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Marian SAWER
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Shifting Boundaries

In the run-up to our Madrid Congress next year, Participation has commissioned articles dealing with the reconfiguring of power in a globalized world. As we say in our statement of the Congress theme, every boundary is both an expression and exercise of power. Our authors show how boundaries have been shifting not only in the world but also in the discipline. While the study of power has always been central to political science, political scientists are now using broader conceptions of power to study phenomena such as the dynamics of globalization, the production of the gender order or language as the bearer of power relations.

In this issue Jorge Heine and Ramesh Thakur argue that the compression of time and space has yet to be matched by adequate forms of global governance to control its dark side. The spatial dynamics need to be understood if the collective action problems are to be solved. Raewyn Connell looks at how globalization reproduces gendered relations of power, whether within international relations, international political economy or transnational organizational cultures and how it generates feminist resistance in all parts of the world.

Moving to a more traditional subject for political scientists, Cas Mudde presents new perspectives on the populist parties of the radical right that have emerged in response to globalization. These include the relationship between the radical right and religion, and the redefining of the main ‘threat’ in terms of religion rather than ethnicity. Katharine Gelber looks at regulatory dilemmas posed by an increase in hate speech directed at Muslims and Middle-Eastern minorities around the world. The anonymity, accessibility and transnational character of the Internet make it a convenient platform for hate speech. Not only is the Internet notoriously difficult to regulate, minorities who feel targeted by anti-terrorism policies are less likely to utilise what regulation exists.

Our Participation authors provide a foretaste of the panels being organised around the Madrid Congress theme of ‘Reordering Power, Shifting Boundaries’. IPSA members are becoming familiar with our Congress logo, designed by Rajafetra Abraham of Madagascar. It combines the colours of the Spanish flag with a digital display evoking the global communications revolution. One of the articles in this issue of Participation is also presented in Spanish, courtesy of former IPSA Vice-President Jorge Heine. It signals the way IPSA is reaching out to its Spanish-speaking members who joined us for the Congress in Santiago de Chile and will be such an important part of our Madrid Congress.

Of course the Congress is not the only thing happening at IPSA. In this issue you will read about the successful conference organised together with the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR) at the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil. Under the leadership of Dirk Berg-Schlosser, IPSA is also conducting summer schools in social research methods in the global south. Two summer schools have now been held in Sao Paulo and one in Stellenbosch in South Africa.

There are a record number of new research committees — in the areas of Comparative Public Opinion (RC17), Elections, Citizens and Parties (RC23), Comparative Public Policy (RC30) and Quality of Democracy (RC34). The new Elections RC is chaired by Pippa Norris, co-winner of the Skytte Prize (see p. 8). It is being launched with a workshop on the Challenges of Electoral Integrity, immediately before the Madrid Congress. Indicative of the richness of offerings, it will clash with another workshop organised by IPSA’s three gender research committees: ‘In this together? Women’s movements and the politics of intersectionality.’

And that’s not all! IPSA has joined the social networking world with its Facebook page and Twitter account (www.facebook.com/ipsa.aisp and twitter.com/#!/ipsa_aisp) as has the IPSA Portal (www.facebook.com/ipsaportal and twitter.com/#!/IPSAtweets)! So we are now well and truly part of the digital revolution as well as analysing it. But please remember to get your abstracts/paper proposals in for the Congress next year so we can all meet again face-to-face.
Globalization refers both to the process and to the results or end-state. As a project, it refers to the vision of an idealized end-state and the initiation of particular processes in order to hasten the achievement of that end-state by those who embrace the vision. Thus, globalization is not a ‘natural’ process; rather, it is brought about by human beings for the achievement of certain specific aims. This is what makes the political dimension of globalization so critical and why political scientists and political sociologists have made such a significant contribution to its study. Among the first, the work of David Held, (see especially his co-authored book with Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (1999); among the latter, Manuel Castells deserves special mention. His trilogy on *The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture* (*The Rise of the Network Society, The Power of Identity, and End of Millennium*) has been described as having done for the Third Industrial Revolution (that triggered the current wave of globalization) what Karl Marx’s three volumes of *Das Kapital* did for the first, and not without reason. Few theorists have captured so well the underlying dynamics and significance of an age as Castells has with ours.

Globalization is not uncontrolled. The movement of people remains tightly restricted. The flow of capital is highly asymmetrical. The benefits and costs of
linking and delinking are unequally distributed. Industrialized countries are mutually interdependent; developing countries are largely independent in economic relations with one another; and developing countries are highly dependent on industrialized countries. Contrary to public perceptions, compared to the postwar period, the average rate of growth decelerated during the age of globalization: from 3.5 per cent per annum in the 1960s, to 2.1, 1.3 and 1.0 in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, respectively.

There is also a growing divergence in income levels between countries and peoples, with widening inequality among and within nations. Assets and incomes are more concentrated. Wage shares have fallen. Profit shares have risen. Capital mobility alongside labor immobility has reduced the bargaining power of organized labor. The rise in unemployment and the increase in informal sector employment has generated an excess supply of labor and depressed real wages in many countries.

In the developed countries, too, globalization has been blamed for the destruction of the manufacturing base and a ‘scam’ by corporations to exploit cheap labor. The widespread public anger against top financial and banking executives in 2009–10 was rooted in a powerful sense of unfairness at the stringent austerity measures imposed on workers and retirees while the senior executives continued to award themselves lavish bonuses. The result was that at the January 2010 World Economic Forum gathering in Davos – the very symbol and bastion of globalization – some of the most powerful delegates challenged the basic tenets of globalization.

