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Multilevel Governance and Federalism: Closely Linked or Incompatible Concepts?

Michael STEIN
Visiting Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto

The concept of multilevel governance is increasingly being applied beyond its European origins. However, in retrospect, we find substantive and/or analytical differences between the two concepts in complementary rather than contradictory terms, and to consider the boundaries between them to be increasingly blurred. We suggest that the concepts of federalism and multilevel governance share some important characteristics.

Lisa TURKEWITSCH
PhD Candidate in Political Science, University of Toronto

In the second sense, multilevel governance can well be combined with the concepts and models currently used to study intergovernmental relations in Canada, the United States and other federalizations.

IPSA has new ways of letting its members know about events in the global community of political science, providing up-to-date information through the monthly e-newsletter and through the IPSA website (<www.ipsa.org>). The new website is now online. It is more accessible and user-friendly than ever. It has listings of conferences, as well as job postings, publications, IPSA events such as the summer schools and the useful ‘paper room’. I invite you to explore all its new features.

The ‘research committee’ button takes you to the 52 IPSA research committees and the many features offered on their websites. For example, the political communication research committee will hold a UK conference in November, exploring, among other things, the fine line between the mediatisation of politics (compatible with democracy and populism (damaging to democracy) – keynote speaker Gianpiero Mazzoleni, Milan.

IPSA hasn’t yet ventured into forms of communication increasingly favoured by politicians, the use of social networking tools such as Facebook and Twitter. Let us know if you think we should have a Facebook site, like some other political science associations. IPSA is keen to develop its online presence and welcomes all suggestions.

All of this brings us to the changing role of Participation. Because we now provide news through other channels, this frees up Participation to provide more analytic articles. We would like to include insights into current political developments in different parts of the world as well as debates over competing political science frameworks, whether theoretical or methodological. In this issue you will find different perspectives on the recent UK election, in which no party gained a majority of seats, and what this development means for Westminster majoritarianism.

Building Bridges

Marian SAWER
IPSA Vice-President and Chair of the Committee on Publications

As IPSA’s Wikipedia entry says: ‘During its history IPSA has helped build bridges between East and West, North and South, and has promoted collaboration between scholars in both established and emerging democracies. Its aim is to create a global political science community in which all can participate, most recently it has been extending its reach in Eastern Europe and Latin America.’

David Bretham argues that the ensuing coalition between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats presents an opportunity to move beyond the first-past-the-post electoral system and its damaging effects on political equality. He points out that in this election it took around 120,000 votes to elect each Liberal Democrat MP, compared with 34,000 votes for each Conservative and 33,000 for each Labour MP. There is a coalition agreement to have a referendum on electoral reform, specifically the introduction of the alternative vote, where voters mark preferences and these are distributed until a candidate has 50 percent of the vote plus one.

Wyn Grant is more cautious about the benefits of moving beyond majoritarianism. He points out that proportional representation might give a disproportionate amount of influence to smaller parties such as the anti-immigration British National Party. On the other hand the alternative vote would be unlikely to change the outcome in a large number of seats, although it does give minor parties more bargaining power.

I have a particular interest in the topic explored by Bretham and Grant because no party achieved a majority in Australia’s recent election – although we have used the alternative vote for the House of Representatives since 1918 and usually have majority governments. There is now a minority Labor Government in Australia supported by three Independents and a Green MP. This has led to a negotiation over the formation of government provided opportunities to sign both major parties up to a series of parliamentary and political finance reforms. Political scientists were quick to get involved in drafting these reforms, under the aegis of the online campaigning organisation GetUp, which has more members than all the Australian political parties combined.

Also in this issue, Michael Stein and Lisa Turkewitsch argue that the concept of multilevel governance can enrich the study of federalism, because of its attention to the way public decision-making is increasingly shared both between a larger number of levels of government (including the transnational) and between both state and non-state actors. In North America federalism experts have tended to be suspicious of the concept of multilevel governance but European theorists have been more likely to see the two analytic frameworks as sharing normative concerns and being complementary in their analytic focus.

If you would like to see more articles of this kind in Participation, we would welcome suggestions. Please forward your comments to Marian Sawer at: marian.sawer@uams.edu.au

The concept of multilevel governance is increasingly being applied beyond its European origins. However, many North American scholars of federalism and intergovernmental relations have been slow to embrace it. We suggest that multilevel governance is a useful approach for capturing the increasingly complex and shared nature of public decision-making in federal systems, especially in the current age of increased global competition. We argue that the concept of multilevel governance can well be combined with the concepts and models currently used to study intergovernmental relations in Canada, the United States and other federalizations.

IPSA has provided us with important opportunities for developing our argument both at IPSA conferences (Montreal 2008, Sydney 2009 and Luxembourg 2010) and through Research Committee 28 (Federalism and Federation) meetings (Berlin 2008). We have welcomed feedback from IPSA members and further refined our ideas as a result of our participation in these conferences.

The term, ‘multilevel governance’, can be used in at least three different ways: as an analytical concept, as a concrete entity or substantive construct, and as a normative device. In the first sense, multilevel governance is a framework for analysis and a conceptual approach to the study of decision-making across levels of governance. In the second sense, multilevel governance is a concrete or substantive governmental form. It is a system of governance that emerged originally in the European Union and is distinct from federalism.

In a third, normative sense, multilevel governance is a more desirable approach to intergovernmental decision-making in the current era of economic globalization. This is because of the horizontal expansion of this mode of decision-making, particularly in this age, to include non-governmental actors and civil society, and its vertical expansion to encompass both the local and supranational governmental levels.

Some scholars have also argued that MLG can be used in both empirical and normative senses. We agree, but also note that it is important to distinguish between these usages. We argue primarily for the utility of multilevel governance as an analytical framework. Our work highlights the conceptual strengths that the multilevel governance approach can bring to the study of intergovernmental relations in federal systems in an age of increasingly complex modes and multiple units of intergovernmental decision-making.

With respect to the application of federalism and multilevel governance to the European Union, most European federalists and MLG theorists have tended to use the two concepts in complementary rather than contradictory terms, and to consider the boundaries between them to be increasingly blurred. We suggest that the concepts of federalism and multilevel governance share some important characteristics.

