer choosing a major party on the basis of ideology then the rationale for choosing one party over another changes. A number of books have recently suggested that ‘voting politics’ is now the dominant way in which the British electorate interacts with the British political parties. That means that voters do not vote on the basis of their self-interest or resulting ideological beliefs but rather for parties that they believe to be competent managers - whether of the economy or public services. Although it is difficult to test these ideas, we agree that competency and judgements of party leaders have become more important ways of choosing for which party to vote.

Where we disagree with those authors is in the explanation. They say that this is due to the voters changing—the classless society that John Major envisaged but did not achieve. We argue that it is due to the parties changing—the taking out of class from politics that Tony Blair envisaged and actually achieved by altering the policies that Labour offered the electorate. That has implications for the future, as parties could choose to differentiate themselves from one another again leading to a renewed class basis to British politics. And indeed the early indications are that in the wake of the recession and tighter budgets the parties are diverging from one another again. Class politics in Britain may, therefore, be sleeping rather than dead.
The importance of getting exit strategies right is hard to overstate. For multilateral post-conflict state-building operations. Her Bosnia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and Burundi, among other territorial administrations. The project is particularly timely given the challenges families of experience where state-building, broadly conceived, has been an objective: colonial administrations, peace support operations, transformative military occupations, and international territorial administrations. The project is particularly timely given the challenge of seeing exit as a process rather than as a single moment or event. This suggests the need for a very different perspective from what has often been the case in the past. Not only is greater flexibility required—a firm orientation towards ‘end states’ as opposed to ‘end dates’—but also the need to consider much longer time horizons and thus to withstand the temptation to seek quick fixes. This approach is consistent with what we now know to be the long time required to achieve ‘threshold institutional capability’ even for states not compromised by violent conflict. According to the World Bank’s most recent analysis, countries generally need more than a decade—and more often as many as 15-30 years—just to reach a level of ‘good enough’ governance!

According to the World Bank’s most recent analysis, countries generally need more than a decade—and more often as many as 15-30 years—just to reach a level of ‘good enough’ governance!

A technical matter. Such a view ignores the salience of political factors, at both the national and international levels, and the extent to which these may have a bearing on the timing and the nature of exit strategies. In some cases, local pressures for a more rapid transfer of authority to national actors have resulted in an accelerated transition for which the country, in effect, was not adequately equipped. In other cases, pressures from troop-contributing countries for burden relief have resulted in a premature withdrawal of forces that compromised a fragile peace.

Early on in my career I was invited to present the findings of the Peacebuilding Commission itself in New York—the first time a scholar had addressed member-state representatives in this forum. Concerned that my presentation could be ‘too academic’, I was advised by the PBSO to pitch my talk appropriately. ‘Yet to my surprise, many of the delegations responses to my presentation were replete with references to scholars and scholarly works. I wondered if any of them were graduates of our postgraduate programmes!

I also served for two years on the World Economic Forum’s Global Agenda Council on Fragile States. During my tenure the Council put forward a number of constructive and imaginative proposals, including for the promotion of mutual accountability between donors and states and between states and their citizens to help ensure that aid is spent for the purposes intended and that the identification of a state’s needs is informed by the preferences of the local population. The Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund operated on such a basis, with an International Management Committee reimbursing the government of Afghanistan for eligible operating expenditure and providing financing for national development programmes, including the National Solidarity Program, which provided bilo grants to villages that chose how they wished to use these funds for the improvement of rural infrastructure, thus giving voice to communities and not just to state authorities.

All of these activities are consistent with my personal interest in promoting the integration of knowledge with practice. Although there have been very significant strides in conflict-relevant scholarship in recent years—and we now know a lot more about violent conflict with higher levels of confidence—the insights from academic research on conflict and conflict management often have little resonance within the policy community. There are many reasons for this. Bureaucratic organisations face internal constraints that hinder their ability to apply new knowledge that would drive their practices. Interventions policies are frequently driven by strategic and other interests—budgetary timelines, for instance—that are at odds with what many see as the most seemingly sensible policy implications of some research findings. And scholarship does not always generate knowledge that is readily accessible or that has obvious application to the particular needs of practitioners. My hope is that in future years the important insights from academic research will make even greater contributions to the development of sound policy and more informed public debate.

Richard Caplan
Professor of International Relations, Official Fellow, Linacre College

Exit Strategies and State Building will be published by Oxford University Press in August 2012.

Richard Caplan looks at the logistics, challenges and perspectives of international post-conflict state-building.

Few issues in the study of international security since the end of the Cold War have received as much attention as post-conflict peace- and state-building. Scholars and practitioners have devoted considerable resources to analysing the challenges to stabilising peace and to re-building war-torn societies. At Oxford, researchers from a wide range of disciplines—including International Development, Economics, Geography, African and other Area Studies, as well as Comparative Government, Political Theory, and International Law and Security—have made very substantial contributions to scholarship in this field over the past two decades.