Thus, globalization creates losers as well as winners. It entails risks as well as providing opportunities. The problems lie not in globalization per se, but, rather, in the words of an International Labor Organization (ILO) report, in the ‘deficiencies in its governance’. The deepening of poverty and inequality – prosperity for a few countries and people, marginalization and exclusion for many – has implications for social and political stability among as well as within states. The rapid growth of global markets has not seen a parallel development of social and economic institutions to ensure balanced, inclusive and sustainable growth. Labor rights have been less sedulously protected than capital and property rights, and global rules on trade and finance are inequitable. This has asymmetric effects on rich and poor countries.

Even before the global financial crisis (GFC), many developing countries were worried that globalization would impinge adversely on economic sovereignty, cultural integrity and social stability. ‘Interdependence’ among unequals translates into the dependence of some on international markets that function under the dominance of others. The GFC confirmed that absent effective regulatory institutions, markets, states and civil society can be overwhelmed by rampant transnational forces.

Globalization has brought many benefits. The proportion of people under the poverty line in the world has dropped considerably since 1980. This has been driven in part by the high rates of growth in Asia – especially, but not only, in the Asian giants, China and India. The rise of these and other emerging powers like Brazil, South Africa, Turkey and Indonesia, is not unrelated to the capacity of these nations to navigate the treacherous waters of an increasingly globalized economy. There are countless ways in which the internet and IT have facilitated access and made the life of peasants and poor people across the developing world easier and better.

There is, however, another side, what we have chosen to call the ‘dark side’ of globalization, that is, the negative forces unleashed as a result of the compression of time and space made possible by modern technology. The forces of globalization have also created the infrastructure of an uncivil society and accelerated the onslaught of transnational flows of terrorism, drug trafficking, organized crime and diseases like AIDS. By ‘uncivil society’ we refer to a wide range of disruptive and threatening elements that have emerged in the space between the individual and the state, and that lie outside effective state control. It merges into the ‘dark side of globalization’ as it becomes transnationalized. This is the subject of our book, The Dark Side of Globalization (2011). The growth of these transnational networks threatens state institutions and civil society in many countries.

What to do?
What can developing nations do to manage the challenges of globalization?

The outright rejection of globalization and a retreat into autarky is neither practical nor desirable: who wants to be the next Myanmar or North Korea? As one wag has put it, opposing globalization is like opposing the sun coming up every morning, and about as fruitful. Another extreme is the full embrace of globalization with all it entails, somewhat along the lines of what countries like Ecuador and El Salvador did at one point in the early 2000s by adopting the US dollar as their national currency and giving up a monetary policy of their own. This challenge is not limited to nations of the global South. Who wants to be the next Iceland, Greece or Ireland? The notion that endless liberalization, deregulation and relaxation of capital and border controls (except labor) will assure perpetual self-sustaining growth and prosperity has proven to be delusional. The three Baltic nations that embarked on this course (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania) – to which, for good measure, they added the flat tax – all had double-digit negative growth in 2009. This was followed in 2010 (and again in 2011) by the repeated debt crises of Greece that threatened the viability of the entire Eurozone.

Most observers would agree with the proposition that to cope effectively with the forces of globalization, developing nations need policies that are somewhere in between those two extremes. Lowering all barriers to the tides of the global economy may end up drowning much of local
In Africa, home to 36 of the world’s 50 least developed countries, state weakness often has opened the door to transnational crime and terrorism. Garth le Pere and Brendan Vickers highlight six pathologies that are particularly prevalent across national crime syndicates exploit government weaknesses to make huge profits. Illegal migration and money laundering rob the state of valuable human and material resources, in a region that desperately needs them.

A different kind of challenge is posed by insurgencies that thrive as a result of the inequalities created by globalization. One of the countries that has made the most of the opportunities offered by IT and telecommunications technology has been India, a world leader in IT-enabled services, and whose 5 per cent yearly growth in the eighties climbed to 6 per cent in the nineties and to 7 per cent in the 2000s. Yet, this prosperity has gone hand in hand with an ever greater gap between the prosperity of urban, middle-class Indians and the squalor still seen in many of its 600,000 villages where most Indians still live. It is this ‘development dichotomy’ that has allowed the Naxalite movement, originally founded in West Bengal in the late 1960s, not only to persist in much of northern and central India, but to grow as it propounds its oddly out-of-date Maoist ideology, a belief system left behind even by the People’s Republic of China, where it originated. Uprooted from ancestral lands and unable to adapt to the demands of a modern economy, aboriginal populations (adivasis) often see revolutionary redemption as the only way out of their predicament. The Indian Maoist insurgency also has parallels in neighboring countries, especially Nepal.

Sri Lanka’s Tamil Tigers, on the other hand, may well have been one of the most globalized terrorist movements anywhere. Part of the reason for their considerable, if ultimately transient, success was the effective way they relied on the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora both to obtain resources and to marshal political support for their cause.

It remains to be seen whether the GFC has brought to an end globalization as we have known it for three decades. But there is little doubt that the ‘dark side’ of globalization is here to stay.