In terms of their common traits, the two concepts share a normative focus on attributes such as the capacity to divide power and sovereignty between national and other levels of government in order to combat authoritarian or overly centralized government. They have other common normative concerns such as that of conflict management, protecting minority interests, achieving a balance between societal unity and diversity, and providing for the representation and protection of territorial interests.

With respect to the analytic differences between the two concepts, the term federalism continues to apply primarily to a polity that encompasses two territorial jurisdictions within a single nation-state, whereas the term multilevel governance is applied to all levels and units of governance, whether defined vertically or horizontally. In our 2008 paper we set out a grid to establish a substantive and/or analytical differences between federalism and multilevel governance. However, in retrospect, we find these distinctions increasingly hard to sustain, and overall, we suggest that there are more similarities than differences between the two concepts.

One of the most persuasive academic arguments in favour of extending the definition and application of federalism in today’s globalized world to encompass some of the strengths of the MLG analytical construct has been made recently by a leading specialist in international relations.
Gross Stein. She uses the term “networked federalism” rather than “multilevel governance” to describe what she refers to as a process that is located in a grid that is simultaneous horizontally and vertically, where movement is along many of the axes, not through a central hub. The institutions remain, but the patterns of movement among them and between them change. The important questions become those of the genesis of policy ideas, the creation of shared policy space, the opportunities for feedback and correction, and the resilience of transmission lines. (This concept) might better reflect federalism in a global age. (Stein, ‘Canada by Picasso, 2006, p. 18).

Stein recognizes that the concept of “networked federalism” is essentially equivalent to what others call multilevel governance. Although she does not explicitly draw on the recent MLG literature, she acknowledges its close kinship with her concept of “networked federalism.” She finds many of the same benefits in “networked federalism” as we have identified with the concept of MLG. These include capacity to capture movement away from command and control structures towards policy-making that is more “network-like”; as is the case with non-governmental organizations such as networks of environmentalists that push to hold governments and corporations accountable for their performance on environmental commitments (ibid. p. 41).

Our own argument in support of linking the concept of multilevel governance to federalism in the current globalized international context is a similar one, but has been framed in a somewhat different, more empirical and comparative form. We have tried to demonstrate the applicability of a multilevel governance framework for the understanding of contemporary internal intergovernmental relations in two older federations, Canada and the United States. We consider these two federations to be “prototypes” of mature parliamentary and presidential federations.

We have attempted to show the relevance of MLG for understanding the changing policy-making process of intergovernmental relations in these two countries in three policy areas: environmental policy, fiscal policy and health policy. We argue that the emergence of new modes of intergovernmental relations in these three policy areas as a result of globalization points to a need for the framing of new theoretical constructs and the offering of new insights drawn in particular from the concept of MLG. As we do not have enough space here to elaborate on this argument, we direct interested readers to our chapter in the Handbook on Multilevel Governance edited by Enderlein, Walti and Zürn, which is the work of Edward Elgar.

In short, a multilevel governance approach can bring several new conceptual tools to the study of intergovernmental relations in Canada and the United States, as well as to the study of federal systems in other parts of the world. Multilevel governance encourages a broader focus on the vertical and horizontal non-governmental and governmental policy-making structures at different levels and sectors of the intergovernmental process.

The concept of multilevel governance promotes greater emphasis on cooperative rather than competitive or conflictual aspects of intergovernmental relations. It draws attention to the incorporation into the complex web of intergovernmental decision-making of both public and private actors, and the need for this process to be more transparent and open. We acknowledge that the inclusion of private actors in processes of intergovernmental policy-making may fail to produce more cooperative governance in some policy-making contexts.

In considering the application of multilevel governance as a conceptual tool, increased focus on the local level of government is another area where traditional approaches to the study of intergovernmental relations can draw inspiration from a multilevel governance approach. Increasingly, studies of local governance in the political science literature make use of this understanding of local governance as an analytic tool.

We have recently extended our comparative analysis of intergovernmental relations in federal systems to seven other federations, including several countries in the developing world. They encompass three federations of the parliamentary type (Australia, Germany and India) and four of the presidential type (Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Nigeria). Our findings here diverge somewhat from those in our Canadian-American intergovernmental comparison.

We find that some common characteristics are manifested exclusively in the parliamentary federations that we have studied, and some commonalities are exhibited only in presidential federations. However it is the overlapping features of the emergent parliamentary and presidential federations that we consider to be most significant. Our overall conclusion is that a more nuanced understanding of these federations calls for the development of a more dynamic categorization, encompassing political cultural, historical and societal, as well as institutional features. This is an ongoing project of ours.

We have also compared in greater depth two emergent federations, Brazil and India. We explore whether the concept of multilevel governance could be incorporated into an analysis of changing patterns of intergovernmental relations in those countries. We speculate that Brazil, since it has a comparatively more multicentred and decentralized presidential federal system, is a petry in which an application of an MLG approach should prove to be particularly useful. Our work also highlights several policy areas in which a multilevel governance approach appears to be most analytically promising.

In conclusion, we find the interface between federalism and multilevel governance to be a fruitful area for future research. Dialogue between scholars of multilevel governance in the European context and students of comparative federalism globally can only serve to further clarify and solidify the links between the two concepts, and further enrich our understanding of intergovernmental processes.

Michael B. Stein
Michael B. Stein is currently Visiting Professor of Political Science at the University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada and Professor Emeritus at McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada. He is Chair of IPSA Research Committee 28 on Comparative Federalism and Federation, and co-editor of the IPSA Research Committee Book Series on The World of Political Science.

Lisa Turkewitsch
Lisa Turkewitsch is a PhD candidate in Political Science at the University of Toronto, Canada. She received her BA (Specialized Honours) in Political Science at Glendon College, York University, Canada in 2006, and her MA in Political Science at the University of Toronto in 2007.
Two Cheers for Majoritarianism

What view you take of majoritarianism depends in part on what view you take of the purposes of democratic politics. For some political scientists and many members of the political class, process legitimacy (maximising adherence to democratic norms) is what matters most. For others, the proper purpose of politics is contingent and unexpected. The coalition agreement was reached relatively quickly, certainly much more quickly than the parties, particularly if they have a strong geographical base. 