My own work in this area has focused on the international administration of war-torn territories: institutional innovations in peacebuilding, especially within the United Nations; problems of international accountability; and, most recently, exit strategies in relation to post-conflict state-building operations. With the support of the Folke Bernadotte Academy in Sweden, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Oxford’s own John Fell OUP Research Fund, I have been directing a research group of fifteen scholars and practitioners engaged in the study of exit in war-torn societies to four families of experience where state-building, broadly conceived, has been an issue: support operations, transformative military occupations, and international territorial administrations. The project is particularly timely given current preoccupations with exit from Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, and Burundi, among other multinational post-conflict state-building operations.

The importance of getting exit strategies right is hard to overstate. There have been numerous cases in which UN and other forces have either withdrawn or scaled back a peace operation only to see the situation deteriorate and collapse into renewed violence. Rwanda (1994), Macedonia (1999), and East Timor (2006) are just a few examples. Given that some four out of ten countries emerging from violent conflict succumb to renewed fighting within ten years of the cessation of hostilities, it is critical to understand the dynamics of conflict transformation, including the requirements for the consolidation of peace, in the wake of international interventions. This study aims to provide such an understanding.*

Although it is difficult to generalise about experiences as complex and varied as those that the research group has been examining, a number of recurring themes have emerged from the study. One is the importance of seeing exit as a process rather than as a single moment or event. This suggests the need for a very different perspective from what has often been the case in the past. Not only is greater flexibility required—a firm orientation towards ‘end states’ as opposed to ‘end dates’—but also the need to consider much longer time horizons and thus to withstand the temptation to seek quick fixes. This approach is consistent with what we now know to be the long time required to achieve ‘threshold institutional capability’ even for states not compromised by violent conflict. According to the World Bank’s most recent analysis, countries generally need more than a decade—and more often as many as 15-30 years—just to reach a level of ‘good enough’ governance!

Another recurring observation is the importance of more systematic and targeted follow-on measures—a e.g., continued training, successor missions, ‘over-the-horizon’ troop deployments—that can and should be taken in the wake of exit to reinforce peace and state-building achievements. Of course, exit is not merely

Richard Caplan
Professor of International Relations, Official Fellow, Linacre College

Exit Strategies and State Building will be published by Oxford University Press in August 2012.
Here, in no particular order, are Politics and International Relations alumni from all over the world. How many do you recognise? The key is on page 26.
I and trade sectors. It was an exciting time in MAS’ economic policy department, overseeing international relations and economics. In Studies at Stanford University, also a blend stateside for a Masters in International Policy.

After PPE I was hungry for more and moved to Palau, an island on the desk economist covering Palau, an island in and somewhere between Rousseau and myself in and somewhere between Rousseau and. As I read more about civil conflicts and

I had a similar PPE path in mind. I always

in political theory at Harvard University), and

College before me and majored in Philosophy

I did not expect to have a career in economics, even though I took up a scholarship with the International Monetary Fund (IMF), where I was a principal beneficiary. Seventeen Singaporeans are currently studying PPE at Oxford. When they graduate, they go on to career-paths that lead to top positions in Singaporean finance, business and government. As part of our regular focus on life after graduation, the Oxbridge PPE graduates who have gone into the financial sector tell us about their careers to date.

One of the most important things I learnt in PPE was to gut a book like a fish—to quickly grasp and slice of information, and connecting the dots to quickly grasp and slice of information, and connecting the dots. PPE also taught me to gut a book like a fish—to quickly grasp and slice of information, and connecting the dots. One of the most important things I learnt in PPE was to gut a book like a fish—to quickly grasp and slice of information, and connecting the dots to quickly grasp and slice of information, and connecting the dots.

Jovasky Pang

Pembroke College, 1997-2000

Having no idea what I wanted to do in life, I went ask to Oxford to read PPE. I believed at that time that a broad training in humanities and the social sciences could help me discover my true calling. I had a wonderful time at University but despite being taught by the most learned scholars, I left Oxford with no clearer idea of what to do with myself. That would explain my first career choice, joining McKinsey as a management consultant, since I figured that I needed more time to explore a broad spectrum of challenges before I finally made up my mind.

With McKinsey, I had the privilege of working with a bunch of really intelligent and passionate colleagues who helped me shape my view of the world. I worked on many interesting engagements in places such as Hong Kong, Indonesia, Australia, Malaysia and China. It was an interesting time to be in Asia then as many of the courses I worked on were just recovering from the Asian financial crisis and were undertaking serious and often painful reforms. After years of consulting for financial institutions and sharing many complex problems, I finally felt a deep urge to lead from the front. I joined a newly created arm of Temasek Holdings (Singapore’s sovereign wealth fund) that specialised in acquiring and managing financial institutions. Managing a bank is not as easy as it looks and I was excited to work with a bunch of really intelligent and passionate colleagues who helped me shape my view of the world. I worked on many interesting engagements in places such as Hong Kong, Indonesia, Australia, Malaysia and China.

