A LETTER FROM THE EDITORS

Welcome to the fourth issue of Inspires, the alumni magazine for the University of Oxford’s Department of Politics and International Relations (DPIR). We hope you enjoy it. We are pleased to bring you again a sample of the wide-ranging research activity of DPIR members, including two articles by DPIR alumni, Sundeep Waslekar and Tim Soutphommasane. Three alumni also kindly agreed to share with you their accounts of ‘Life after DPhil’, continuing the success of the ‘Life after PPE’ and ‘Life after History and Politics’ features in previous editions. We have a new Head of Department, Elizabeth Frazer; please find her ‘Welcome’ on page 4.

It has been another very active year for the DPIR alumni programme. It was a pleasure to meet so many of you at the November 2013 alumni event ‘The Engagement of Theory’. One delegate remarked, ‘Saturday was a splendid day and quite as good as my highest hopes. Thanks to everybody for making it happen. It stimulated my thinking on a wide range of topics.’ We know that many alumni also enjoyed the joint OUP/DPIR ‘Oxford@ISA’ reception, which was held at this year’s International Studies Association convention in Toronto, and the Toronto Oxford-Cambridge Society event which took place on the same day. Planning is underway for our next Oxford event, ‘Political Economy in Times of Crisis’, which will be held on Saturday 29 November – please see further details on the back cover of this magazine. We hope to hold many more events of this kind, not only in Oxford, but further afield. We have received generous donations towards this programme. We hope to hold many more events of this kind, not only in Oxford, but further afield. We have received generous donations towards this programme. It was a pleasure to meet so many of you at the November 2013 alumni event ‘The Engagement of Theory’. One delegate remarked, ‘Saturday was a splendid day and quite as good as my highest hopes. Thanks to everybody for making it happen. It stimulated my thinking on a wide range of topics.’ We know that many alumni also enjoyed the joint OUP/DPIR ‘Oxford@ISA’ reception, which was held at this year’s International Studies Association convention in Toronto, and the Toronto Oxford-Cambridge Society event which took place on the same day. Planning is underway for our next Oxford event, ‘Political Economy in Times of Crisis’, which will be held on Saturday 29 November – please see further details on the back cover of this magazine. We hope to hold many more events of this kind, not only in Oxford, but further afield. We have received generous donations towards this programme.

We welcome feedback on this issue, suggestions for the next and will be warmly appreciated. We welcome feedback on this issue, suggestions for the next and will be warmly appreciated. We welcome feedback on this issue, suggestions for the next and will be warmly appreciated.

Kate Candy and Stuart White
alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk

Please keep sending us your alumni profiles, ‘class notes’ (for the online Alumni Newswire newsletter), news and publications, and join our ever-growing alumni networks. We will post material online and publish it in the newsletter wherever possible. We are very grateful to those of you who have returned the form enclosed with last year’s issue of this magazine, informing us of changes in contact details and of your current employment. This latter information is particularly important for DPIR as our alumni achievements encourage the most talented scholars from across the world to apply to study here; it is also inspirational for our current students to learn of alumni career destinations. Thank you for your help with this.

We will mention here that DPIR is currently working to redevelop its website, with the launch of the new site due in Michaelmas term. Your suggestions for improvements to the alumni webpage are very much appreciated. We will mention here that DPIR is currently working to redevelop its website, with the launch of the new site due in Michaelmas term. Your suggestions for improvements to the alumni webpage are very much appreciated. We will mention here that DPIR is currently working to redevelop its website, with the launch of the new site due in Michaelmas term. Your suggestions for improvements to the alumni webpage are very much appreciated.
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Welcome to our 2014 issue of *Inspires*, in which you will find articles that show how the research conducted by department staff engages directly with the events of the world: changes in the European Parliament, International Relations of the Middle East, intergenerational justice, constitutional change and entrenchment, and the relationship between market forces and the welfare state. Two alumni have generously contributed articles: one on the patriotic case for responding to racism, the other on the need for active water cooperation between countries to prevent conflict; three alumni also reflect on their experiences of ‘Life after DPhil’.

Questions of relevance, impact and engagement are prominent in all current discussions of university research. Basic research itself cannot be aimed directly at the goal of applicability: the levels of relevance and engagement that are evident in the articles we publish in *Inspires* are more often a by-product of basic scholarship, the development and use of rigorous methods of data gathering and processing, careful interpretation, theoretical reflection and sophisticated analysis. It is the values of validity and truth, clear-mindedness and, technical capability that deliver truly significant findings. Work in our department is rooted in the disciplines of history, philosophy, and the social sciences. The concepts and techniques of these disciplines change - with technologies of research, and also in response to past findings and models which are openly discussed and criticised in publications and in public conferences. These disciplines change all the time, and they intersect with and make differences to the core fields of study of those of you who studied Philosophy, Politics and Economics, or History and relations, government, and political history. We are very much looking forward to the implementation of this project, and we will report on the results of it in due course.

I am also very happy to bring readers’ attention to the next alumni event which will give our research staff an opportunity to discuss their work with our old students. In November 2014 Professor David Rueda is organising the third of these conferences. This time the focus will be on our political economists, whose research asks how economic exchanges and flows interact with governmental institutions and forms, and with what human and social consequences. We are very much looking forward to welcoming some of you on that occasion.

I hope that you will all choose to stay involved with the Department of Politics and International Relations in whatever capacity you wish, be it by joining one of our alumni networks or by attending an event. We welcome discussions on how we can help you continue to bring outstanding graduate students to the Department, and further information can be found on page 14. And meanwhile, I hope that you enjoy reading this issue of *Inspires* as much as I have.

Elizabeth Frazer
Head of Department, DPIR,
Associate Professor of Politics,
Official Fellow, New College

**Elizabeth Frazer** became Head of Department on 1 January this year. In this welcome note she reflects on the value of departmental research and initiatives and looks forward to our next alumni event later this year.
The EU in 2014: An Endgame?

Anne Deighton looks back at the history of the EU and asks whether recent challenges now find it in uncharted waters.
Justice between generations: a research agenda

Simon Caney outlines the challenges which lie at the heart of the debate about justice for future generations

Many of the activities that we engage in – and the policies that our governments implement – have profound effects on future generations. The current generations have these kinds of impacts is not new. Government financial decisions concerning say, pensions, housing, health care or the funding of education will have an impact on future generations. In these cases, the impacts are felt primarily by the young or the next generation. However, other phenomena, such as climate change, threaten to affect future generations for hundreds, indeed thousands, of years.

Intergenerational phenomena pose several distinct kinds of challenge. First, they raise important ethical questions concerning what obligations, if any, members of one generation have to future generations. Second, they call for policies that adequately recognise the entitlements of both current and future persons. And, third, they call into question existing political institutions that are often, though not always, resolutely focused on the short term. That is, they raise questions of institutional design.