**Human trafficking is among the darkest sides of globalization, turning human beings into commodities bought and sold in the international market place.**

The growth in transnational flows has not been matched by an equivalent growth in global governance mechanisms to cope with them and with what they entail. In addition to the challenge posed by globalization to individual states, there is a ‘collective action’ problem. No single state can hope to deal successfully with global warming or with international crime syndicates. And yet the very nature of the structure of globalized networks, which intertwine global actors and interests, ensures that no single power is able to maintain its position within this newly emerging global disorder without making compromises with other global players.

In Africa, home to 36 of the world’s 50 least developed countries, state weakness often has opened the door to transnational crime and terrorism. Garth le Pere and Brendan Vickers highlight six pathologies that are particularly prevalent across national crime syndicates exploit government weaknesses to make huge profits. Illegal migration and money laundering rob the state of valuable human and material resources, in a region that desperately needs them.

A different kind of challenge is posed by insurgencies that thrive as a result of the inequalities created by globalization. One of the countries that has made the most of the opportunities offered by IT and telecommunications technology has been India, a world leader in IT-enabled services, and whose 5 per cent yearly growth in the eighties climbed to 6 per cent in the nineties and to 7 per cent in the 2000s. Yet, this prosperity has gone hand in hand with an ever greater gap between the prosperity of urban, middle-class Indians and the squalor still seen in many of its 600,000 villages where most Indians still live. It is this ‘development dichotomy’ that has allowed the Naxalite movement, originally founded in West Bengal in the late 1960s, not only to persist in much of northern and central India, but to grow as it propounds its oddly out-of-date Maoist ideology, a belief system left behind even by the People’s Republic of China, where it originated. Uprooted from ancestral lands and unable to adapt to the demands of a modern economy, aboriginal populations (adivasis) often see revolutionary redemption as the only way out of their predicament. The Indian Maoist insurgency also has parallels in neighboring countries, especially Nepal.

Sri Lanka’s Tamil Tigers, on the other hand, may well have been one of the most globalized terrorist movements anywhere. Part of the reason for their considerable, if ultimately transient, success was the effective way they relied on the Sri Lankan Tamil diaspora both to obtain resources and to marshal political support for their cause.

It remains to be seen whether the GFC has brought to an end globalization as we have known it for three decades. But there is little doubt that the ‘dark side’ of globalization is here to stay.
El lado oscuro de la globalización

Aunque aún no hemos llegado al ‘fin de la historia’, nos hemos acercado al ‘fin de la geografía’. El costo real, efectivo de un llamado telefónico de Nueva Delhi a Denver no es distinto al de uno de Nueva Delhi a Mumbai. La compresión del tiempo y el espacio golpeada por la Tercera Revolución Industrial - grosso modo, desde 1980, cuando el primer computador personal llegó al mercado y el primer canal de noticias de 24 horas, CNN, irrumpió - ha alterado nuestra relación con el mundo. Para algunos, la globalización - el creciente intercambio transfronterizo de bienes, servicios, capital, tecnología, ideas, información, sistemas legales y personas - es tan deseable como irreversible, habiendo impulsado la prosperidad a lo largo y lo ancho del mundo. Para otros, no es sino una expresión del imperialismo corporativo que saquea y se beneficia del consumismo rampante.

Desde un punto de vista, la globalización existe desde las primeras expediciones comerciales (como la Ruta de la Seda). El comercio internacional, como proporción del producto mundial, era más o menos el mismo en los ochenta, que en las últimas dos décadas del patrón oro (1890-1913). El proceso como tal, entonces, no es particularmente nuevo. Sin embargo, la actual era de la globalización es sui generis, dada la rapidez de su difusión y la intensidad de las interacciones en tiempo real que gatilla.

La dimensión fundamental de la globalización es la de la expansión de actividades económicas transfronterizas. Ello ha causado una creciente interdependencia por medio del cada vez mayor volumen y variedad de flujos internacionales en material de finanzas, inversiones, bienes y servicios y de la rápida difusión de tecnología. A ello cabe añadir el flujo internacional de ideas, información, sistemas legales, organizaciones y personas, así como los intercambios culturales.

La globalización se refiere tanto al proceso en cuestión como al resultado final del mismo. Como proyecto, se refiere a la visión de una condición final idealizada y a la iniciación de procesos específicos destinados a acelerar el llegar a esa meta por los partidarios de ella. En esos términos, la globalización no es un proceso ‘natural’. Es algo llevado a cabo por los seres humanos para lograr ciertos objetivos específicos. Es por ello que su análisis requiere captar su dimensión política, razón por la cual algunos de sus estudios más penetrantes han sido llevados a cabo por politólogos y sociólogos políticos. Entre los primeros destaca la obra de David Held, particularmente su libro con Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt y Jonathan Perraton, Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture (1999). Entre los segundos, está nada menos que el ‘padre’ de la noción de ‘sociedad red’, Manuel Castells. Su trilogía La era de la información: economía, sociedad y cultura (El surgimiento de la sociedad red, El poder de la identidad y Fin de Milenio, Siglo XXI) ha sido comparado con los tres tomos de El capital de Karl Marx, en el sentido de haber provisto para la Tercera Revolución Industrial (que gatilló la presente era de la globalización) lo que Marx hizo para la primera. Pocos autores han logrado captar con tanta precisión la dinámica y el sentido de una era como lo ha hecho Castells con la nuestra.