I have spent most of my time after graduation in my three years at Oxford to mention! One of the most important things I learnt in PPE was to gut a book like a fish—to quickly grasp and extract its essence.

It is only after many years of hard knocks that I discovered how much my training in PPE had helped prepare me for leadership. In many instances, I often have to make tough decisions in situations where there are sharp conflicting interests, information is incomplete and consequences uncertain. Working in China, where commercial interests and governmental interests often conflict, I have found myself increasingly using the many frameworks which I learned while studying PPE at Oxford.

I find myself drawing constantly and deeply from the well of intellectual capital that I built up during my formative undergraduate years.

I have spent most of my time after graduation in the fund management industry in Asia. As an equity fund manager investing mostly in Asian markets, I find myself drawing constantly and deeply from the well of intellectual capital that I built up during my formative undergraduate years. Clear and critical analysis of the facts is important in this industry, and I can say without a doubt that I was prepared well for the challenging job that lay ahead of me after I graduated. My career so far has seen me dealing with many world-changing events, witnessing the impact of the Asian financial crisis (1997-98),

the dot com bubble (2000), the US wars with Iraq, the Lehman crisis and more recently the European debt crisis. On a more positive front, I have also witnessed the emergence of China and India. From the UK’s perspective, it is a remarkable country and aspiration to be a part of. I have also learnt how to separate the facts from the noise and the ability to see the future a little more clearly that helps a fund manager invest when many despair and retreat or when many are irrationally bearish.

I also learnt from my years in the industry that the markups do not suffer fools gladly – and that is how much money is won. It is one thing to come up with a new theory of the world every day and another if you have to put your money on the line, often tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars. A fund manager is paid to make mistakes and when you make enough mistakes in your analysis, you will find yourself out of the game very soon.

It can be exceptionally financially rewarding.

It was an exciting time in economics—we chased the global economy to the bottom and back up during its spectacular rebound. I moved to the monetary policy unit in 2009, turning my focus to exchange rates and preparing monetary policy advice for the Monetary Policy Committee. Curious about finance, I pursued a CFA on the side.

One of the most important things I learnt in PPE was to gut a book like a fish—to quickly grasp and extract its essence.

I have spent most of my time after graduation in the fund management industry in Asia. As an equity fund manager investing mostly in Asian markets, I find myself drawing constantly and deeply from the well of intellectual capital that I built up during my formative undergraduate years. Clear and critical analysis of the facts is important in this industry, and I can say without a doubt that I was prepared well for the challenging job that lay ahead of me after I graduated. My career so far has seen me dealing with many world-changing events, witnessing the impact of the Asian financial crisis (1997-98),

the dot com bubble (2000), the US wars with Iraq, the Lehman crisis and more recently the European debt crisis. On a more positive front, I have also witnessed the emergence of China and India first-hand by taking on companies, farmers and ordinary people from big cities to rural villages. At these events, there have been dramatic effects on global and Asian markets. In a world where there is no shortage of information, it is the ability to separate the facts from the noise and the ability to see the future a little more clearly that helps a fund manager invest when many despair and retreat or when many are irrationally bearish. I have also learnt from my years in the industry that the markups do not suffer fools gladly – and that is how much money is won. It is one thing to come up with a new theory of the world every day and another if you have to put your money on the line, often tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars. A fund manager is paid to make mistakes and when you make enough mistakes in your analysis, you will find yourself out of the game very soon.

I have spent most of my time after graduation in the fund management industry in Asia. As an equity fund manager investing mostly in Asian markets, I find myself drawing constantly and deeply from the well of intellectual capital that I built up during my formative undergraduate years. Clear and critical analysis of the facts is important in this industry, and I can say without a doubt that I was prepared well for the challenging job that lay ahead of me after I graduated. My career so far has seen me dealing with many world-changing events, witnessing the impact of the Asian financial crisis (1997-98),

the dot com bubble (2000), the US wars with Iraq, the Lehman crisis and more recently the European debt crisis. On a more positive front, I have also witnessed the emergence of China and India first-hand by taking on companies, farmers and ordinary people from big cities to rural villages. At these events, there have been dramatic effects on global and Asian markets. In a world where there is no shortage of information, it is the ability to separate the facts from the noise and the ability to see the future a little more clearly that helps a fund manager invest when many despair and retreat or when many are irrationally bearish. I have also learnt from my years in the industry that the markups do not suffer fools gladly – and that is how much money is won. It is one thing to come up with a new theory of the world every day and another if you have to put your money on the line, often tens if not hundreds of millions of dollars. A fund manager is paid to make mistakes and when you make enough mistakes in your analysis, you will find yourself out of the game very soon.