If we start with the ethical level, one fundamental question is what distributive justice in terms of people’s levels of happiness? Or what Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen call capabilities? Or should the focus be on resources? These questions raise fundamental debates about our vision of a good and just society. If we hold that intergenerational justice is concerned with bequeathing a fair set of opportunities to lead a fulfilling life then it is possible in principle that this is not served by continued economic growth. This would take us to the vision expressed by John Stuart Mill in Principles of Political Economy, where he defends the ideal of the ‘stationary state’. Such a state, he argues, ‘implies no stationary state of human improvement. There would be as much scope as ever for all kinds of mental culture, and moral and social progress; as much room for improving the Art of Living, and much more likelihood of its being improved; when minds ceased to be engrossed by the art of getting on’. John Maynard Keynes strikes a similar note in his celebrated essay on ‘Economic Possibilities for our Grandchildren’, which argues that once we have attained a certain material standard of living we should focus less on the ‘means of life’ in order to orient ourselves to what he calls ‘the art of the’. The point underlying the perspective articulated by Mill and Keynes is that economic resources are only a means to an end – living rewarding and fulfilling lives. If they are right then what we owe future generations may not require – may even be harmed by – continued economic growth.

Recognising principles of intergenerational justice will, of course, require policies that secure the entitlements of future generations. For example, in the case of climate change there is a powerful case for investing in and transferring clean technologies to enable the least advantaged to develop, but do so in ways that do not trigger dangerous climate change.

In addition to this, taking intergenerational justice seriously requires rethinking existing political institutions, both at the national and international level. One striking feature of many existing political systems is their insufficiency in the medium and long-term. Humans generally focus on the short term (out of self-interest, pure time discounting, and a tendency to ignore problems which we encounter in an abstract way rather than through personal experiences). Furthermore, the incentives facing political actors (notably the electoral cycle, but also the timetables employed to evaluate policies) often encourage myopia.

Given this, one fundamental challenge is to reform existing institutional architectures to incentivise greater protection of future generations. Broadly speaking, one can distinguish between two approaches. One – a constitutional/judicial approach – focuses on the use of constitutional articles and courts or ombudsmen for future generations. For example, in the case of climate change, the Brazilian Constitution (Art 225) and the German Basic Law (Art 20a) – now contain articles affirming a commitment to intergenerational justice. There have also been some influential cases – both at the national and international level – where courts have invoked ideas of intergenerational justice.

This strategy can be contrasted with political/legislative approaches. These seek to tackle the issue by designing the legislative process in such a way as to give due protection to the interests of future generations. One step in this direction was taken by Finland, which created a parliamentary Committee for the Future, and made it a permanent committee in 2000. Building on this kind of model one might, however, envisage more radical democratic reforms. If we are to put a due concern with the interests of future generations at the heart of policymaking, then one way of doing so would be to create a legislative process in which (a) newly elected governments are required to issue a statement of how they plan to address long-term problems, (b) there is a Committee for the Future whose role it is to evaluate the long-term implications of current policies, and (c) there is a public deliberative process in which the Government’s statement is evaluated by the Committee for the Future (among other bodies) and government ministers are required to give a public justification of how their policies serve the interests of people living in the medium and long-term. This kind of process would not guarantee upholding the rights of future generations – nothing may be able to guarantee that. However, it would make it much harder to ignore the future and would make long-term problems visible in a way that is currently not the case.

There are, of course, other mechanisms that one might explore. The central point is simply that if – as many accept – there are obligations of justice to those who come after us, then we need to start thinking about how best to organise our political system to reflect those obligations.

Simon Caney
Professor in Political Theory,
Director, Centre for the Study of Social Justice,
Fellow and Tutor in Politics, Magdalen College
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Talking and writing about Middle East IR

Louise Fawcett explains how an examination of past patterns and practices and engagement with fellow scholars can help inform a balanced analysis of current issues in the Middle East.

One of the perils of academic life, particularly in a research field as fast moving and controversial as International Relations of the Middle East, or ‘Middle East IR’, is that one is frequently called upon to offer snap opinions and judgements about the latest event or crisis. The Arab Spring uprisings, which started late in 2010 and whose consequences still reverberate today, are an obvious case in point. Iranian foreign policy – including its alleged drive to acquire nuclear capability – is another. So are the current travails of Turkish democracy.

Sitting down to lunch in our congenial Senior Common Room exposes one regularly to current questions about the latest Middle East developments, and also to avoid getting things wrong. And academics (and policymakers) frequently do seem to get things wrong when it comes to the Middle East.

Consider Iran. I wrote my first book on Iran in the Cold War and, though one might reasonably argue that Iran during the Cold War was an altogether different state from Iran since the Revolution – not least because it was closely aligned to the West, it is surprising just how many parallels can be drawn between the Islamic Republic and the Shah’s Iran. For example, the ambition to assume an important regional position, to be a regional leader or ‘hegemon’ is one that has characterised both pre-revolution and post-revolution Iran. This desire derives from the country’s history and cultural identity, from its size, location and resources. Iran operates in a sensitive and highly competitive regional environment and this has led to heightened sense of insecurity and vulnerability.

Take another issue, that of democratization. For a long time, political scientists and commentators have alternatively puzzled at or despaired of the apparent hostility of the region towards the processes of political liberalisation. The Middle East is seen as an outlier having evidently missed Samuel Huntington’s Third Wave of Democratization. Reasons for this have often been sought in the region’s so-called exceptionalism, with Islam and Arabism often invoked to explain the democracy gap. The political economy of rentierism has been also implicated in explaining the resilience of authoritarian rule. When the Arab Spring started there was therefore considerable surprise, even scepticism, that Arab peoples had found their voice and were demanding human dignity and basic freedoms.

The Arab Spring, however, is less surprising if one considers the experience of the modern region over the long twentieth century. Yes, there is little democracy judged by Western standards, but plenty of close encounters with democratic practices and liberal values, from the first Ottoman constitution in the late 19th century, or the Iranian constitution of 1906, to the multiple episodes of attempted and mostly thwarted liberalisation that have punctuated Middle East history since the end of the Second World War. That these have hitherto failed to produce more stable democratic outcomes in most of the region (Israel and Turkey are the outliers here) does not mean that the region is inherently inhospitable to democracy, as the scholar Elie Kedourie once argued.

Whatever the outcome of the Arab uprisings, the region is unlikely to return to the status quo ante. Progress towards greater pluralism has been made.

With democratization, as with Iran, or indeed with the widely misused label ‘political Islam’, so diverse and complex as to be devoid of significant meaning, it is important to avoid the generalisation and oversimplification that is present in much public commentary. We need to look beyond such simplifications, to examine the facts on their own terms.