La globalización no es descontrolada. El movimiento de personas está restringido. Los flujos de capital son asimétricos. Los beneficios y costos de sobrellevar los lazos internacionales existentes están distribuidos desigualmente. Los países industrializados son interdependientes; los - en vías de desarrollo tienen pocos vínculos económicos entre sí; estos últimos son altamente dependientes de los industrializados. Brasil, China e India han comenzando a cambiar esa ecuación. Sin embargo, en contra de la percepción pública, en comparación con el período de post-guerra, la tasa de crecimiento anual cayó durante la así llamada era de la globalización, de un 3.5 por ciento al año en los sesenta, a un 2.1, 1.3 y 1.0 en los setenta, ochenta y noventa, respectivamente.

Hay también una creciente divergencia en niveles de ingreso entre países y pueblos, con una cada vez mayor desigualdad entre y al interior de los países. La propiedad de activos e ingresos está más concentrada. La proporción de las rentas del trabajo en la producción total de finanzas, inversiones, bienes y servicios ha caído. La de las ganancias del capital ha subido. La movilidad del capital, junto a la inamovilidad del trabajo, ha reducido el poder negociador de los sindicatos.

En los países desarrollados, la globalización también ha sido acusada de haber socavado la base industrial de las economías y de constituir un truco empresarial para explotar mano de obra barata. El resentimiento generalizado del público en contra de los ejecutivos bancarios y financieros en el 2009 y 2010 estaba basado en la sensación de injusticia ante las medidas de austeridad y ajuste impuestas a los trabajadores y jubilados mientras los altos ejecutivos se seguían asignando a sí mismos elevados bonos. El resultado fue que en la reunión del Foro Económico Mundial en Davos en Enero de 2010 - verdadero símbolo y emblema de la globalización - algunos de los delegados más prominentes cuestionaron los principios fundamentales de la globalización.

La creciente pobreza y desigualdad - prosperidad para unos pocos, marginalización y exclusión para los más - tiene implicaciones para la estabilidad política y social entre y al interior de las naciones. El rápido crecimiento de los mercados globales no ha visto el crecimiento paralelo de instituciones económicas y sociales que aseguren un crecimiento equilibrado, inclu-
yente y sostenible. Los derechos del traba-
jo han sido menos protegidos que los del
capital, y las reglas globales sobre comer-
cio y finanzas son poco equitativas. Esto
tiene efectos asimétricos sobre los países
ricos y los pobres.

Así, la globalización crea ganadores y
perdedores. Implica riesgos y ofrece oportu-
nidades. El problema no radica en la
globalización en sí, sino que, en palabras de
un informe de la Organización Interna-
cional del Trabajo (OIT), en las ‘defi-
cencias en su gober-
nanza’. Aun antes de
la crisis financiera
global (CFG), mu-
chos países en vías
de desarrollo esta-
ban preocupados por
los efectos de la
globalización en su
soberanía económi-
cia, integridad cultu-
ral y estabilidad social. La ‘interdependen-
cia’ entre países desiguales se traduce en la
dependencia de algunos de mercados inter-
nacionales que operan bajo el dominio de
otros. La CFG confirmó que, ante la ausen-
cia de instituciones reguladoras efectivas,
tanto los mercados como los estados y la
propia sociedad civil, pueden ser pasados a
llevar por fuerzas transnacionales.

La globalización no ha dejado de traer
muchos beneficios. La proporción de per-
sonas bajo la línea de pobreza ha caído
considerablemente desde 1980. Esto se
debe en parte a las altas tasas de crecimien-
to en Asia, especialmente, pero no solo en
los ‘gigantes asiáticos’. China e India. El
surgecimiento de esta y otras potencias como
Brasil, Sudáfrica, Turquía e Indonesia, no
está desvinculado de la capacidad de estos
países de navegar exitosamente por las agi-
tadas aguas de una crecientemente globali-
izada economía mundial. Hay numerosas
maneras en que el internet y las Tecnol-
ogías de la Información (TI) han facilita-
do el acceso al mercado y han mejorado las
condiciones de vida de campesinos y sec-
tores de bajos ingresos a lo largo y lo
ano del Sur global.

Sin embargo, hay también otro lado de este
proceso, que nosotros hemos llamado ‘el
lado oscuro’ de la globalización. Este se
refiere al de las fuerzas perniciosas desa-
tadas como resultado de la compresión del
tiempo y el espacio facilitada por la tec-
nología. Como resultado de ello hemos visto
el incremento del terrorismo interna-
cional, así como del crimen organizado y
de epidemias como el SIDA. Ellos son
parte de numerosas actividades que han
surgido en el espacio entre el individuo y el
estado y que escapan al control de este últi-
mo. Al transnacionalizarse, ellas se con-
vierten en ‘el lado oscuro de la globali-
zación’. Este es el tema de nuestro libro:
El lado oscuro de la globalización (2011).

El crecimiento de estas redes transna-
cionales constituye una amenaza tanto para
el estado como para la sociedad civil en
muchos países.

El encontrar ese difícil punto de equilibrio
entre apertura y regulación requiere una
sana dosis de vigilancia sobre la criminali-
dad transfronteriza que florece en los inter-
sticios de lo nacio-nal y lo internacional.
El comercio ilegal, que llega a un diez por
cento del producto mundial según algunos
estimados, podría estar creciendo a un
ritmo siete veces superior al del comercio
legal.

El crecimiento de flujos transnacionales no
ha sido equipara-
do por un c rece-
imien
to equivalente
de los mecanismos
de gobernanza
global necesarios
para regularlos y monitorearlos.

¿Cómo deben los países en desarrollo
enfrentar la globalización?