The British civil service is rightly famed for the ease and speed with which it handles a change of government. This time it was a little more difficult than usual. In previous elections the day after a general election, the outgoing government has handed over to the incoming one. The civil service has had about 50 minutes ahead of the official announcement by checking with a special assistant. What is on the agenda at the moment in Britain in terms of a prospective referendum is the alternative vote, which is usually behaved in a mature and responsible way in coalition negotiations. This cannot be said of some ‘flash’ parties as was experienced in New Zealand after the switch to proportional representation. In Britain the half million or so votes received by the popu.
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The coalition agreement was reached relatively quickly, certainly much more quickly than the parties, particularly if they have a strong geographical base. It could also be castigated as a “rainbow coalition” with Liberal Democrat activists tending to be to the left of centre. Much depends on what one wants from government and politics? Does one want a “zealocracy” with ministers and cabinet ministers taking part in the election. In the event it may have been White Southern England and concerned about immigration, who delivered the final blow to New Labour. All this shouldn’t be taken too seriously, but it does point to the extent to which the election campaign becomes focused on a narrow range of seats and their particular concerns. So is the case for proportional representation overwhelming? It is clearly strong, but creating more fairness in the electoral process may create unfairness elsewhere.
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As chance would have it, I was with mid-
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The UK - Beyond Majoritarianism?

Securing an effective government

The chief advantage of FPTP, according to its supporters, is that single-party rule produces strong government, and the coalition governments typical of a proportional system only weak ones. Any glance at the record of coalition governments in continental Europe will readily dismiss the second part of this proposition. Coming closer to home, the experience of Scotland and Wales shows that coalition government, or even a minority government as recently in Scotland, can be perfectly effective. And now we have the new Prime Minister, David Cameron, justifying his successful attempt to forge a coalition government on the grounds that it is the only one that can produce ‘strong and stable government’. As to the first part of the proposition, the British record of the past twenty years shows that single-party rule can produce ‘strong and stable government’. The executive does not need a majority in parliament to produce a ruthless whipping system (whereby party discipline is enforced) leaves parliamentarian oversight and scrutiny far too weak, and makes government all too prone to policy disasters: the poll tax under Thatcher, the rail privatisation under Major, and the Iraq war under Blair, to give only the most notable examples. In this context, for a ruling party to have to debate and convince a coalition partner or even an opposition could be seen to be a positive advantage, and make for more consideration, and hence effective, government. It is doubtful that a repeat of the 2005 election result, in which Labour won a decisive parliamentary majority with only 36 per cent of the popular vote, would be accepted again as legitimate, or carry public support for tough decisions.

Prospects for change

The creation of a coalition government between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats (‘Conrats’ or ‘Liberatives’ according to choice) has been described as a typical- ly British revolution, though it was the only sustainable administration that the parliamentary arithmetic would allow. The executive does not need a majority in parliament to produce a ruthless whipping system (whereby party discipline is enforced) leaves parliamentarian oversight and scrutiny far too weak, and makes government all too prone to policy disasters: the poll tax under Thatcher, the rail privatisation under Major, and the Iraq war under Blair, to give only the most notable examples. In this context, for a ruling party to have to debate and convince a coalition partner or even an opposition could be seen to be a positive advantage, and make for more consideration, and hence effective, government. It is doubtful that a repeat of the 2005 election result, in which Labour won a decisive parliamentary majority with only 36 per cent of the popular vote, would be accepted again as legitimate, or carry public support for tough decisions.
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New Bidding Process for IPSA World Congresses

Beginning in 2009, IPSA is asking cities interested in hosting the World Congress of Political Science to respond to a specially-prepared Request for Proposal (RFP) taking into account the requirements necessary for ensuring a successful event.

The deadline to submit bids for the 2015 World Congress of Political Science was December 1, 2009. We received bids from Istanbul, Montreal, Singapore and Taiwan.

Headed by Werner Patzelt, the selection committee took the time to review each bid in detail, and a shortlist of candidates (2) was produced in time for the spring Executive Committee (EC) meeting in Luxembourg. These cities were Istanbul and Montreal.

At the full EC meeting, the selection committee will present a new report to the Executive Committee, featuring the results of the two site visits. The EC will then vote on the final host city for the 2015 World Congress of Political Science.

The bidding process for the 2018 World Congress of Political Science will begin immediately following the next event in Madrid. Details are available through the IPSA Events and World Congress Coordinator.

A Tale of Two Cities for IPSA

Werner Patzelt, head of the Executive Committee’s selection committee, visited Istanbul and Montreal, the two cities shortlisted to host the 2015 IPSA World Congress of Political Science, in May and June, respectively. Accompanying him was IPSA Events and World Congress Coordinator, Isabel Brinck. See sidebar for more information on the bidding process.

May 26 to 28: Istanbul

The IPSA team, including Secretary General, Guy Lachapelle, was warmly received in the city that straddles two continents by Süle Kut, head of the Department of International Relations at Bilgi University and member of the IPSA Executive Committee; Gün Kut, associate professor at Bosphorus University; Gencer Öçcan, associate professor at Bilgi University; Dilek Gündog and Hülya Vahide Kaya, representatives of Inventive House, a local destination management company; and political scientists from other universities in Istanbul.

The Galata Tower and the Beyoğlu district

We were shown the principal hotels in the Taksim Plaza area, including the Hilton Istanbul – the longest operating Hilton outside of the Americas – the Lütfi Kirdar Convention Centre, and the Santral and Dolapdere campuses of Bilgi University. A beautiful dinner cruise on the Bosphorus afforded views of both the European and Asian sides of the strait, as well as a chance to mingle with the Turkish political science community, including the program chair of the Santiago World Congress, Ilter Turan. The visit culminated with a dinner in the company of Füsun Türkmen, associate professor at Galatasaray University.

All in all, we gained a glimpse into a welcoming, cosmopolitan city that is both intellectually and culturally vibrant.

Palais des congrès de Montréal (convention centre)

Werner Patzelt during a site inspection in a Montreal hotel

June 16 to 18: Montreal

Tourisme Montréal, represented by Marie-France Polidori and members of the bidding local committee, among them EC member Leslie Pal, extended a friendly’s welcome to Prof. Patzelt on June 16. Joining him for dinner were Stéphane Paquin, chair of the organizing committee and professor at Sherbrooke University, and committee members Leslie Pal (Carleton University), Stéphane Roussel (UQAM), former Canadian Political Science Association president Kim Richard Nossal (Queen’s University), and Catherine Côté (Sherbrooke University).