I have spent most of my time after graduation in the fund management industry in Asia. As an equity fund manager investing mostly in Asian markets, I find myself drawing constantly and deeply from the well of intellectual capital that I built up during my formative undergraduate years. Clear and critical analysis of the facts is important in this industry, and I can say without a doubt that I was prepared well for the challenging job that lay ahead of me after I graduated. My career so far has seen me dealing with many world-changing events, witnessing the impact of the Asian financial crisis (1997-98),
We all know that emotions play a role in how political parties appeal to voters and in how we respond to them. It is not all about issues and policies. I suspect we all may have an intuition also that the role of emotions in party politics has grown in recent years, as parties often are less differentiated from one another on policy grounds and as the traditional anchors of class and party allegiance have declined. But little is really known about how parties use emotions, and party allegiance have declined. But little is really known about how parties use emotions, and how emotional appeals have changed over time. That is what we are going to investigate.

Of course, emotions are complex things and the manners in which they can be studied are myriad. In some ways, this is work for psychologists rather than political scientists. And rather than taking up that profession, our approach is to make use of what psychologists have done already in analysing emotions, in particular a dictionary developed at Harvard University called ANEW, which provides a way of interpreting and analysing the emotional content of words on a number of dimensions. We will likely focus on two—Valence (positive and negative emotions) and Arousal (which is just as it seems). Examples of high valence would be words like triumphant, love, or paradise, and low valence would be words like cancer, rejection or suicide. Examples of high arousal words would be rags or thrill, and low arousal would be found in words like fatigued or lazy. So, we intend to apply the ANEW dictionary to political texts and speeches to test for their emotional content, and in particular we will start with party manifestos—true, not likely to be the most emotional documents, though who knows for sure—which are available in the UK going back to 1903 for the three main parties, Liberals (and their successors), Labour and Conservitives.

We can also apply the ANEW dictionary to the analysis of transcripts such as those from the televised Prime Ministers’ Leaderships shown in Figure 1. Of course, we are cautious and hesitant about how to interpret what we see. First, we are not yet entirely sure how a dictionary developed and validated on American and Canadian English translates when dealing with British. That is something to be investigated. Second, we need to be very careful about inferring anything much about what works emotionally from just three debates with three participants. Would the emotional strategies of the debaters have been different had just two been involved? Would the effective emotional strategy have been different in an economic boom election rather than in the midst of recession? How much of the strategy of each leader was determined by their character or by the nature of their political party and the times? Does emotional appeal really help parties and politicians to win votes? If so, what kinds of appeals work in what circumstances? Will certain issues—health or war for example—carry distinctive emotional content? These are also questions that we will try to address by looking at how emotional appeals vary by party and across different economic and social circumstances over time and at how emotions translate into votes and seats.

But it is intriguing to note that the perceived winner in each of the debates (shown in figure 1) was the one who scored the lowest in terms of emotional content. Nick Clegg stood out in debate number 1 in that way, as does David Cameron in debate number 2. Gordon Brown, who won none of the debates, was consistently the most emotional, particularly in debate number 3. We wonder why the ‘winning’ strategy appears to have been with low emotional content and whether the debaters knew. But it is also very interesting to compare the UK leadership with Presidential debates in the US. As shown in Figure 2. Here, it seems, the perceived winners are the more rather than less emotional debaters. And even the losers appear massively more emotional than their UK counterparts. Is this because of American political culture? Or perhaps because debates focused on dealing with economic cuts and austerity, as in the 2010 UK election, are much less likely to be of high emotion than elections fought over wars, as was the case when Bush and Kerry contended. Another mystery for now but one we hope to solve in the course of our research to solve.

Figure 1: Analysis of the Emotional Content of the UK’s Televised Prime Ministerial Debates April 2010*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Debate</th>
<th>2nd Debate</th>
<th>3rd Debate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>24.40</td>
<td>24.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clegg</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>22.86</td>
<td>21.76</td>
<td>21.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arousal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>20.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clegg</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameron</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>15.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unit follows that used in ANEW

Figure 2: Analysis of the Valence Content in the US Presidential Debates, 2004 and 2008*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Debate 1</th>
<th>Debate 2</th>
<th>Debate 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obama</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>20.16</td>
<td>20.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCain</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>23.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>39.56</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>35.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush</td>
<td>56.56</td>
<td>55.13</td>
<td>55.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unit follows that used in ANEW; mean valence over three debates for each election

...little is really known about how parties use emotions, which ones ‘work’ electorally, and how emotional appeals have changed over time.

---

Stephen Whitefield, Eamonn Molloy and Sara Hobolt are about to embark on a new project, funded by the John Fell OUP Research Fund, to study how political parties use emotions to compete for our votes.