One of the more recent publishing ventures I have been involved in is precisely an attempt to keep abreast of major developments in the International Relations of the Middle East by engaging with different scholars and a variety of perspectives. IR theory tends towards grand assumptions: it can be a huge simplifier. But in exploring issues ranging from the colonial legacy and regional economy to political identities and regional security, my fellow authors and I have tried to demonstrate the need for careful, balanced analysis and considerable nuance in writing about the International Relations of the modern region. I attempt to follow the same principles in my lunchtime conversations!

Louise Fawcett
Associate Professor of Politics, Wilfrid Knapp Fellow, Tutor in Politics, St Catherine’s College
1 International Relations of the Middle East, 3rd edition (Oxford University Press, 2013)
LIFE after DPhil

The DPhil student community currently numbers over 221, with DPhil alumni going on to a wide range of academic careers and positions in the public and private sectors both nationally and globally. Three DPhil alumni share with Inspires how the DPhil influenced their lives and career choices.

David Malone
Magdalen College 1995

In 1994, at 40, I was concluding a Canadian ambassadorial term at the UN, chairing its peacekeeping committee. I had sat on the UN Security Council’s Foreign Affairs Committee and I needed a PhD to be taken seriously within academic circles. I applied to Princeton and Oxford, the two places that had hitherto been the most prominent eminences active on the UNSC.

A job relevant to my research? Eighteen years on, looking back on a career that’s spanned both think tank and academic employment, the answer to all three questions is a resounding yes, but it’s by no means the path I would have expected when starting the degree back in 1996.

For a start, there’s still a misconception that doctoral research must inevitably lead to an academic post. In reality, fewer than half of all those with a PhD will make it into academia in the long-run, if figures reported in THE are to be believed. But this needn’t mean that all that research expertise will go to waste. In my case, the propositions of getting a job in political Theory were probably slim, and I yearned for a position that would enable me to apply the normative lessons learnt from a thesis on political legitimacy as they arise beyond the borders of sovereign states. After a round of naïve and probably rather glowing letters, I was lucky enough to get a job with the UK’s Foreign Office (left-handed think tank, the Institute for Public Policy Research. At a time when questions of community and social cohesion were high on the political agenda I was given the chance to run my own project, essentially applying the policy lessons learnt in my heavily philosophical thesis.

In retrospect, I learnt some tough lessons damn fast. Civil servants and ministers won’t read a 30-page conceptual analysis. Seminars at Number 10 Downing Street can’t be approached as if they were the Nuffield Political Theory Group. And most important of all, if you can’t explain the importance of your own work, no one else will do it for you. I stayed in the app for two terrifying but exhilarating years, and gradually came into ring-side seat to the profound shift in international relations as the Cold War ended. My years in New York left me with much greater appreciation of the multi-tasking skills of diplomats – the grubby, dirty work of politics – which I consider myself a very lucky swan) pleasures of the place, of which I consider myself a very lucky swans – white, instead of black like all the swans at home in Melbourne. I hope that I can bring them back again when they are a little older, and share with them some of the other (non-swans) pleasures of the place, of which I consider myself a very grateful beneficiary.

Victoria Nash
Magdalen College 1993

It’s fair to say my family expressed little excitement at the prospect of me achieving an Oxford DPhil in Political Theory. For a start, I was a humanities student and my research topic was the UN Security Council – two areas that would be utterly foreign to them. I was a political theorist and I teach outstanding future academics and policymakers. But I’m still a political theorist at heart.

The ambitions of the research programme inspired by my time at Oxford still motivate and structure my present research.

Terry Macdonald
Nuffield College 2000

I work now as an academic in the International Relations (IR) programme at the University of Melbourne. Between completing my DPhil and taking up my present appointment I had a series of academic jobs: as a Junior Research Fellow at Merton College in Oxford, as a Research Fellow at the Australian National University, and as a Lecturer at Monash University. It is hard to apply any neat disciplinary label to my work, but it is perhaps best described as ‘international political theory’ – capturing its position at the intersection between the mainstreams of ‘social scientists’ and ‘normative’ approaches to the theory of world politics. At the moment I am finishing a book on the topic of global political legitimacy, I have worked in the past on institutional sources for global democratization; and I have some in-progress work on the theory of human rights. In all of this my research focuses on problems of political legitimacy as they arise beyond the borders of sovereign states.

An academic career might seem the least surprising of all paths to follow after the DPhils, though when I came initially to Oxford to study IR it was not in fact my intention. I embarked on the DPhil in 1989 with the rationale that this degree would open doors to interesting policy and activist work as well as to further academic research. But since there’s resistance against this democratic academic life – a result of being the child of academic parents! I was lucky enough to gain an interview at the left of centre think tank for two terrifying but exhilarating years, and gradually came into the world of international relations. My years in New York left me with much greater appreciation of the multi-tasking skills of diplomats – the grubby, dirty work of politics – which I consider myself a very lucky swan) pleasures of the place, of which I consider myself a very grateful beneficiary.
INVESTING in the FUTURE
THE NEXT GENERATION OF SCHOLARS IN POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

DPIR asks for your help in recruiting the best of the next generation of scholars and leaders

Why support postgraduate study in Politics and International Relations?

Most importantly, we need the next generation of scholars, who will teach future generations of undergraduates. Scholars like those who teach at Oxford – who may have taught you when you yourself studied here – need to be nurtured, taught to research, and taught to teach.

Additionally, postgraduate study generates a much wider group of social scientists and political theorists with the skills of research, data-gathering, hypothesis testing, modelling and programming, conceptual analysis and normative theory building. These skills – put to good use right across the public and private sectors, in civil society, in the UK and worldwide – are not, for the most part, honed through undergraduate study alone. There is a need for a graduate degree.

But graduate study only justifies itself when built on excellence. Our Department is one of the best in the world. Top-quality research, teaching future scholars and intellectual leaders, and real-world impact are interlinked in rich and complex ways, which can be illustrated by the tremendous success of our alumni and the way in which their work and ideas impact on the world. Oxford too is uniquely placed to combine the highest level disciplinary teaching and research skills with deep knowledge of the regions of the world, allowing us to understand different regional, religious and cultural perspectives – increasingly vital in our globalised world.

In DPIR we train the very best. To enable the very best to study at Oxford we must support our brightest graduates irrespective of their financial situation. We need above all to retain in Oxford the best of our Master’s-level students to generate the best doctoral research and publications. That demands fully funded pathways from Masters degree to doctoral thesis. Graduate study is costly. Lack of finance is too often today the cause of promising young scholars declining their places for postgraduate study at Oxford. Our reputation and quality helps to make up for the funding gap but without proper funding regimes to support postgraduate study in Politics and International Relations, the best postgraduates will simply not be able to study in the UK.