Sultan Ahmet Mosque (Blue Mosque) built in the 17th century

Prof. Patzelt was then treated to a tour of the city that included a thorough examination of the central Palais des Congrès (Montreal Convention Centre), together with a well-prepared audiovisual presentation showcasing the numerous features of this world-class venue. To capture the spirit of the city, he was also taken on a special walking tour of historic Old Montréal, with stops at various hotels and student residences in the vicinity of the convention centre to highlight the diversity of accommodations available. Capping off the visit to Montréal was a customized tour of the island city proved to be a delightful, friendly metropolis, one that knows how to mix business and pleasure à la Montréal.

The bidding process for the 2018 World Congress of Political Science will begin immediately following the next event in Madrid. Details are available through the IPSA Events and World Congress Coordinator.
Dear IPSA members,

We are proud to present the new IPSA website, We have been working hard for the past months to bring you a new, modernized version of the IPSA website. While keeping all the features you love, we have infused the IPSA website with a shot of vitality. The new features will bring more interaction between IPSA and its members. They are:

- A reconceptualised and easy to use homepage titled “Political Science News”. As opposed to the old homepage, this nicer looking screen will provide you with even more news about political science around the world.
- A personalised “My IPSA” profile for each IPSA member. With a personalized log in, you will be able to perform tasks only available to members such as:
  - Edit your biography, specialization, résumé, publications, etc.;
  - Post news, events, calls for papers, books, journal summaries, awards, and job, fellowship & internship offers that will appear on the “Political Science News” homepage;
  - Easy to use members’ directory;
  - Edit your privacy settings;
  - And much more.

Upcoming new features:

- Submit panels and papers, register and get information about IPSA events directly in your IPSA Profile;
- My IPSA profiles for research committees and institutional and collective members;
- Possibility to create/join groups related to specific subjects;
- A complete section to navigate past events;
- Manage your RC (exclusively for RC Chairs);
- An IPSA Store;
- A revamped Online Paper Room;
- And many more.

We hope you will enjoy the new site and the services it brings to the political science community.

IPSA New Website!

IPSA Stays at Concordia University: Renewal of the Agreement

On October 6th 2010, Concordia University and IPSA renewed their agreement extending their partnership for another 5 years (2011-2015 inclusive). Leonardo Morlino, IPSA President and Judith Woodsworth, President of Concordia University, exchanged and signed the agreement in the presence of Louise Dandurand (Vice-President, Concordia University), Guy Lachapelle (Secretary General, IPSA), Peter Stoett (Chair, Political Science, Concordia University) and Andrea Cestaro (Administrator, IPSA).

The IPSA Secretariat is located in Montreal since 2001. It all started in 2000, when IPSA organized with great success its XVIIIth World Congress of Political Science in Quebec City. One of the organizers of the event was Guy Lachapelle who became Secretary General of the association the same year. As the Secretariat normally followed the Secretary General to his country of residence, it came to be officially transferred from Dublin, Ireland to Montreal in January 2001. In October 2005, the IPSA Executive Committee decided to establish its Secretariat on a more permanent basis in Montreal with the support of Montreal International and Concordia University. Establishing the Secretariat in Montreal has contributed a great deal to the development of the association as it provided the institutional stability necessary for the diversification and increase of IPSA’s activities. The association is indebted to Concordia University for its continuous support and looks forward to a long and productive relationship.

Another element of the visit of Prof. Morlino to Montreal was a public lecture at the Political Science Department of Concordia University on October 7th. His lecture, based on aspects of his latest book (International Actors, Democratization and the Rule of Law: Anchoring Democracy?, London, Routledge 2008) and research generated great interest and lively participation from the attendants.

Eric Mathieu
IT Project Manager
Mathieu ST-LAURENT
External Relations & Membership Coordinator, Webmaster

From left to right Guy Lachapelle (Secretary General, IPSA), Leonardo Morlino, IPSA President, Judith Woodsworth, President of Concordia University, Louise Dandurand (Vice-President, Concordia University), Peter Stoett (Chair, Political Science, Concordia University)
IPS A at the APSA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC

For a third consecutive year, IPSA manned a booth at the American Political Science Association’s Annual Meeting. This year’s event was held in Washington, DC. From the well-positioned table, administrator Andrea Cestaro and Events & World Congress Coordinator Isabel Brinck extolled the benefits of IPSA membership and participation in research committees, as well as provided details on upcoming conferences. Membership brochures, Madrid 2012 flyers, and 60th Anniversary pins were handed out, as were popular copies of the International Political Science Review and Abstracts. Even the display copies of the History of IPSA and the Constitution were gone by the end of the exhibit! A popular new item at the booth this year was a newsletter promoting the upcoming activities of research committees and national associations. For a bilingual copy of the Madrid 2012 “Save the Date” flyer that was available at the stand, go to www.ipsa.org. Members are encouraged to download a copy and forward it to friends and colleagues.

Of course, those already familiar with IPSA are always welcome to stop by and say hello. This year, we greeted members past and present Richard Niemi, Joyce Gelb, Luciano Bardi, Marin Bull, Jane Bayes and Cynthia Massey, Maria, not to mention the program chair of the next world congress, Wyn Grant. For those who meant to come but never made it, your next opportunity will be at the International Studies Association meeting in Montreal from March 16 to 19, 2011. Look for the IPSA banners!

A highlight of this year’s APSA Annual Meeting was greeting Nobel Laureate Elinor Ostrom, seen here with Andrea Cestaro. Ostrom will serve as a plenary speaker at the 2012 IPSA World Congress of Political Science, to be held in Madrid.

In addition, a career day for young political scientists, particularly doctoral and post-doctoral students, will be offered as part of the conference, with an emphasis on fundamental questions such as how to publish a PhD thesis or a scientific article or how to pursue an academic career. Students will also have a chance to meet representatives of well-known publishers. The career day for young political scientists will be held in English.

Details on the conference and workshops are available at www.demlaendraertaquaguru.unibas.ch.

The application deadline is November 30, 2010.

The Three-Country Conference is open to participants from all disciplines. We look forward to seeing you there!

If you have any questions, please contact project assistant Myra Pouloschi-Treuner at myra.pouloschi-treuner@unibas.ch.