El rechazo de plano a ella y el aspirar a una
especie de autarquía no es viable ni
deseable. ¿A quién le gustaría pasar a ser
Myanmar o Corea del Norte? Como
alguien ha señalado, el oponerse a la gob-
ralización es equivalente a oponerse que el
al sol salga por las mañanas e igual de fruc-
tífero. Por otra parte, sin embargo, ¿quién
quiere pasar a ser la próxima Islandia,
Grecia o Irlanda? La noción de que la lib-
eralización, desregulación y relajación de
todos los controles a la libre circulación
del capital y todo lo demás (excepto el tra-
bajo), constituye una panacea para asegu-
rar el progreso y la prosperidad ha demo-
strado ser una quimera. Los tres países-
bálticos que siguieron esa ruta (Estonia,
Latvia y Lituania) - a la cual añadieron,
paro no ser menos, el impuesto plano
-tuvieron todos crecimiento negativo de dos
dígitos en el 2009.

Para los países en desarrollo, el eliminar
todas las barreras a las mareas de la glob-
alización puede terminar ahogando gran
gente de la producción local. A su vez, el
establecer barreras demasiado elevadas
can ser contraproducente, sino inútil.
Países que son capaces de encontrar una
solución intermedia, como Chile y Singa-
pur, prosperan y aprovechan al máximo las
ormas oportunidades que ofrece una
economía mundial en expansión. Aquellos
que no lo hacen, y no logran forjar una
inscripción internacional adecuada, como
muchos de África Central y Occidental,
son marginados y dejados atrás.

El crecimiento de flujos transnacionales no
ha sido equiparado por un crecimiento
equivalente de los mecanismos de
gobernanza global necesarios para regularlos y monitorearlos.

En África, donde están 36 de los 50 países
menos desarrollados, la existencia de esta-
do díbles y frágiles ha abierto las puertas
al crimen transnacional y al terrorismo.
En nuestro libro, Garth Le Pere y Brendan
Vickers subrayan seis patologías prevalen-
ciales en el continente: la explotación
ilegal de recursos naturales, terrorismo,
tráfico de drogas, personas y de armas, y
lavado de dinero. De acuerdo a algunos,
Guinea Bissau ya ha pasado a ser el primer
narco-estado. Una respuesta a las brechas
de soberanía global que han posibilitado
estas actividades ilegales han sido mecani-
smos de gobernanza regional. La transfe-
rcencia de funciones estatales a expresiones
supranacionales de gobernanza global
podría reforzar la capacidad de los estados
para combatir estas patologías. El compar-
tir información, conocimiento, institu-
ciones, herramientas de política, personal
y otros recursos, puede ayudar a detener esta
verdadera marea de actividades no
deseables.

El tráfico de personas es uno de los lados
más oscuros de la globalización. El mismo
transforma a seres humanos en bienes
transables. Las mujeres y los niños son los
más vulnerables. ONGs de todos los conti-
entes están dedicadas a combatir esta
funesta actividad y a denunciar a los
involucrados en ella.
En África Austral han surgido sofisticadas organizaciones dedicadas al crimen transnacional organizado. El tráfico internacional de drogas, recursos mineros, marfil, y de productos falsificados y robados, está floreciendo. Carteles del crimen organizado explotan las debilidades de los gobiernos y hacen enormes ganancias. La emigración ilegal y el lavado de dinero le resta a la región valiosos recursos, precisamente en momentos en que más los necesita.

Un desafío distinto es el planteado por las insurgencias y levantamientos que se producen debido a las desigualdades creadas por la globalización. Uno de los países que ha aprovechado al máximo las oportunidades creadas por las TI ha sido India, país líder en servicios telemáticos, y cuya tasa de crecimiento de un 5 por ciento anual en los ochenta subió a un 6 por ciento en los noventa y a un 7 por ciento en los 2000. Sin embargo esta prosperidad ha ido de la mano con una creciente brecha entre la India urbana y la rural. Estas ‘dico
tomías del desarrollo’ explican el porque en India el enorme progreso que se ha dado a nivel nacional ha ido de la mano con una brecha aun mayor entre la prosperidad de los sectores medios urbanos y la enorme pobreza que aun se ve en las 600,000 aldeas donde vive la mayoría de la pobla
ción. Arrancados por la fuerza de sus tierras ancestrales e incapaces de adaptarse a las exigencias de la economía moderna, la población de aborígenes (adivasis), a veces ven la revolución y la lucha armada como única alternativa a un presente desesperanzador y frustrante.

Por otra parte, en Sri Lanka los Tigres Tamiles, fueron tal vez uno de los movimientos terroristas más globalizados que se hayan visto. Parte de la razón de su éxito inicial y por la cual lograron mantenerse combatiendo una guerra civil durante un cuarto de siglo (entre 1983 y el 2009) se debió a su efectividad en apoyarse en la diáspora tamil a lo largo y lo ancho del mundo, tanto para obtener recursos materiales como para apoyo político internacional.

El verdadero impacto de la Gran Recesión sobre el proceso de globalización, tal y como lo hemos conocido por los últimos treinta años, está por verse. Sin embargo, poca duda cabe que el ‘lado oscuro’ de la globalización ha llegado para quedarse.


---

**Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart Win the 2011 Johan Skytte Prize**

The 2011 Johan Skytte Prize has been awarded to Ronald Inglehart (University of Michigan) and Pippa Norris (Harvard University) in recognition of their innovative ideas on the relevance and roots of political culture in a global context. The Johan Skytte Prize is among the most prestigious prizes in the political science field, with a cash award of SEK 500,000.