Help us become fully ‘needs blind’ and recruit the best of the next generation of scholars

Our goal is competitive funding packages for our best applicants at graduate-entry level. Further information is online at www.politics.ox.ac.uk; alternatively please give us a call to discuss how you can help. Thank you.

Elizabeth Frazer
Head of Department, DPIR,
Associate Professor of Politics,
Official Fellow, New College

David Hine
CUF University Lecturer in Politics,
Student, Christ Church

If you would like to discuss how you can support DPIR, please contact us as follows:

By phone: +44 (0)1865 278700
By email: alumni@politics.ox.ac.uk
The Patriotic Case for Responding to Racism

Tim Soutphommasane argues that understanding patriotism as a civic virtue can empower citizens to counter racism in society

Patriotism means a love of country. But what does it mean to love a country? And what kind of patriotism is appropriate for a society with a multicultural population? These were questions I explored in my research as a political theorist – first in my PhD and then subsequently as an academic in Australian universities. But they continue to feature in the background of my current work as Australia’s Race Discrimination Commissioner. My brief as Commissioner is to educate Australians about racial discrimination and to be an advocate for multicultural harmony. Many would say that patriotism should be the last sentiment I should be entertaining. After all, many who describe themselves as patriotic believe that their country is not only the best in the world but must be protected jealously from any criticism.

It is in this manner that patriotism can morph into jingoism. Loving your country may mutate into a belief in your country’s superiority and into an aggressive imposition of that belief on others. Indeed, some see no significant difference between these two terms. George Bernard Shaw, for instance, defined patriotism as ‘your conviction that [your] country is superior to all other countries because you were born in it.’

Real-world experience shows that patriotism can be a vice. Across Europe, populist parties of the far right and extremist street movements have been growing in strength. Racism and xenophobia continue to thrive. Here in Australia, during the past two decades a reactionary nationalism has seeped into the mainstream consciousness. Since the 2005 Cronulla Beach race riot in Sydney (when a 5,000-strong, flag-waving mob attacked Australians of Middle Eastern appearance), some members of the Australian public have embraced the national flag with jingoistic enthusiasm.

We may understandably regard patriotism with suspicion. In an increasingly globalised world, many suggest that it would be better for us simply to celebrate our common humanity, to become citizens of the world – and not worry about our country being special. I disagree. We shouldn’t reject all forms of patriotism because of its possible dangers. Rather, we should be clearer about what kinds of patriotism we are willing to accept. Because patriotism can also be understood as a civic virtue.

Admittedly, coming to this view requires a number of steps.

First, one needs to conceive of patriotism as tied to one’s membership of a political community. National stories matter especially in multicultural or multiethnic societies, though not like a conservative sense of cultural assimilation. For example, in the British context, it can be simplistic to believe that cohesion can only be secured if immigrants have a masterful command of Shakespeare, Trafalgar and Churchill (not least given the questionable grasp the general British population may have of such topics).

Nuance matters: the common ground of citizenship should be defined more by political than by cultural membership. Emphasising the political content of citizenship means there is room for cultural diversity. Rather than a source of division, difference can be a source of enriching a national tradition.

This isn’t about having a cultural identity or crudely appropriating elements of other cultures. It is about recognising there is no one authoritative way to express one’s national identity. For instance, few would suggest there is one musical group that could ever be described as the definitively British band, even if there may be a body of music that is authentically British. In the same way, there can be multiple ways that someone can make sense of their affinity and allegiance to a country.

Second, patriotism need not mean mindless loyalty or chauvinism. A genuine patriotism involves a special concern for the welfare of your fellow citizens and a belief that they must live up to certain standards.

This kind of patriotism sees a national tradition as a living thing – always growing and evolving. It also demands being prepared to criticise your own country when it falls short of being just and good.

Patriotism provides the fuel for the engine of a good society. This doesn’t mean embracing a tribal belief in the superiority of one’s country. There must be room for reason and reflection. Fundamentally, though, there must be a desire to contribute to the common good and to improve one’s country.

It is this particular aspect of the patriotic mindset that can inform the challenge of countering racial discrimination. While in its extreme forms, patriotism can itself generate racism, in its more moderate versions it can be part of the solution to bigotry. From the viewpoint of the patriot, when your country falls short of its best, it may be your responsibility for responding to discrimination. This isn’t about having a cultural identikit of: ‘My country, right or wrong: if right, to be kept right; if wrong, to be set right.’

It demonstrates the serious health effects racial prejudice and discrimination can have on individuals. More generally, racism can poison social trust and cohesion. Racism’s harm lies in how it reduces its targets to second-class citizens, and how it empowers perpetrators to humiliate others.

These are some of the messages that are at the heart of Australia’s National Anti-Racism Strategy, which seeks to empower citizens to stand up to racism, wherever they see it. In addition to tackling systemic dimensions of discrimination, the Strategy seeks to equip individuals and communities to take responsibility for responding to discrimination. It is an ethos that is, in one sense, patriotic. As the nineteenth-century American statesman Carl Schurz put it, patriotism is indeed a case of: ‘My country, right or wrong. If right, to be kept right; if wrong, to be set right.’

Tim Soutphommasane

DPhil in Political Theory (Balliol 2004)

Race Discrimination Commissioner, Australian Human Rights Commission
In 2013 the Department of Politics and International Relations created a Constitutional Studies Programme, which is intended to use social science techniques, including analytic history and comparative methodology, to improve the quality of public and academic debate on UK constitution and constitutionalism generally. In this article, Scott Peterson, the inaugural Bingham Research Fellow in Constitutional Studies, outlines themes from his recent research into constitutional and legal entrenchment.

Candidates for political office promise to solve problems better than their opponents. Moreover, they promise to do so indefinitely. Particularly after times of turmoil, they attempt to finalise solutions that will last. Following the wars of the seventeenth century and the abdication of James II/VII, in 1688 a convention parliament assembled to confirm William and Mary as king and queen of England. The same parliament passed a Bill of Rights, which guaranteed, among many other things, that the monarch, that taxes must be approved by parliament, and that Protestants have the same rights as others to bear arms. At the conclusion of the act, it says the rights set out there ‘shall be declared, enacted, and established by the Law of this Realm for ever’. And indeed they have.

Elements of these kinds of laws – laws which entrench particular policies or institutions – can be multiplied. The treaty and acts of union between England and Scotland guarantee the continued existence of the established Church of Scotland, the law courts and the educational system in Scotland, and so on. More recently, the Climate Change Act 2008 attempts to set objectives for carbon emissions reaching to 2050, and the European Union Act 2011 imposes a referendum lock on all future parliaments, requiring a referendum when power is transferred to the EU.