The Three-Country Conference titled “Political Integration” to be held in Basel, Switzerland in 2011

The conference will focus on processes of political integration, viewed in this context as both a challenge and an opportunity to build stronger societies. For a bi-national association of research committees, as well as provided details on upcoming conferences. Membership brochures, Madrid 2012 flyers, and 60th Anniversary pins were handed out, as were popular copies of the International Political Science Review and Abstracts. Even the display copies of the History of IPSA and the Constitution were gone by the end of the exhibit! A popular new item at the booth this year was a newsletter promoting the upcoming activities of research committees and national associations. For a bilingual copy of the Madrid 2012 “Save the Date” flyer that was available at the stand, go to www.ipsa.org. Members are encouraged to download a copy and forward it to friends and colleagues.
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The call for papers runs from October 1, 2010 to January 15, 2011.

Interested participants are asked to forward an abstract (one page max.) by email to any of the workshop leaders. Details on workshops and the NoPSA Congress are available at www.nopsa2011.abo.fi.

Workshops:
- Interesseorganisationer i nyt terræn
- Urban politik i et nordisk samhandhag
- Omsorgspolitikkens dynamisk: institutioner, interesser og spørsmål
- The Nordic: models in transition
- Politikens projektivering – temporære organisationer i oftest politikkforming
- Perspektiver på politisk kultur
- Mellem demokratisk konsolidering og hybridregimer
- Utvurdering i offentlig sektor
- Politisk kommunikasjon: antecedents, contents and effects of political information
- Parlamentet og regeringer
- Postkommunismens politikk: 20 år etter mures fall: teoretisk perspektiv og empiriske analysar?
- Religion og nationalisme: skärmingspunkter, konflikter og utmaningar
- Kommunalt selvstyre i Norden
- Sovereignty in the making: emerging forms of state formation and political authority
- Nordic migration states
- Nordisk populist: konvergensen eller divergens?
- Politics of history
- Parliamentarism
- Models of democracy: what are they and do they travel?
- Politics & expertise
- The politics of party leadership change: criteria for party leadership challanges and impacts on political outcomes
- Mängfald och integration i Norden
- Flerparti och utbildnings på velferdsstaten
- Deltagaremömkratik
- Social behavior and turnover
- Discourse and ideology: storytelling, images, and the space of conflicts
- Humanitarian politics

The politics of party leadership change: criteria for party leadership challenges and impacts on political outcomes

- The politics of party leadership change: criteria for party leadership challenges and impacts on political outcomes
- Mängfald och integration i Norden
- Flerparti och utbildnings på velferdsstaten
- Deltagaremömkratik
- Social behavior and turnover
- Discourse and ideology: storytelling, images, and the space of conflicts
- Humanitarian politics

- Political practices and institutional order in Russia
- Public policy, civil society and human rights in the context of political modernization
- Russia within the broader framework of global political trends
- The role of information technologies in modernization processes
- Research methods and modeling of political processes

Details are available at www.rasp.org and raps_conf@raps.org.
Representing a Global Community of Commit-ted Scholars: Introducing Ten IPSA RC Chairs (Part 1)

Rainer EISFELD
RC. Liaison Representative

A t its 18 World Congress in Munich (1970) some 40 years ago, IPSA decided to insti- tutionalize worldwide research activities in our disci- pline by establishing research committees. The sheer variety of research topics, a milestone in IPSA’s greatest ac- ceptance. In this issue and in the next, Participation pays tribute to their work by introducing ten scholars currently chairing some of our most vibrant RCs. An indispensable and spectrum of nationalities across several continents and themes explored and taught under the umbrella of political science, these portraits speak to IPSA’s global reach and to the sheer scope of our discipline.

Readers are sure to notice the conspicuous absence of two IPSA’s most prolific research committee chairs, Michael Stein (RC 28) and John Trent (RC 33). When it comes to political science, both are old hands – one a former RC representative (2000-2006), the other a former IPSA Secretary General (1976-1988) – whose photos have often appeared in these pages. Messrs. Stein and Trent are also co-editors of the World of Political Science series. The current issue of Participation therefore introduces Hal Colebatch, Australia (RC 32), Sharda Jain, India (RC 39), Jim Björkman, Netherlands (RC 25), Fred Lazin, Israel (RC 5) and Linda Cardinal, Canada (RC 50). The next issue will also feature five scholars serving as chair of our most active RCs.

Hal Colebatch – Chair of RC 32
hal@colebatch.com

Hal Colebatch has carried out research and taught in a number of countries in the Asia-Pacific region as well as in Africa and Europe. His focus is on the discourses and organizational structures of governance, and the manner in which concepts such as “policy” are woven into the fabric of governing. This abiding con- cern with the policy-making process is, by its very nature, cross-disci- plinary. This is reflected in the fact that Hal has served as co-chair of both RC34 (Government and Business) and most recently RC8 (Public Policy and Administration). He has published widely in a range of refereed journals and books. As well as written or edited 10 books. In 2007, he edited National health policies in South Asia. He has also been a visiting scholar in Sweden, France, China, the Czech Republic, Canada and the U.S. He is this year’s Abesbacher Visiting Professor at American University. He has authored over 60 scholarly articles and chapters in books, as well as written or edited 10 books. In 2007, he edited Local Government Reforms in Countries in Transition: A Global Perspectives. His lat- est book (2010) is titled Higher Education and Equality of Opportunity: Cross-National Perspectives.

Sharda Jain – Chair of RC 39
shardajain1992@hotmail.com

Sharda Jain, Associate Professor of Political Science at University of Delhi, has her credit a rich teach- ing experience spanning nearly four decades. A tire- less researcher and author of books, research papers, articles, and editor, Sharda Jain has been an active member of IPSA since 1997. The two-day joint regional conference of RCs 25 and 39 in Delhi in October 2007 – where some 16 quality presen- tations were given – was an eloquent testimony to her dedication to IPSA’s mission and to her passion for the discipline.
RC06 – Political Sociology

RC06 working groups:

Working group on religion and politics
Convenors: Piero Ignazi, University of Bologna (piero.ignazi@unibo.it) and Spencer Wellhofer, Denver University (spwellhofer@du.edu)

Working group on members and political party activists (MAPP)
Convenors: Wolfgang Rudig (w.rudig@strath.ac.uk) and Emilie van der Veer (e.vanderveer@rug.nl)

Working group on contentious politics & social movements
Dr. S. Seferiadis, Panteion University – Athens (ss161@cam.ac.uk, sef@rehn.gr)

Working group on political inequality (POLING): http://politicalinequality.wordpress.com

The working group on political inequality (POLING) is organized around the concept of political inequality as a distinct form of social stratification and a subfield of political sociology. Its purpose is to (a) publish research in first-rate social science journals as well as high-quality monographs on issues of political inequality; (b) encourage members and affiliated professionals to write funding proposals aimed at securing grants, fellowships and other awards related to political inequality; (c) stage conferences and workshops dedicated to presenting first-rate research on political inequality; (d) foster international collaboration between scholars interested in issues of political inequality; and (e) encourage official membership in ISA RC 18 and IPSA RC 06 among members of the scholarly community.