Stephen Whitefield (author)  Head of Department, Professor of Politics, University Lecturer in Politics, Rhodes Pelczynski Tutorial Fellow in Politics, Pembroke College

Eamonn Molloy  Fellow and Tutor in Management Studies, Pembroke College, Associate Fellow, Said Business School

Sara Binzer Hobolt  Sutherland Chair in European Institutions, European Institute, London School of Economics and Political Science, Associate Member, Nuffield College, Former University Lecturer, DPhil
Good research students are the life-blood of universities. They are the energetic and imaginative young researchers who sustain our reputation and who are currently at the vanguard of human knowledge. They are not just contributing to the world’s understanding of politics and international relations; they are shaping it.

They are also the future leaders. Political careers, of course, are just one field of work for many of our graduates. But the skills and academic insights that they develop are applicable across a wide range of other professional disciplines. Our doctoral degrees are well respected and widely valued, as a professional qualification, whether it is in academic institutions or in policy-based jobs in government, NGOs and business. These are the needs-blind scholarships available every year to all our qualified doctoral researchers.

Our long-term goal is to have needs-blind scholarships available every year for all our qualified doctoral researchers.

Focus on Graduate Research

The Department offers two prestigious doctoral programmes: Politics and International Relations. Most of our doctoral students have progressed from one of the Department’s MPhil or MSc programmes, for which competition is fierce as we seek to enrol the best candidates from an international field. Within the department, as elsewhere in the University, we pride ourselves in providing the best for our students, including close supervision, tutorials, and small seminar groups.

Two doctoral students - David Blagden and Angela Cummine – talk to Inspire about their research and what it means for their future careers.

David Blagden
DPhil International Relations, UK

I came to the DPhil having read PPE as an undergraduate. Having been away to the University of Chicago for my MA, and having then worked in London for a country risk analysis firm, coming back to Oxford for doctoral research represented a welcome return to the UK’s leading academic institutions for the rigorous study of international politics. I am fortunate that my doctoral studies are funded by the UK Economic and Social Research Council.

My research looks at how economic integration – of which contemporary globalisation is a particularly disfigured form – can bring about shifts in the international balance of power, by facilitating catch-up growth in follower economies (states that are not amongst the most developed in the international system). Such shifts in the balance of power can generate international conflict, because rising powers face incentives to restructure the international system in their favour while declining powers face incentives to safeguard their own current position. The implication is that there may be a countervailing mechanism to the oft-cited incrementalism that deepening economic interdependence promotes peace.

The DPhil Politics, Australia

I am an Australian law graduate who moved to Oxford on the above-mentioned PhD opportunity. I was involved in small government and private sector work before starting my DPhil. I am currently working on a comparative study of the impacts of a liberalisation of the Alternative Vote referendum in the UK. I have found this to be a stimulating area to work on and have seen it as a stepping stone to entering a policy research career.

My strong methods training also equipped me to conduct original field research in settings as varied as Alaska, Norway, and Hong Kong, the UAE, Singapore and Australia; all made possible by the generosity of the DPIR in providing funding opportunities. Employing a combination of elite interviews, focus groups and qualitative surveys, I gathered data from SWF representatives, citizens and government officials on the design and operation of their sovereign funds. Not only was this research fascinating to undertake, it also led to exciting employment opportunities at the OECD and the International Forum of SWFs during its first three years of operation. As I approach the end of my DPhil, I am confident that the empirical and philosophical research skills cultivated during my Masters and the career opportunities these skills yielded throughout the doctorate place me in a strong position for careers both within and beyond the Academy.

Details of our graduate courses are available at www.politics.ox.ac.uk/index.php/study/study.html

Angela Cummine
DPhil Politics, Australia
Here is a selection of books which have been published over the past year by members of the DPIR. We welcome review suggestions from authors and publishers: please send brief details to alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk. We also publish details of alumni publications on the DPIR website.

Recent Books

Justine Lacroix & Kalypso Nicolaidis (editors) European Stories: Intellectual Debates on Europe in National Contexts (Oxford University Press)

European Stories is the first book of its kind in any European language. It provides a remarkable attempt to capture the full polyphony of different national, sub-national and supra-national traditions of the European story, and then to find some underlying tune. The chapters focus on the long history of the ‘European tune. The chapters focus on the long history of the ‘European

Steven Casey & Jonathan Wright (editors) Mental Maps in the Early Cold War Era, 1945-1968 (Palgrave Macmillan)

In this collection of essays, the radical changes in the balance of power at the beginning of the Cold War are viewed through the eyes of fifteen major political figures that helped to define and shape it. The mental maps of Stalin, Truman, Bevin, de Gaulle, Adenauer, Gromyko, Tito, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Nehru, Nasser, Castro, Kennedy and Johnson, and Khrushchev provide fascinating insights into the opportunities and constraints felt by the leaders of a world still scarred by the horrors of two world wars.