In 1688 the king’s abuse of power and the threat of war that had arisen before his abdication provided a back-drop for MPs’ desire to entrench the rule of law and the primacy of parliament in the legislative process. In 1707 the Scots recognised that they would be a minority in the new British parliament, and in approaching union they tried (with some, but not complete, success) to entrench religious, educational and legal institutions that had been central to Scottish history, culture and identity. Climate change is notorious as a collective action problem: no one person or nation acting on its own can solve the problem in a fixed period of time. Widespread, long-term commitment is a necessity. And the history of the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe and the Lisbon Treaty showed that politicians could not necessarily be trusted to carry through on the promise of a referendum.

There is a common structure to each of these examples of entrenchment. In each case, one parliament (P1) attempts to protect a future parliament (P3) and its electors from short-sighted or opportunistic policies of an intervening parliament (P2).

According to traditional UK constitutional theory, however, none of this really matters. A.V. Dicey famously wrote, ‘That Parliaments have more than once intended and endeavoured to pass Acts which should tie the hands of their successors is certain, but the endeavour has always ended in failure.’ Parliament, as a sovereign power, on Dicey’s view, simply cannot bind itself. (Of course, since Dicey’s time the constitutional theory has been weakened by UK membership in the EU and by laws like the Human Rights Act 1998, but it remains a general rule subject to exceptions.) Were all four parliaments that adopted the statutes reviewed above really acting in a way that was futile?

One way of making commitments like these credible is through strong judicial review of the kind we see in Germany and the United States. But that is only one way. Even without it, commitments can increase the cost of later parliaments’ deroga-tion from them.

At the weakest end of the spectrum are the arguments that can be made by the supporters of the original statute, who can point out to voters that P3 has abandoned it, even if P2 attempts to ignore that fact. If support for the original statute has deteriorated, the costs will be less, but it’s a popular case can still be made for the policy, then the political costs will be higher. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the legislature can do what parliament did when it enacted the Human Rights Act 1998, permitting the courts to declare that the second statute is incompatible with the first one, while leaving it to parliament to remedy the inconsistency if it chooses. These are all consequences of legal entrenchment—without strong judicial review.

Another kind of entrenchment is purely political, rather than legal, as the statute says nothing about how long the policy is to last. Political entrenchment has been under-theorised, but it may consist in the benefits of coordination on a fixed point (think of the evolution of the office of the prime minister), repeated interactions (working through the whips via the ‘usual channels’), and material incentives focused on a particular group or even, occasionally, the population in general. Political entrenchment can reinforce spending programmes like the National Health Service, but it can also reinforce constitutional conventions like the political bar on the monarch withholding the royal assent. Political entrenchment is different from, but may work in tandem with, legal entrenchment. In the cases that Dicey points to, where parliaments were unable to be their successors’ hand, legal entrenchment was not adequately supported by political entrenchment. This can be just as true when a codified constitution is the subject of strong judicial oversight: the United States Supreme Court failed to enforce the Fourteenth Amendment of the US Constitution to protect African Americans until the middle of the twentieth century, and it approved government intervention of Japanese Americans in World War II. Indeed, legal entrenchment requires political entrenchment to succeed, but political entrenchment can work by itself to make statutes, conventions and other parts of the constitution difficult to change. These are all positive, descriptive points about entrenchment, and their analysis is necessary before moving on to more normative arguments, ascertaining what kinds of entrenchment are desirable. For example, one of the many criticisms of the EU Act imposing the referendum lock is the fact that the Act was not itself adopted in a referendum. It is doubtful whether it makes sense for a bare majority in one parliament to impose super-majoritarian requirements on future legislatures.

Fundamental principles that underlie the stability of constitutional principles in the UK have not been fully theorised, and these are some ways that theories can move forward in the future.

Scott Peterson
Bingham Research Fellow in Constitutional Studies
This Special Issue explores the worldwide phenomenon of the judicialisation of politics and its relation to representative democracy. Is judicial power expanding to new geographical and policy areas, and if so, what social and political factors are causing this? How do political agents at different levels of governance redesign the judiciary to facilitate or modulate judicialisation? Does institutional design determine actual judicial practice? Is judicialisation subvert or promote democracy; some of both; or neither, merely modifying its nature? Empirical and normative logics are applied to these questions by scholars from different perspectives and methodologies.

Invention of the Market: Smith, Hegel, and Political Theory
Alexandra Delano
Cambridge University Press

The historical origins and debates over the meaning of the market are the focus of this multiple prize-winning book, which contrasts the thinking of Adam Smith and George Hegel, who saw contrasting implications for freedom and justice in the rise of the market-oriented society. This book examines their differences on matters of social theory and philosophy, not just economics, and also relates their views to contemporary concerns in political theory such as the place of inequalities in society and justifications of inequality. The book is based on Dr Herzog’s thesis, which won the PSA’s Sir Ernest Barker Prize.

Struggling for Recognition: The Psychological Impetus for Democratic Progress
Doron Shultziner
Continuum

Inventing the Market: Smith, Hegel, and Political Theory
Alexandra Delano
Cambridge University Press

The historical origins and debates over the meaning of the market are the focus of this multiple prize-winning book, which contrasts the thinking of Adam Smith and George Hegel, who saw contrasting implications for freedom and justice in the rise of the market-oriented society. This book examines their differences on matters of social theory and philosophy, not just economics, and also relates their views to contemporary concerns in political theory such as the place of inequalities in society and justifications of inequality. The book is based on Dr Herzog’s thesis, which won the PSA’s Sir Ernest Barker Prize.

Political Choice Matters: Explaining the Strength of Class and Religioso Cleavages in Cross-National Perspective
Geoffrey Evans and Nan Dirk de Graaf (edited)
Oxford University Press

What role is there for human nature in theorising about democratic transitions? Struggling for Recognition seeks to reintegrate human psychology into history and political science by examining the psychological importance of ‘recognition’ in the pursuit of democracy, how the desire for positive self-esteem and status alters the calculus of collective action and mobilisation in ways underappreciated by existing theories of social and political change. Case studies of the Momentum and the South African anti-apartheid movement illustrate the political movement. The book is based on Dr Herzog’s thesis, which won the PSA’s Sir Ernest Barker Prize.

In the saeering, bloody experience of its war with Japan, the contours of modern China were born. China’s War with Japan charts how exactly a divided and impoverished country survived in the face of overwhelming odds against a foe that swept through the rest of Asia, and the human toll of this struggle. Importantly, however, this story is also one of how its rise and return to superpower status – not just China’s troubled relationship with Japan, but its understanding of its place in the world – are still marked by the legacies of this undersupervised theatre of the Second World War.