CPS presented the following panels at the 17th ISA World Congress in Gothenburg from July 11 to 17, 2010

Panel 1 Consequences of political inequality
Panel 2 Sacred and religious dimensions in contentious politics
Panel 3 Religion and politics: Institutional challenges
Panel 4 Measurement and causality
Panel 5 Party members and activists: The state of the art comparative perspectives
Panel 6 Party members and activists: The state of the art methodological challenges
Panel 7 Party members and activists: The state of the art party change
Panel 8 Party members and activists: The state of the art party elites
Panel 9 Individual class membership, political attitudes and behaviour
Panel 10 Social class, social structure and politics
Panel 11 Religion and politics (II)
Panel 12 Religion and politics (III)
Panel 13 Comparative class and religious voting
Panel 14 Church/state relationship and party strategy
Panel 15 Religion and politics (I)
Panel 16 Business meeting

RC 08 – Legislative Specialists

At the IPSA conference in Luxembourg last summer, committee member Werner Patez, working alongside Christopher Lord, convened a well attended panel exploring democratic representation and governance. The panel featured stimulating papers presented by Petra Guasti (Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic), Eric Mink (Free University Amsterdam), Johannes Pollak (Webster University Vienna), Dionysia Tamvaki and Christopher Lord (University of Oslo), and Richard Rose (University of Aberdeen).

Ongoing activities:
1) Irina Khmelko and Werner Patez are preparing a special issue of JEEAS (Journal of East Europeans and Asian Studies) outlining and explaining the development of legislative institutions some 20 years after the annus mirabilis in several Central and East European countries. Most of the contributors are from RCLS.
2) David Olson and Gabriela Ionzski are in the process of editing and reviewing chapters for a volume titled The Second Decade: Post-Communist Parliaments. The book will explore a range of parliamentary systems, from stable democratic parliaments to parliaments dominated by the executive branch. It is expected to be published in late 2011.
3) Irina Khmelko is preparing an RCLS panel for the Southern Political Science Association’s annual conference, which takes place in New Orleans in January 2011. RC 08 presented two highly successful panels at the SPSSA 2010 annual meeting in Atlanta (USA), also holding a business meeting. The committee plans to present three panels and a business meeting at IPSA’s 2011 meeting in New Orleans. The committee will review issues pertaining to the organization of the conference, which will see legislative scholars and practitioners take part in a discussion on modern legislatures. Examples of issues the committee is considering include representation, party development, electoral competition, legislative effectiveness, and legislative-executive relations.

Please join the committee in New Orleans in January 2011 or email your thoughts to Dr. Irina Khmelko at irina.khmelko@UTC.edu.

One-line emails saying “yes” to the idea of the conference are welcome, as are emails citing subjects you would like to see covered at the conference.

RC 09 – Comparative Judicial Studies - 2011 interim meeting

University of California-Irvine July 21 to 23, 2011

Paper and panel proposals for the 2011 meeting of the Research Committee on Comparative Judicial Studies are now being accepted. The meeting is open to all scholars interested in the comparative study of law and courts. The theme of the 2011 meeting is “The Judicialization of Politics from International and Comparative Perspectives.” Comparative literature on international law and courts has recently described the contours and different forms of judicialization in a variety of politics. The literature has also sought to explain the causes of judicialization in politics, including the dynamics behind court empowerment, the reasons for which people turn to courts to resolve disputes, and court involvement in the policy process.

Emerging out of this research stream is an examination of the possible consequences of judicialization. The RC09 panel and proposal ideas devoted to the following topics are especially welcome:

- The impact of judicialization on processes of design, debate, passage, and policy implementation
- The impact of judicialization on policy content, outcomes and effects
- Variation in the impact of judicialization on policy and the policy process over time and across borders
- Causes of variation in the impact of judicialization
- Judicialization of politics by other means.

Papers with an international dimension will be included in panels on the following subjects:

- The effects of judicialization on emerging international legal regimes
- Judicialization as a barrier to or source of international harmonization
- Judicial balancing and legal reasoning in comparative and international perspectives
- Comparative papers on courts are also welcome, including papers involving but not limited to the following topics:
  - Comparative conflict resolution in non-traditional settings
  - Courts and comparative elections
  - Law and religion in different cultural contexts
  - Comparative impact of judicial policy-making
  - The judicial role in emerging democracies and authoritarian states
  - Relationships and differences between constitutional courts and supreme courts
Comparative studies of sub-national courts
Constitutional courts in emerging democracies
The protection of rights in parliamentary systems and constitutional democracies

Please forward your 200-word abstracts by email to our conference co-convenors and hosts: Professors James Kelly (james.kelly@sun.ac.za) and Diana Kapszuki (d.kapszuki@rc10ipsa.org). The submission deadline is November 15, 2010.

The co-convenors expect to develop one edited volume on comparative law topics and a second on international law topics, based on the papers presented.

RC 10 – Electronic Democracy

Call for papers

Workshop on electronic direct democracy
June 2 to 4, 2011
Portorož, Slovenia

Innovative new participatory instruments move to more discernibly discourse-interactive procedures corresponding to models of deliberative politics and communitarian democracy. New information and communications technologies (ICTs) can play a vital role in these evolving public spaces. The Internet has given renewed impetus to a worldwide boom of direct democracy. What types of electronic direct democracy instruments are being developed? What criteria are used to evaluate these instruments? Where are these new ICTs implemented? Do innovations such as electronic town meetings, web forums, e-conferences and e-participatory budgeting enhance deliberation? What are the pros and cons of online political forums, and what does the future hold in this regard?

The workshop will be given as part of the Slovenian Political Science Conference.