The 2011 Johan Skytte Prize for political science is awarded to two researchers who worked closely together to systematically investigate and highlight the importance of human values and value change for political behaviour and societal life. Ronald Inglehart, a professor in sociology at the University of Michigan, and British-born Pippa Norris, a professor of political science at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University and now at the University of Sydney, will share the prize for “contributing innovative ideas about the relevance and roots of political culture in a global context, transcending previous mainstream approaches of research.”

In three co-authored books and numerous articles, Inglehart and Norris use sophisticated analyses and global material (including a majority of the world’s population) to show that civic values, beliefs and attitudes hold the key to continuity and fluctuations in political participation, and they also determine how and why issues become prioritized. The importance of religion today has been in focus of much of their joint work, together with gender equality and the role played by global media and information technology in converging and polarizing values. The process of value formation and change is intimately linked to structural factors such as the shift from industrial to post-industrial production and rests on feelings of existential security, which in turn are affected by greater equality of well-being.

In their research, Norris and Inglehart are known to weave together their respective theories (and sometimes those of others) and analyses using uniquely rich and subtle material that allows for systematic empirical testing and development – but also refutation. Their focus, consequently, is on citizens and their indirect interplay with elites as well as political and societal institutions.

Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris accepted the prize at a ceremony held in Uppsala on September 24, 2011.
Gender, Power and Global Society

Raewyn CONNELL
Professor at the University of Sydney

In the last two decades there has been a wave of murders of women in the city of Juarez, on the northern border of Mexico; so intense that Mexican activists speak of feminicidio, ‘femicide’. Juarez is one of the sites of large-scale foreign investment creating maquiladoras, light-industry factories producing goods for export, especially into the huge and wealthy US market just to the north. Women are preferred for this workforce; given rural unemployment elsewhere, internal migrants, often indigenous, have flooded into Juarez. With upheaval in customary gender relations, poor social services, poor transport, little policing, corrupt government, and on top of all, an increasingly violent and hypermasculine drug trade, a situation was created that has led to appalling levels of violence against women – and almost total impunity for the men who have been killing them.

This is one example - a particularly dire one - of an issue that has attracted increasing interest from social scientists, the impact of “globalization” on the lives of women. There is now research from many parts of the developing world about the impact of economic change produced by the new strategies of global capitalism. The maquiladoras of Mexico can be matched elsewhere, for instance in the clothing factories of the ‘south China economic miracle’, and the micro-processor assembly plants of south-east Asia.

It is not only factory work that has changed. The export agriculture of Chile, expanded by neoliberalism’s ‘comparative advantage’ strategy, drew rural women into paid labour for the first time. Domestic labour too has become an export industry. Filipina and Indonesian women have become breadwinners for their families as maids, housekeepers, childcare and eldercare workers in south-east and east Asia and the Gulf states. Their remittances are now an important part of economic strategy for the home country.

Though women are often preferred as workers in global industry because they are supposed more easily controlled than men (quite apart from stereotypes about ‘nimble fingers’ and women’s ability to put up with boredom), active resistance and political struggle does arise in these circumstances. There are attempts at unionization, supported by international union confederations, addressing issues such as poor health and safety conditions as well as wages. There are local movements concerned with bullying, rape, child care problems, and other aspects of gender politics in the new workplaces.

‘Gender and globalization’ has also become, in a backhanded way, an issue in neo-conservative politics and international relations. A narrative has been created in which globalization is equated with modernization, and a key test of modernization interventions. The invasions are accompanied by rhetoric constructing an image of strong, protective masculinity for the political leaders. The irony of men from different patriarchal regimes killing each other in the name of women’s rights is almost unbearable.

How do we understand these events? Commonsense understandings usually picture gender as a biological dichotomy resulting in natural differences of psychology and behaviour between women and men. This is little help in understanding politics; and it is also factually wrong. A very large body of empirical research in psychology shows that there are few differences in measurable traits between men as a group and women as a group (or between girls and boys). Differences in bodies there certainly are, and major differences in behaviour can be found, such as different rates of involvement in severe violence. But the differences in conduct have more to do with the different situations that men and women are placed in (such as being members of armed forces) than with natural differences of character.

These problems have been greatly clarified in the last few decades, as it has come to be understood that gender is a social structure as well as a feature of personal life. Gender can be seen, in a first approximation, as the way a society organizes conduct, interactions and institutions in relation to human reproduction. Gender patterns change historically, and change in major ways. The steering of those changes is inherently a political process.

There are alternative models of gender as a social structure, but all of the influential ones agree in seeing social power as a major dimension of gender relations. They also agree in seeing power as woven through a complex terrain of institutions and cultural processes. Gender is in no sense segregated from other aspects of social life. Every phenomenon studied in political science, from international relations to electoral processes and bureaucracy, has gender aspects. This was not highly visible when cabinets, armies and managements were all men. But of course an all-masculine institution is...
highly gendered, and that becomes visible when the first woman walks in the door.

It is now a cliche that the institutional world of government, business and media is a scene of ‘globalization’. The term was popularized in business journalism in the 1980s, to describe the strategies of what were then called ‘multinational corporations’ – global sourcing, global financing, and global marketing. In the 1990s the term became popular in social science, to describe what was usually seen as a novel and rapid world-wide homogenization of culture. This was usually explained as a spread of ‘Western’ modernity across the globe and a blending of elements from here and there – Thai food in Sydney, English suits in China, CNN broadcasts in Africa, etc.