POLICIES OF EMIGRATION SINCE 1848
in the United States
and Its Diaspora
Alexandra Delano
Cambridge University Press

The different pressures on migration flows northwards and perceived and sought to manage Mexican governments have and the different ways in which Mexican immigration to the US book reviews over 150 years of Mexican diaspora – illustrate the health of the two economies, superpower neighbour, the relative book is based on Dr Herzog’s justifications of inequality. The of individuals in society and political theory such as the place book examines their differences over the meaning of the ‘market’ the pursuit of recognition, especially the political consequences of this apartheid movement illustrate existing theories of social and collective action and mobilisation into history and political science for Recognition seeks to reintegrate human psychology into history and political science by examining the psychological importance of ‘recognition’ in the pursuit of democracy, how the desire for positive self-esteem and status alters the calculus of collective action and mobilisation in ways underappreciated by existing theories of social and political choice matters. This argument is made through eleven case studies of advanced democracies and complemented by the use of quantitative pooled time-series data.

The relationship between parties and voters has been a long-studied one, in particular the importance of social cleavages of class and religion in explaining electoral choices. This book focuses on how the distribution of the party’s vote. Electoral choices influences the extent of these social cleavages. Rather than social changes being reflected in party choices, the degree of modernisation of parties is offered to voters by parties has important consequences for understanding the social bases of political choices. This argument is made through eleven case studies of advanced democracies and complemented by the use of quantitative pooled time-series data.

The historical origins and debates over the meaning of the market are the focus of this multiple prize-winning book, which contrasts the thinking of Adam Smith and George Hegel, who saw contrasting implications for freedom and justice in the rise of the market-oriented society. This book examines their differences on matters of social theory and philosophy, not just economics, and also relates their views to contemporary concerns in political theory such as the place of inequalities in society and justifications of inequality. The book is based on Dr Herzog’s thesis, which won the PSA’s Sir Ernest Barker Prize.
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Learning about Politics in Space and Time
Richard Rose
ECPR Press

This memoir charts the changes in a lifetime, of both politics and the study of politics, of one of the pioneers of public policy analysis in Europe. Co-author of a pathbreaking Nuffield study of the 1959 British general election, Richard Rose recalls the beginning of political ‘science’ in the 1950s and 60s, and his half-century practice of learning about politics by the travels reflect on the art and craft of political ‘science’ in the 1950s and 60s, and his half-century practice of learning about politics by the travelling from desegregation of the southern US. The different pressures on migration flows northwards and perceived and sought to manage Mexican governments have and the different ways in which Mexican immigration to the US book reviews over 150 years of Mexican diaspora – illustrate the health of the two economies, superpower neighbour, the relative book is based on Dr Herzog’s justifications of inequality. The of individuals in society and political theory such as the place book examines their differences over the meaning of the ‘market’ the pursuit of recognition, especially the political consequences of this apartheid movement illustrate existing theories of social and collective action and mobilisation into history and political science for Recognition seeks to reintegrate human psychology into history and political science by examining the psychological importance of ‘recognition’ in the pursuit of democracy, how the desire for positive self-esteem and status alters the calculus of collective action and mobilisation in ways underappreciated by existing theories of social and political choice matters. This argument is made through eleven case studies of advanced democracies and complemented by the use of quantitative pooled time-series data.

The relationship between parties and voters has been a long-studied one, in particular the importance of social cleavages of class and religion in explaining electoral choices. This book focuses on how the distribution of the party’s vote. Electoral choices influences the extent of these social cleavages. Rather than social changes being reflected in party choices, the degree of modernisation of parties is offered to voters by parties has important consequences for understanding the social bases of political choices. This argument is made through eleven case studies of advanced democracies and complemented by the use of quantitative pooled time-series data.

This collection of seven chapters uses the themes of ‘innovation’ to explore the novel changes underway in China and step beyond the common analyses of socialism and exceptionalism. This discussion of innovation is a diverse issue area, from security policymaking to image and reputation management, and from the search for a distinctive Chinese IR theory to the evolution of online civil resistance. In doing so, it asks both how China is attempting to shape its future, as well as the kind of ‘China’ being made through these processes.

Security and defence issues are hard cases for the transfer of authority to an international bureaucracy. Yet this is exactly what has happened with the development of the European Union’s Common Security and Defense Policy, and the creation of new EU institutions to manage newly delegated functions on security and defense. This book, through a focus on principal-agent theory, examines why these functions were transferred, as well as the implications of bureaucratic design and agency in how the EU’s security policies are made and implemented.

How are the challenges of globalisation changing China? This collection of seven chapters uses the themes of ‘innovation’ to explore the novel changes underway in China and step beyond the common analyses of socialism and exceptionalism. This discussion of innovation is a diverse issue area, from security policymaking to image and reputation management, and from the search for a distinctive Chinese IR theory to the evolution of online civil resistance. In doing so, it asks both how China is attempting to shape its future, as well as the kind of ‘China’ being made through these processes.
IN CONVERSATION

Jane Gingrich, University Lecturer in Comparative Political Economy and Fellow at Magdalen College, talks with Gerda Hooijer about her research into the introduction of market forces to the welfare state and the implications for policymakers, citizens and producers.

Since the 1980s many governments have introduced cutbacks and reforms to their welfare state. Social services, in particular, have been greatly transformed by the introduction of market elements, such as voucher schemes to expand parents’ choice of schools. Market proponents often portray market reforms as a panacea for all its related to big government. Market opponents, on the other hand, perceive them as a threat to equality.

Jane Gingrich, a University Lecturer in Comparative Political Economy and Tutorial Fellow at Magdalen College – who recently joined the University of Oxford from the University of Minnesota – adds a much-needed nuance to this debate. In her first book, Making Multiple Markets in the Welfare State, she argued that markets vary greatly across countries, across time, and across policy areas. Although some may say that ‘a market is a market and all markets produce inequality’, Gingrich argues that ‘one cannot understand the motives of political actors and the effects of reforms without disaggregating the types of market reform’.

Market reforms differ in how services are distributed to citizens (the allocation dimension) and who has control over the delivery of services (the production dimension). While the former relates to shifting risks and responsibility from the collective to the individual, the latter focuses on whether the state, users of services, or the producers of services themselves have control over the production process. Policymakers, users, and producers will each tend to prioritise different goals, respectively: cost efficiency, quality, and profit. Combining these two dimensions leads to six ideal-types of markets with various consequences not only for who receives benefits from the state, but more broadly, which actors call the shots in the production process.