Ben Jackson & Marc Sears (editors) Liberalism as Ideology: Essays in Honour of Michael Freeden (Oxford University Press)

Debates about the liberal political tradition lie at the very heart of the discipline of political theory, and in these debates the original voice of Michael Freeden deserves particular attention. In the course of a body of work that spans over thirty years, Freeden’s iconoclastic contributions have repeatedly challenged the established thinking of liberal ideology, history, and theory. This book brings together an international group of historians, philosophers, and political scientists to evaluate the impact of Freeden’s work and to reassess its central claims.

Rama Mari & Thomas G Weiss (editors) Responsibility to Protect: Cultural Perspectives in the Global South (Routledge)

This volume explores the emerging norm of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), initially adopted by the United Nations World Summit in 2005. Its contributors analyse this perceived responsibility to protect through multiple disciplines—philosophy, religion and spirituality, anthropology, and aesthetics, in addition to international relations and law. In each case, they combine theory with first-hand experience with violent crimes, making this essential reading for all those with an interest in humanitarian intervention, peace and conflict studies, critical security studies and peacebuilding.

Joel E Albinson & Gillian Poole (editors) Crisis of Conservatism?: The Republican Party, the Conservative Movement, and American Politics After Bush (Oxford University Press)

Crisis of Conservatism assesses the status of American conservatism—its politics, its allies in the Republican Party, and the struggle for the soul of the conservative movement that became especially acute with the controversial policies of the Bush administration and Republican losses in the 2006 and 2008 elections. The book’s contributors, a broad array of leading scholars of conservatism, identify a range of tensions in the US conservative movement over what conservatism is and should be, over what conservatives should do when in power, and over how conservatives should govern.


Over the past two decades, governments have delegated extensive regulatory authority to international private-sector organisations. This internationalisation and privatisation of rule making has been motivated not only by the economic benefits of common rules for global markets, but also by the realisation that government regulators often lack the expertise and resources to deal with increasingly complex and urgent regulatory tasks. The New Global Rulers examines who writes the rules in international private organisations, as well as who wins, who loses – and why.

Robert Rohrschneider & Stephan Whitley The Strain of Representation: How Parties Represent Diverse Voters in Western and Eastern Europe (Oxford University Press)

This new book assesses how political parties across Europe have attempted to represent diverse voters. It focuses on two particularly significant features: the emergence of new democracies in Eastern Europe, and the increasing diversity of European voters, specifically between partisan and independent supporters, that must be represented. Expert surveys conducted in 24 European countries have been analysed together with other available data on voters, party characteristics, and country conditions to make a compelling case on ‘the strain of representation’ in Europe today.

Caroline Fehl Living with a Reluctant Hegemon: Explaining European Responses to US Unilateralism (Oxford University Press)

How Europeans choose to deal with the ‘reluctant hegemon’ of the United States has critical implications for how global challenges are addressed - and yet, the striking variation of European responses has been largely overlooked in a scholarly debate fixated on understanding US unilateralism. This book fills this important gap by studying European strategic choices in recent transatlantic conflicts over multilateral agreements. It is the first book-length study of European responses to US unilateralism, and features an extensive range of expert interviews, including many key figures in the negotiations.

Christine Chang & Dominik Zaum (editors) Corruption and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: Selling the Peace? (Routledge)

This edited volume evaluates the influence of corruption in post-conflict peacebuilding from a political rather than technical perspective. Its authors explore the different manifestations of corruption, both conceptually and with specific reference to a wide range of case studies. This book also examines the impact of key anti-corruption policies on peacebuilding environments. The analysis highlights that fighting corruption is only one of several important peacebuilding objectives, and that due consideration must always be given to the specific social and political context when considering how a sustainable peace can be achieved.

We are keen to hear about alumni publications and have featured several on our DPIR alumni web pages over the past year. Please send information to alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk.

Details of publications will also be published (space permitting) in the DPIR Alumni newsletter Alumni News, due out in December 2012.
Kalypso Nicolaïdis, Professor of International Relations and Director of the Centre for International Studies, talks with Thomas Clarkson about Oxford, the EU and European ‘demi-cracy’

Kalypso Nicolaïdis

In Conversation

Most admissions candidates will tell you that, while they might partially understand Oxford’s college system, the labyrinthine web run by deans, masters and wardens remains confusing, even Kafkaesque. Indeed, even experienced dons are occasionally surprised by quirks of collegiate education. But Kalypso Nicolaïdis, Professor of International Relations at the DPIR, has a new take on one of Oxford’s most distinctive characteristics: ‘The longer I spend here, the more I feel that the Oxford system, based on age-old colleges with their entrenched identity, stubborn attachment to their own autonomy and yet pragmatic commitment to the idea of the University as a whole, is very reminiscent of the European Union as a federation of entrenched nation states condemned to live together forever!’