The deadline for paper proposals and abstracts (200 words) is December 31, 2010.

Please contact:
Prof. Norbert Kersting, University of Steffenbosch, South Africa (norbert.kersting@ru.ac.za) or local organizers Prof. Miro Hlavaty, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia (Miro.hlavaty@ff.uni-lj.si) or Lea Smerklo (Lea.smerklo@ff.uni-lj.si).

For more on RC 10, please visit the new website at http://rc10.ipsa.org/

RC 11 – Science and Technology Policy

Nature prospects and opportunities

RC 11, one of the most senior IPSA research committees, is currently looking to increase its membership and activities with a focus on policy issues related to science and technology. The committee has contributed in various ways to the development of policy studies in science and technology. More recently, it has limited its activities to the presentation of panels at IPSA congresses. In Santiago, RC 11 sponsored two well attended sessions. The first dealt with the role of science and technology in sustainable development, while the second, co-sponsored by RC 46 on Global Environmental Change, examined the role of NGOs.

RC 11 recently held elections, and the following officers were nominated:
Chair: Joseph S. Szyldelowicz, University of Denver
Vice-Chair: Stephan Albrecht, University of Hamburg
Secretary: Sergio Emiliozzi, University of Buenos Aires
Treasurer: Pierre Delvenne, Université de Liége

We plan to broaden the scope of RC 11 activities with the objective of strengthening ties with political scientists in the international IPSA community – specifically those working on policy issues related to science and technology – as well as disseminating relevant information and promoting scholarly research on these important topics. New members are therefore welcome, as are suggestions on specific projects we might sponsor independently or in conjunction with other RCs or organizations. Projects may include workshops, symposia and joint conferences. Our vice-chair, Professor Stephan Albrecht of Hamburg University, has already offered to host a meeting at that institution, provided that funding can be arranged. We are also setting up a website to facilitate interaction.

This is an exciting time, as we have an opportunity to strengthen RC 11 and create a strong intellectual community within IPSA on issues related to science and technology. I therefore urge all IPSA members interested in this important and exciting field of study to contact me.

Joseph Szyldelowicz, Chair, jszyldelowicz@du.edu

RC 12 – Biology and Politics

RC 12 on Biology and Politics sponsored one panel at the 2010 American Political Science Association meeting in Washington, D.C. The committee will also present a panel at the meeting in San Francisco, California from September 1 to 4, 2011.

On June 4 and 5, members of RC 12 attended a conference on “Evolutionary Theory in Political Science” at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy. Dr. Sven Steunou served as its chief organizer.

Finally, the Association of Politics and the Life Sciences will hold a meeting at Indiana University (Bloomington, Indiana) on October 20, 2010. Nobel laureate Dr. Elazar Ostrom is slated to give the keynote speech. Several members of RC 12 are expected to attend.

RC 16 – Socio-Political Pluralism

Elective appointment

RC 16 on Socio-Political Pluralism held the elected position of executive board this summer. The following officers were elected:
Chair: Kyrzysztof Jasiewicz, Washington and Lee University (USA)
Vice-Chair: Raymond Hudon, Université Laval (Canada)
Secretary and Treasurer: Christian Leuprecht, Royal Military College of Canada
Board Members: Phillip G. Cerny, Rutgers University (USA); Marzouk Zawawi, Ryukoku University (Japan)

In conjunction with the election, a referendum on the abolishment of committee dues was held. Some 62% of voting members favoured their abolition, while 38% were against.

RC 16 plans to sponsor a panel on “The New Populism: A Threat to Pluralist Democracy or a Corrective Mechanism?” at the joint ECPR/IPSA conference titled “Whatever Happened to North–South?” The city of Sao Paulo plays host to the conference in February 2011.

RC 19 – Gender Politics and Policy

RC 19 has enjoyed a very productive year since the Santiago Congress. The book Fed-erализm, Feminism and Multilevel Governance was released by Ashgate in July. Edited by section president, former president Marion Sauer and section co-chair Jill Vickers, the book is the first to combine these three concepts. It covers countries in Eastern and Western Europe as well as in Asia, Africa and North America, and it is advertised on the IPSA website. Several chapters were written by RC 19 members, based in part on their Santiago presentations.

RC 19 membership is on the rise (a good thing!) and people active in other national and international associations continue to join – a fine example of scholarly networking.
RC 26 - Human Rights

Conference on “Human Rights, War and Peace after the Cold War”

RC 26, the Korean Association of International Studies and the Korea Foundation cordially invites you to submit proposals for a conference on “Human Rights, War, and Peace after the Cold War,” which will be held in Seoul, Korea from June 16 to 18, 2011.

Human rights and peace are two closely related concepts. In addition to their inclusion among the missions of the United Nations (UN), they appear to have a causal relationship. International or civil wars may be triggered by discrimination, abuse of human rights or attempts to assert the right to self-determination. Regardless of the cause, however, wars create conditions for the violation of human rights, from freedom of movement and expression to the right to food, shelter and life; more often than not, these violations have a far more profound impact on women. Inversely, they also give rise to refugee crises, with the internally displaced, increasingly, among the world’s most vulnerable people.

The solidarity rights articulated in the 1970s included the right to peace, and in 1984 the UN adopted “The Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace.” The end of the Cold War brought the promise of peace as well as a peace dividend and the expectation, on the part of many, that the new era of respect for social and economic rights would follow.

Sadly, though, rather than lead to a safer or more peaceful world, the end of the Cold War merely marked changes in the types of wars being fought. The number of internal armed conflicts and civil wars has surged, and, according to some estimates, there are twice as many internally displaced people today as there are international refugees. Just as worrisome is the fact that international conflicts and wars are no longer limited to those between states, but also extend to those pitting states against networks of armed international groups. In addition to casualties and violations stemming from the act of war, human rights groups are concerned that repressive politics that directly or indirectly support terrorism are now cited as a necessary tool in the “war on terror.”

For human rights scholars and practitioners alike, this three-day conference will provide a discussion forum on human rights issues related to peace and war in the post-Cold War era. Topics may include, but will not be limited to, the relationship between international humanitarian and human rights law, the effectiveness of efforts by global and regional human rights regimes to prevent or address human rights violations in war zones, the impact of recent UN resolutions (e.g., Security Council resolution no. 1325) and treaties, and the role and impact of the International Criminal Court, the role of international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the impact of new norms such as “the responsibility to protect” and “human security.” These issues can be explored at the theoretical level or in relation to specific conflicts and events via the diplomatic, judicial, and political conduits.