The type of market which is introduced is not random. It is the result of the motives of political parties, as Gingrich emphasises. Left- and right-wing parties will make different choices based on their ideology. She illustrates this with an example from the UK: ‘Both Conservatives under Thatcher and Labour under Blair reformed the NHS, in which they focus on pension and unemployment reform, but less attention to the ways in which policymakers were altering services, and yet services are tremendously important spending items – health and education alone constitute 12-20% of GDP – involve a large workforce and matter a great deal for voters. Understanding these reforms seemed to raise new questions about what the distributive politics of services looked like, and why policymakers, while drawing on a common rhetoric of improved quality and efficiency, often prioritised quite different goals.’ The interactions between policymakers, citizens and producers add another layer to the analysis of this complex good, which is incredibly important for citizens who are using them and for policymakers who are trying to manage them.

In her more recent work, Gingrich explores whether the privatisation in the welfare state has affected general attitudes towards redistribution and support among social policy recipients. These attitudes matter because it is often assumed that they inform people’s vote choices. In an article with Ben Arssli, Professor of Comparative Democratic Institutions at Nuffield College, she analyses the interaction between housing prices, education systems and preferences. They find that rising housing prices enabled high-income individuals to target high-quality schools for their children and exclude low-income individuals. The satisfaction with schooling reflected the winners and losers of this legislation, with the rich being more satisfied and the poor significantly less satisfied. Gingrich continues this line of research in an ongoing project with Sara Watson, Assistant Professor at Ohio State University, in which they focus on recipients of incapacity benefits. They investigate whether the joint introduction of conditionality and private provision of these benefits have had any effect on benefit recipients’ trust in government and their demands on the state.

Citizens are expected to hold governments accountable for the performance of services. Market reforms, however, may have made it more difficult for them to determine who is responsible for what. This fuzziness has implications for theories of how far voting is based on citizens’ evaluations of politicians’ past or likely future performance. The informational role of the welfare state and its effect on social policy preferences is the subject of one of Gingrich’s latest articles. Her results show that there is a stronger link between the social policy preferences and the vote choice of citizens in countries where the role of the state in providing social benefits is more visible than in countries where citizens cannot easily assess what the state is doing.

Jane Gingrich has approached the question of privatisation in the welfare state from many different angles using both qualitative and quantitative methods. She has moved beyond the issues of spending and cutbacks alone and has shed light on the qualitative differences in market reform. The drawings in her office, made by her two children, show that Gingrich has settled into her life at Oxford. Looking back on her first year here, she notes that ‘it has been tremendously rewarding. It has been a pleasure teaching the undergraduate students in tutorials, and working with MPHs in DPIR. There is an excellent group of people working on social policy, not just in politics but across the University, providing an exciting intellectual environment.’
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Blue Peace

Sundeep Waslekar argues for a global centre to facilitate active water cooperation between neighbouring countries and thereby prevent wars.

In February 2006, UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon told the General Assembly that water was at the core of life systems, a decision to cooperate in this sector has implications for electricity, agriculture, urbanisation, livelihood, migration and political stability. Water and peace are interdependent.

Since water is at the

Global overview of water cooperation and the correlating risk of war.

A skeptic might argue that this result shows correlation but not causation. ‘Perhaps’, the sceptic says, ‘countries that already have peaceful relations for other reasons are also able to engage in active water cooperation.’ However, if we look more closely, we can see that countries engaged in active water cooperation tend as a result to bury their differences over other issues. Senegal, Mali, Mauritania and Guinea experienced military rules and conflicts until the beginning of the 1970s. In 1972 three of them created the Senegal River Basin Organisation with a supra-national institutional structure and authority. Guinea joined in 2008. When hostilities broke out between Senegalese farmers and Mauritians bred in 1989, followed by the ‘fossil valley crisis’ between the two countries a few years later, the river basin organisation was able to mediate between them and prevent a war. With its dams, electricity, similarly, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam experience tensions over numerous issues ranging from dams to temples. But the Mekong River Commission, along with the ASEAN economic cooperation regime, forces the four countries to resolve conflicts at a low threshold level. Europe is a classic example of collaborative water management contributing to comprehensive peace. The Rhine River Commission protects several countries in Western Europe from risks of floods and pollution. This has wider impact. When I asked a senior Dutch diplomat to imagine a scenario where the Rhine River Commission is dismantled and the EU Water Framework Directive is abandoned, he took less than a minute to say, ‘This will lead to the dismantling of the European Union, mutual trust and ultimately the threat of war.’

As soon as Cold War was over, the East European countries joined the Danube Commission. The search for peace in the Balkans, after the wars of the 1990s, began with the formation of the Sava River Commission. Finland and Russia have created a bilateral commission to resolve conflicts over water, which also helps build confidence between the two countries to prevent any other conflicts before they blow up.

The Strategic Foresight Group study estimates that there are 37 countries at risk of war, accounting for more than 50% of the world’s population. These are precisely the same countries which do not have institutional mechanisms for active water cooperation. Water does not end an on-going war. But active water cooperation can help to prevent war. When water drives peace and good neighbourly relations, experience shows that riparian countries move into a much higher level of cooperation than they could imagine otherwise. Mere trade liberalisation is not enough, since it can be switched on and off easily. Since water is at the core of life systems, a decision to cooperate in this sector has implications for electricity, agriculture, urbanisation, livelihood, migration and political stability. Water and peace are interdependent.

In collaboration with the governments of Switzerland and Sweden and with helpful discussions in the UK House of Lords, we at the Strategic Foresight Group have developed the Blue Peace framework1. For transforming water from a source of potential crisis into an instrument of peace. This approach crafts the architecture of regional water cooperation, engages mainstream political leaders along with water managers in trans-boundary water discourse and enables politicians to use collaborative institutions to negotiate large trade-offs between water and other public goods. However, much of the work in water diplomacy so far has been regional. There is now a growing realisation that we need a global approach1.

Everywhere in the world, upper riparian countries claim territorial rights to utilise waters, flowing in their jurisdiction for dams and diversions, whereas the lower riparian countries claim historical and environmental rights for unhindered pollution-free flow. We need a global hydro-diplomacy facilitation centre to resolve such disputes.

Whether it is Syria of South Sudan, Palestine or Pakistan, if water infrastructure is damaged in conflict, it takes several years to build. Water cannot be air-dropped like food packets and medicine. We need a political campaign to persuade states and non-state actors to spare water infrastructure in violent conflicts. We also need international agreements to control pollution of water bodies and diplomatic efforts to settle the current debates on various alternative water conventions.

We need to construct global political solutions to water challenges because active water cooperation has the potential to build world peace.

Sundeep Waslekar PPE (St John's College 1981) President, Strategic Foresight Group. The Group has worked with or on 50 countries from four continents.

Sundeep Waslekar was conferred D Litt (Honoris Causa) of Symbiosis International University by the President of India in 2011.