She is certainly well-placed to make such comparisons. Since moving here from Harvard – where she was associate professor at the Kennedy School of Government and founder and chair of the Kikikalis Programme on Southeastern and East-Central Europe – Nicolaïdis has studied the EU in remarkable breadth. Using approaches as diverse as international relations theory, political economy, political philosophy and legal theory to analyse her particular areas of interest (which include South East Europe, EU-Africa relations, transatlantic relations, and the Euro-Mediterranean and the Arab Spring), Kalypso’s research has been extremely varied. In addition, she has frequently intervened beyond the world of academia, providing policy advice to various European institutions and leaders.

With French and Greek nationality, married to a British husband, and of Spanish and German origin, Kalypso has a truly European identity. When writing her thesis on the EU and student politics in Paris – she was a member of the French Socialist Party and founded a student branch of the Human Rights League in France. When writing her thesis on the EU and the GATT in the 1980s, she became involved in the Uruguay Round and negotiations over the creation of the WTO, and her engagement with policy has continued ever since.

This has included participating in an OECD programme on the relationship between trade and regulation (where she became known as ‘Mrs Mutual Recognition’), and a decade-long cooperation on contemporary European issues with former Greek PM George Papandreou during his time as Foreign Minister. More recently, she has given advice to the European Commission, and to the European Council on the future of Europe as one of the so-called ‘Wise Men’ (much to the horror of her daughter!). Nicolaïdis sees policy work as both an opportunity and a responsibility for academics to step out of their ivory tower and contribute in very small and humble ways to what is happening in the world. At the same time, she believes that the challenge of translating academic theories and concepts into policies exposed to public opinion is one of the greatest that academics face.

She blames this lack of mutual awareness for accentuating the crisis gripping the Eurozone, with Germans not fully understanding Greeks’ motivations and history, and vice versa: ‘In Oxford we advance more carefully, and so are undoubtedly more resilient. But the European crisis has been magnified by the thinness of mutual recognition between states and all the prejudices which accompany this’. In line with the message of her last edited book, European Stories (see book review on page 20), Nicolaïdis hopes that political actors will respect the pluralist spirit of what she has called European ‘demi-cracy’, and not ill-advisedly race towards federalism or a two-speed Europe.

Although it is hardly surprising that an EU-focused academic has a view on contemporary events in the continent, the above comments hint at the motivation for Nicolaïdis’ significant involvement in policy work, which is the result of a ‘combination of inclination and accident!’ Before deciding to embark on a career in academia, she wanted to be a diplomat, and was active in French student politics in Paris – she was a member of the French Socialist Party and founded a student branch of the Human Rights League in France. When writing her thesis on the EU and the GATT, she became involved in the Uruguay Round and negotiations over the creation of the WTO, and her engagement with policy has continued ever since.

This includes participating in an OECD programme on the relationship between trade and regulation where she became known as ‘Mrs Mutual Recognition’, and a decade-long cooperation on contemporary European issues with former Greek PM George Papandreou during his time as Foreign Minister. More recently, she has given advice to the European Commission, and to the European Council on the future of Europe as one of the so-called ‘Wise Men’ (much to the horror of her daughter!). Nicolaïdis sees policy work as both an opportunity and a responsibility for academics to step out of their ivory tower and contribute in very small and humble ways to what is happening in the world. At the same time, she believes that the challenge of translating academic theories and concepts into policies exposed to public opinion is one of the greatest that academics face.

In addition, Kalypso says that Britain was an attractive place to move to: ‘Ironically, given its Euroscepticism, the field of European studies is most vibrant in the UK,’ whereas in Oxford, it takes time to establish which college is which and how to enter them! This cliche is at evidently applies to the Harry Potter fan in Kalypso – for her, Oxford is ‘the most attractive and romantic city in the world’.

For more information on the RENEU project, please see http://cis.politics.ox.ac.uk/research/ Projects/Europe_Non-European.asp

‘Kalypso has defined ‘demi-cracy’ as ‘a union of peoples, understood both as states and citizens, who govern together, but not as one’. Thomas Clarkson

MINI Candidate in Politics (European Politics and Society)
Twenty years ago, if asked whether they agreed that the UK was comparatively free of political corruption, most people probably would have said they thought it was. Britons tended to tell themselves they were reasonably good at keeping politics clean - but that view has come unstuck over the last two decades. It has been challenged by episodes like the cash-for-questions saga of the early 1990s, by periodic high-profile resignations of ministers, by controversies over party funding and lobbying, and most strikingly by the notorious parliamentary expenses scandal of 2009.