Papers on East Asian human rights issues are especially welcome. Regardless of their thematic focus, however, all papers are expected to address human rights as a central theme.

Given in English, this inter-disciplinary conference is open to all researchers interested in human rights.

Researchers are asked to submit a 250- to 300-word abstract of the paper they intend to present by October 15, 2010. Proposals for panels featuring three to four closely connected papers are welcome but should include both panel and paper abstracts. Abstracts should be submitted to each of the following members of the program committee:

- Professor Sukhee Han (sukhan@kumon.ac.kr)
- Professor Anja Milut (A.Mihr@uu.nl)
- Professor Füsun Türkmen (fturkmen@gsu.edu.tr)
- Professor Füssün Türkmen (fturkmen@gsu.edu.tr)

The organizing committee will notify applicants by January 15, 2011. To be included in the program, accepted papers should be submitted by May 1, 2011. Conference registration is open and free, though all participants are expected to defray their own expenses for travel, lodging, food and other accommodations. Pending funding from the IPSA Secretariat, a modest travel allowance may be provided to two or three paper presenters from low-income countries.

RC 27 - Structure and Organization of Government (SOG)

2010 conference on “Crises of Opportunity: State, Markets and Communities in Turbulent Times” – Hertie School of Governance – November 4 and 5

The next regular conference of IPSA Research Committee 27 on the Structure and Organization of Government (SOG) will be held on November 4 and 5 at the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin. Its theme is “Crisis as Opportunity: State, Markets and Communities in Turbulent Times.” The aftermath of the financial crisis has triggered a debate on the future of governance and the relationship between states, markets and civil societies, both across major transnational publics (e.g. the European Union) and within smaller state boundaries. The crisis is reshaping the relationship between states and markets in different ways, while also generating a debate on the future of governance and the relationship to society and the division of labour. Seven panels will be presented on a range of related issues: framing, managing and coping with the financial crisis, the state as regulator – new directions post-crisis; post-crisis regulatory regimes in health care and food safety; transnational standards of good governance; governance and civil society; the impact of the European Union on domestic governance; and pre- and post-crisis reforms in public administration.

Visit our website at http://www.sog.rc27.org/
Emerging out of these discussions were the following themes:

- Though the panel had been framed in relation to the tension between policy professionals and non-official activists, the research reported had much more to do with the policy activities of functional professionals – how “problem specialists” learn to operate in the world of governance.

- The modes of participation available include electoral participation, established modes of stakeholder consultation, and forms of civic involvement, with policy practitioners mobilizing these in various ways.

- Policy issues become professionalized, demanding specialised knowledge and acquaintances with procedures, and these impose specific demands on non-official participants; it was argued that “technologies of governing” such as transferring emission quotas and citizens’ juries take on a momentum of their own, sustained by “epistemic communities” of supporters.

- Engagement in policy issues shapes professional identity, and we were left with a picture of the way in which the management of a policy issue generated recognition on the part of the appropriate experts.

- These issues can become problematic in times of regime change, raising specific questions concerning how political science can contribute to the development of policy work in the context of regime reconstruction involving “transitional politics” in former Soviet states.

We found that we want to know more about how policy issues are questioned and pursued, about the relationship between official and experiential knowledge, and about the manner in which academic constructs are used in policy construction. We will continue to explore these questions at gatherings of researchers, teachers and practitioners in 2011.

A more comprehensive account of these discussions will be posted on the RC 32 website (under reconstruction) in the coming weeks. In the meantime, any questions may be forwarded to Hal Colebatch (chair) at h Colebatch@webmail.ed a.au.
Language occupies an important place in various state traditions. What role has language played in shaping these traditions? The development of the modern state, moreover, has also given rise to distinct language regimes. The French, British, Scandinavian and German traditions have each exercised an influence on language regimes since their development in the 19th century. But what about the world’s other regions? What are the characteristics of a language regime, and how does it come to pass? What context or conditions are needed to transform a language regime? What does the future hold for current language regimes? How does global English pose a challenge to national and minority languages? This meeting will address these questions. How has the analysis of language regimes evolved? How should we evaluate the state of languages in the contemporary world? Researchers are invited to present their work on these questions and are asked to forward their abstracts to the organizing committee (linda.cardinal@uottawa.ca) by February 1, 2011.
SAVE THE DATE:
JULY 8 TO 12, 2012

In a globalising world, everywhere power is being reconfigured, creating opportunities for change:

- New players are emerging on the world stage, reflected in G-20, the "BRIC" and in North-South relations.
- Climate change and the financial crisis have altered global dynamics.
- Transnational governance is taking on new forms, such as the reformed EU, ASEAN and Mercosur.
- Within states, there is increased devolution and the recognition of sub-identities.
- State functions are increasingly being shared with non-state actors such as corporations and non-governmental organisations and are affected by the dynamics of an international society.
- Substantial changes are taking place in social life including gender roles and the nature of the family.
- Religious cleavages refuse to disappear, and may be evolving into a major axis of political and social conflict.
- The Westphalian model of inter-state relations is not sufficient to cope with the challenges of global governance. This emphasises the importance of the dialogue between political science and international relations.

Territory and power no longer align. Boundaries and borders are shifting. Boundaries can be geographical, social, cultural, religious or economic. We need to understand how they are created and interpreted. Every boundary is an expression and exercise of power and this raises normative issues, particularly those relating to justice and the divisions between public and private and at the global level between North-South and South-South relations. The debate about the centrality of trust in social and political life has been reactivated.

How we frame these issues depends in part on our disciplinary assumptions and methodologies. We need to think again about how to conceptualise power, for example in terms of legitimacy, sovereignty or questions of global governance/locality. Boundaries within our discipline and with other disciplines are shifting. Space and scale are becoming increasingly important in the thinking of political science. What other tools or multi-method approaches do we need to respond to these changes? Political science can play an important role in informing the choices that come with the reshaping of power.

We invite you to share your research on the reshaping of power and shifting boundaries at the World Congress of the International Political Science Association, in Madrid 2012.

Submit your paper and panel proposals as of May 2011.

www.ipsa.org