1 Strategic Foresight Group, Blue Peace for the Nile, 2013, http://goo.gl/55vZBz
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Catherine E. de Vries explains the importance of quantitative methods training for DPIR undergraduate students and seeks your help with work placements

The Oxford Q-Step Centre
Generating Enthusiasm for Statistics

The blog is a key element in the Department’s commitment to knowledge exchange and to communicating our academic output beyond our walls. Through Politics in Spires, our researchers can share their latest ideas in progress, build dialogues with academics engaged in similar topics, highlight recent publications, and comment on current popular debates related to their areas of expertise. The blog offers an opportunity to engage diverse and growing audiences, including policymakers, civil society groups and the media. One of our recent collaborations, with openDemocracy, has resulted in an e-book, Democratic Wealth: Building a Citizens’ Economy, which you can download free of charge from the site.

We encourage you to take a look at Politics in Spires, and to share any thoughts or comments with our editorial team at oxfordbridge.blog@gmail.com.

www.politicsinspires.org

SPECIAL SERIES
An editorial series that explores the evolving nature of the social movements that were sparked in the Middle East in 2010. Combining work by scholars and practitioners based in Oxford and beyond, the series has published articles that explore how the revolutions have affected the economic, political, and social outlook of nations in the region, including Bahrain, Algeria, Egypt and Yemen.

Politics in Spires is launching a new series in which contributors are invited to review recent books written by Oxford academics. This series hopes to encourage greater cross-divisional engagement of the Oxford graduate community with the work of the university’s top academics.

Nearly three years ago, DPIR teamed up with Cambridge’s Department of Politics and International Studies to create Politics in Spires, a blog highlighting the academic output of the two departments. Since then, the blog has emerged as an invaluable online source for cutting edge research and insightful commentary. As part of our growing success, we are keen to bring more students, staff, alumni, and other stakeholders into the Politics in Spires community.

We deal with statistics almost in every part of our lives. What is the likelihood that it will rain tomorrow or that the sun will shine? What is the average mark that an Oxford Politics student gets in Finals? We live in a probabilistic world in which certainty is rare. Therefore an in-depth understanding of statistics and research design is of crucial importance when we study Politics. What are the chances that democracy will stabilise in a country that recently survived a coup? Are people more likely to turn out in an election when they have been reminded of their civic duty to vote in a campaign ad? Or is it indeed the case that democracies are less likely to go to war with each other? In order to answer these questions and critically engage with them an understanding of quantitative methods is key.

Last year the Department of Politics and International Relations, in close co-operation with the Department of Sociology, was awarded generous funding from the Nuffield Foundation, ESRC and HERCIE to launch the Oxford Q-Step Centre (OQC). Oxford is one of 15 universities to be selected nationally to host Q-Step, a £10.9 million programme designed to promote a step-change in quantitative social science training. The programme will enable undergraduates across the social sciences to have access to enhanced training in quantitative methods, through lectures and data-labs. As data become increasingly available, the need for graduates who are able to make sense of them increases too. A thorough understanding of statistics makes our Oxford graduates even more competitive on the job market. The private sector, civil service, non-governmental organisations, media, polling institutes, and many others demand graduates with statistical knowledge. As The New York Times put it recently: ‘For Today’s Graduate, Just One Word: Statistics’.

In order to train our students better, new options in quantitative training will be made available to undergraduates taking the PPE or the History and Politics courses. Hands-on data labs will become a core element of the new teaching programme, allowing students the opportunity to work with datasets within the context of their disciplines. The skills training provided through OQC will be shared widely, with the University of Oxford hosting summer schools about quantitative methods for undergraduates from other UK universities. Oxford academics will also develop open access online teaching materials about quantitative methods for wider audiences.

Expertise and resources will be shared across the higher education sector through an accompanying support programme, which will also forge links with schools and employers. Students who go on work placements to develop their quantitative methods will be able to apply for bursaries through the programme.

To further develop our work placement programme, we turn to our alumni for help. Would your organisation be willing to host some of our undergraduates for a summer work placement? Would you be willing to talk to our undergraduates about the usefulness of statistics in your line of work? If your answer to any of these questions is ‘yes’, please contact OQC staff at oqc@politics.ox.ac.uk or visit our website http://www.oqc.ox.ac.uk.

Catherine E. de Vries
Director, Oxford Q-Step Centre.
Professor of European Politics and Government in association with Lincoln College

1 http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/06/technology/06stats.html?_r=2&
Alumni Weekend 2014
19 – 21 September 2014

We invite you to come back to Oxford this September to enjoy being part of our eighth annual Alumni Weekend in the city. This three-day programme of academic sessions will challenge you to think about global issues from a new perspective, allowing you to learn about recent developments in a field that interests you. You will have the opportunity to engage your peers in debate during the many social events which are built into the programme. DPIR’s participation in the event is outlined below. Full details of the weekend can be found at www.alumniweekend.ox.ac.uk

Saturday 20 September 2014
Maths Institute, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter

10:00am – 11:15am
Climate Change in the Media
James Painter, Head of the Journalism Fellowship Programme, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Department of Politics and International Relations

The variety of ways the media represent the science of climate change is now a widely researched area, but it remains a bitterly disputed one. Do climate sceptics get too much coverage? Does the growth in online sites, including sceptical ones, enhance the public’s understanding, or diminish it? Do journalists do a good job in capturing the complexity and uncertainties around climate change, and can climate scientists do a better job in dealing with the media? James Painter is an author and journalist, and was senior editor at the BBC World Service for 15 years.

2:30pm – 3:45pm
The Ties that Unbind: Between the Scotland and the EU Referenda
Professor Kalypso Nicolaïdis, Professor of International Relations and Fellow of St Antony’s
Dr Scot Peterson, Bingham Research Fellow in Constitutional Studies and Fellow of Balliol

On 18 September 2014 Scottish residents will vote on whether to dissolve the Union of the Parliaments of England and Wales and Scotland, which has existed since 1707. If the voters decide in favour of dissolution, many questions will have to be answered in the months before independence. If Scotland votes to stay in the United Kingdom, a different chain of events is set in motion in relation to the general election in 2015, the EU referendum and the UK’s membership in Europe. Kalypso Nicolaïdis and Scot Peterson will discuss these questions just two days after this historic vote.

Booking is via the University Alumni website and brochure www.alumniweekend.ox.ac.uk
Booking closes Friday 30 August 2014

DPIR ALUMNI EVENT
Saturday 29 November 2014
Political Economy in Times of Crisis

Please join political economists in the Department of Politics and International Relations for a conference on Saturday 29 November, ‘Political Economy in Times of Crisis’.

A team of Oxford academics will present some of their latest thinking on the challenges that face Europe today, including the future of the welfare state, immigration and diversity, the importance of political institutions, the relationship between democratisation and growth, etc. They will address how political choices and institutions shape the economy, and in turn, how economic actors and events shape public policy. The conference will be followed by a dinner at Pembroke College.

Full details will be available shortly at www.politics.ox.ac.uk