The UK is certainly not alone in this. Governance quality is permanently on a backburner, and many advanced democracies have had episodes of impropriety. Its work is significant because it tells us how ordinary people, as opposed to journalists or politicians or ethics professionals, think about these issues. When John Major set up the Committee one of its missions was to restore public trust and confidence. More recently, the House of Commons has been involved in significant debates about whether the measures taken in the wake of the expenses scandal have improved public confidence. The research supervised by Mark Philp’s board suggests it is an uphill struggle: the most recent report, published in September 2011 and based on the fourth biennial survey, suggested that public perceptions that MPs are doing a good job fell dramatically between 2008-10, as did perceptions of MPs’ competence and honesty under a range of headings (see: http://www.public-standards.gov.uk/library/ CSPL_survey_Final_web_version.pdf). Not surprisingly, this sort of knowledge sometimes makes for painful reading and lively encounters between MPs and the Committee about research techniques, as readers can deduce from related parts of the Committee’s web-site.

Beyond what the public thinks, we also need to understand how well institutions that are built to defend integrity actually work, and to develop a coherent account of the principles underlying them. On the agenda here are our notions of conflict of interest, of the distinction between acceptable and unacceptable political lobbying and influence, of what forms and sources of party funding are legitimate, and of when a former minister or civil servant can work for businesses they have previously been regulating or consulting with.

Working this out is not straightforward. In the last two decades there has been a veritable explosion of ethics regulators and codes of conduct, many of them the result of the recommendations by the Committee on Standards in Public Life itself. Often they get a bad press from those they are regulating. One or two have been swept away – like the Standards Board for England, which spent a thankless decade trying to find ways of underwriting higher standards in local government. The principles established in its code of conduct were not unchallengeable or easy to implement and, unloved in the shrines as at Westminster, it was abolished by the 2011 Localism Act.

But rules and regulators are only as strong as the underlying values, which takes us back to the starting point. What are British values, and how do they get created and transmitted? We referred to research on the elusive values of the public. No less elusive are those of our officeholders. The next stage is to understand those values better, starting with the next generation of MPs, the 232 who entered the House of Commons in 2010 after one of its largest postwar clean-outs. A grant from the University’s John Fell CUP Research Fund has helped us make a start on this question, and work continues.
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The DPIR is collaborating with the Department of Politics and International Studies (POLIS), University of Cambridge, on a new blog, Politics In Spire, which is gaining recognition both within and outside the Academy in the UK and beyond. Politics In Spire won a 2012 OsTalent award. The blog aims to promote and disseminate research, and to engage in scholarly debate on current affairs, addressing topical issues in a timely fashion.

Our wide-ranging blog posts include:
- Reforming the House of Lords
- Georgian identity and Europe
- Obama Healthcare: Court vs. Congress
- Lifting the Siege: Protecting Civilians in Syria

Contributions and comments welcome: oxbridge.blog@gmail.com
Visit PoliticsInSpires.org
Follow us on twitter @PoliticsInSpire

The Department has an immensely rich and diverse programme of research activities, including seminars, workshops, major lectures, conferences and training, and actively engages the participation of research students.

A selection of DPIR current research projects can be viewed online at www.politics.ox.ac.uk/index.php/projects/current-projects.html (to be updated September 2012).

To request a hard copy of this publicity please contact alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk
The incidence of interstate war has declined since World War II. The incidence of civil war is arguably declining since circa the mid 1990s. Why? And how durable is the trend? Professor Neil MacFarlane, Lester B Pearson Professor of International Relations and fellow of St Anne’s will explore this shifting landscape of war and peace. Dapo Akande, co-Director of the Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict and the Convener of the Oxford Law Faculty’s Public International Law Group, will chair.

2pm – 3pm
The constitutional issues surrounding devolution in the UK
Iain McLean, Professor of Politics and fellow of Nuffield College, the British Academy and the Royal Society Edinburgh, has published widely on constitutional issues. His What’s wrong with the British Constitution? co-won the W J M Mackenzie Prize for the best politics book of the year and was a member of the Independent Expert Group advising the Calman Commission on Scottish Devolution. John Lloyd, Director of Journalism at the Reuters Institute, who Professor McLean will be in conversation with, is a contributing editor to the Financial Times and an author of several books including What the media are doing to our politics.

4pm-5pm
Going into Politics? Tales from an Academic in Westminster
Professor Marc Stears reflects on his experiences. Marc Stears is a Professor of Political Theory and fellow at University College. He is the author of Demanding Democracy: American Radicals in Search of a New Politics and is one of the co-editors of the widely discussed The Labour Tradition and the Politics of Paradox. He is currently visiting fellow at Britain’s leading think tank, the Institute for Public Policy Research, and he works closely with many of Britain’s most prominent politicians on questions of political strategy and communication. Chaired by Dr Mark Philp, Fellow and Tutor in Politics at Oriel College who works on political theory, the history of political thought, and is interested in political ethics, corruption and standards in public life.