Most accounts of globalization (though not all) played down the continuities with the earlier history of European and North American imperialism. Strangely the main centres of globalized culture happened to be the old imperial powers, and the old inequalities of wealth persisted. With them, came gender patterns. Historical research in the last thirty years has shown abundantly that imperial expansion was a strongly gendered process, and the colonial societies created in its wake were also markedly gendered.

The ruling groups of North Atlantic empires, for instance, were almost entirely men. Particular patterns of power-oriented masculinity developed to sustain imperial rule, and colonial versions of femininity to sustain and reproduce the colonizers. Local gender orders in colonized regions were often radically re-structured, under missionary pressure or for economic exploitation. The workforces of plantation economies with slave or indentured labour, and colonial mines, were gender-divided. Domestic labour for the colonizers’ households was also supplied by a gendered workforce. Modern race divisions, a distinctive feature of the history of imperialism, were produced in close interaction (not just intersection) with gender arrangements.

Resistance to colonialism, too, took gendered shapes. Nationalist movements often relied on mobilizing women, but were led by men; and post-colonial regimes often took the form of a re-invigorated patriarchy. This essay is being written in February 2011, at a time of multiple risings against neo-colonial dictatorships across the Arab-speaking world. Every one of the regimes being rejected by these movements is patriarchal, dominated by men and, with very few exceptions, excluding women from both cultural authority and access to power.

The gendered character of the contemporary world economy and political system, then, is not accidental. It grows out of a long history of gendered power relations, embedded in the institutional structures of imperial and post-colonial societies. It also grows out of a history of struggle, because none of these arrangements have been instituted without conflict.

It is important to recognize that the gender arrangements on a world scale are constantly changing. Economic and political dynamics of transnational institutions, the struggles over gender arrangements, are constantly producing new outcomes, in a continuing historical process. These include new institutions. ‘Globalization’ is not just a matter of cultural change. The last half-century has seen an acceleration of institution-building that goes beyond national boundaries as much as the old imperialisms did. Among key contemporary institutions are:

- transnational corporations, large-scale organizations with multinational reach which are the major players in the world economy and now rival all but the biggest governments in importance in international affairs;
- worldwide markets, including capital markets, commodity markets, and to a lesser extent labour markets, that are capable of putting tremendous pressure on local political systems via currency, credit and investment strategies;
- transnational communication systems, including the linked telephone and computer systems underlying the Internet; also including the bulk transport systems involved in international trade that permit the neoliberal ‘comparative advantage’ strategy;
- a conflict-ridden but increasingly important international state, including the linked military and intelligence systems of major powers (linked for instance in the ‘war on terror’), and including the intergovernmental United Nations system.

These are familiar. Less familiar is the fact that all of them are strongly gendered. Transnational corporations, to take just the one instance, have managements that are overwhelmingly men, operating within masculinized organizational cultures. But they employ very large numbers of women, in other gendered roles – for instance as clerical workers, factory operatives, sales personnel and so forth. And they employ large numbers of men in strongly gendered positions too, including oil and transport workers, guards and private police, technicians and tradesmen. For all the rhetoric about ‘equal opportunity’ and gender equality, gender divisions of labour on a micro scale persist with great strength in both private and public sectors.

Gender arrangements in contemporary global society, thus, are by no means just a hangover of ‘tradition’. Gender arrangements are actively produced, in new arenas, as new institutional patterns come into existence. The computer industry, for instance, is notoriously gender-unequal, a fact of importance given its centrality to contemporary economies. But it hardly existed sixty years ago. A whole gender regime on a planetary scale has been brought into existence, in two generations.

Research on gender in global institutions has been increasing, though it is still very uneven. One body of work has looked at the construction of gender in globalized mass media; tracing, for instance, the increasingly pornographic sexism of commercial television (think Berlusconi) and, in a different style, the Internet. Another body of work has looked at gender divisions of labour, in sites of international investment like the maquiladoras, in cross-national labour migration, and in international organizations like United Nations...
agencies. A third has looked at the gender composition and gender dynamics of international interventions, such as peacekeeping forces.

There is still only a little research that looks at one of the key issues, the gender patterns at the elite levels of transnational institutions. Top power-holders are, of course, hard to research directly. But their lives and work leave public traces (decisions, media appearances, memoirs) which can be studied. Researchers have begun to use these traces, and studies of people a little lower in hierarchies of power and wealth, to develop understandings of the gender patterns in the heavily-masculinized elite levels of global power.

For instance, interviews can more easily be obtained with managers at the level from which future top corporate leadership will be drawn. This research, now under way in a number of countries, is yielding pictures of managerial masculinities that throw light on such problems as work/life balance, domestic divisions of labour, managerial style, the shape of corporate careers, the integration of technology with corporate decision-making, social control within elite workplaces, and the tensions between expertise and organizational power. It is still too early to offer a definitive picture of super-elite masculinity, but enough has emerged to show the systematic cultural patterns underlying the familiar statistics of men’s predominance at the pinnacles of global wealth and power.

Structures of inequality always generate tension and social conflict, though this does not always take the forms familiar in the national politics of the global metropole. For instance, women’s mobilizations against military bases in Okinawa; women’s campaigns in Africa around the HIV/AIDS pandemic; struggles against caste rules in India; struggles against men’s monopolizing of aid programmes, and attempts to get communist regimes in Vietnam and China to take their own doctrine of gender equality seriously as they become players in international patriarchal capitalism. Social struggles are constantly arising in the emerging global gender order. Many are local in origin, such as labour struggles in the export-industry factories, though news about them does circulate and international support networks can develop. For instance union confederations and feminist NGOs have both been involved in supporting industrial action by

women in northern Mexico and the smaller countries of Central America. This is complex politics; most union confederations are run by men, and women organizing as women are liable to be accused of undermining labour solidarity.

There is a layer of more systematic and conscious transnational organizing in recent feminism. Aid programmes to developing countries, which grew to significant size during the Cold War, were dominated by men and mostly supported men’s economic activity. This was subject to feminist critique from the 1970s on and a ‘Women in Development’ strategy emerged in aid-giving institutions such as the World Bank. This mutated into a ‘Gender and Development’ strategy that tried to incorporate men as agents in achieving gender equality, which has been controversial among feminists. The strategy of involving men in gender reform was pursued in other arenas, with most success so far in Scandinavia; it has been taken up in other UN forums but with limited effect. Explicitly feminist transnational organizing largely takes a network form, with nodes provided by NGOs. These are usually funded from the global North through the field of operation may be the global South. The ‘ngo-ization of feminism’ is also controversial, many seeing it as a sell-out to neoliberalism; but so far no significant alternative for transnational organizing has emerged. Such networks now exist in all regions of the world. They have been important in sustaining pressure for gender reform through the worldwide turn of political parties towards neoliberalism, a broad policy shift that – despite many exceptions - advantages men.

The research and analysis underlying the discussion above mostly comes from feminists in the global North. That is where most of the funding, skilled labour and institutional support for research are located; however under-resourced universities in Europe and North America may feel, the situation for universities in the developing world is much worse. The global North is also where most of the gender theory comes from that circulates internationally – on which I have freely drawn.

But the colonized world too produced intellectuals, and analyses of colonial society and of the colonizers. This intellectual effort included work on gender issues. There is a global history, not just a Northern history, of consciousness about gender. Thinkers such as Kartini in (what is now) Indonesia, the May 4 Movement writers such as Lu Yin in China, Mabel Dodge in West Africa, gender-aware poets such as Gabriela Mistral in Chile, are part of this story. In the last half-century explicit feminist theory has emerged from Latin America, India, sub-Saharan Africa, and Australia. Feminist writers such as Nawal El Saadawi have global audiences – though not yet the theoretical prestige of counterparts in France, Britain or the USA. The pattern is familiar in all the human sciences.

To sum this up: gender as social structure is an important part of the political order. Gender as social structure is enmeshed with the vast processes constructing a global society. These dynamics are visible, but are still imperfectly understood, partly because the resources for understanding have been imperfectly used. Political scientists have much to learn from this field, and also much to give it.

There is a layer of more systematic and conscious transnational organizing in recent feminism.
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Radical Right Parties in Europe: What, Who, Why?

Given the dominance of party politics in Europe, political parties have always been at the forefront of European comparative politics. And no group of political parties has attracted so much academic interest as the ‘radical right’. Described by a plethora of terms – ranging from ‘neofascist’, ‘extreme right’ and ‘far right’, to ‘right-wing populist’ and ‘anti-immigrant’ – these parties have been the topic of literally hundreds (if not thousands) of articles and books in all major languages.

While this academic interest might be disproportionate to the political relevance of the parties in question, it is matched by the non-academic interest. Throughout Europe journalists, intellectuals, and politicians have been debating the ‘rise of the radical right’ after virtually every electoral victory of an alleged radical right party in the past three decades. What has the combined intellectual labor of at least one hundred political scientists taught us about radical right parties in Europe? In this short piece I will address the what, who and why questions on the basis of the state of the art of the study of the radical right, with particular reference to my own work, most notably Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe (2007).

What are we talking about?

It is not surprising that a phenomenon that goes under many different names will also be defined in many different ways. And while there are definitely widely different definitions out there, today most authors define the ‘radical right parties’ in roughly similar ways. This is in part a consequence of the professionalization of the study of the radical right, or perhaps better: the increasing dominance of social scientific studies over mainly historic or pseudo-scientific studies. For example, today few authors still use terms like ‘neofascist’ and ‘extreme right’ or argue that the parties in question are anti-democratic, racist, or violent.

So, what are they? In my own work, I define these parties as populist radical right, itself a combination of nativism, authoritarianism, and populism. Nativism entails a combination of nationalism and xenophobia, i.e. an ideology that holds that states should be inhabited exclusively by members of the native group (‘the nation’) and that nonnative (or ‘alien’) elements, whether persons or ideas, are fundamentally threatening to the homogeneous nation-state. Authoritarianism refers to the belief in a strictly ordered society, in which infringements of authority are to be punished severely. Populism, finally, is an ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ and ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people. It is the combination of all three ideological features, however, that makes a party populist radical right.

Essentially, the populist radical right is democratic, in that it accepts popular sovereignty and majority rule.

Essentially, the populist radical right is democratic, in that it accepts popular sovereignty and majority rule. It also tends to accept the rules of parliamentary democracy; in most cases it prefers a stronger executive, though few parties support a toothless legislature. Tensions exist between the populist radical right and liberal democracy, in particular arising from the constitutional protection of minorities (ethnic, political, religious). In essence, the populist radical right is monist, seeing the people as ethnically and morally homogeneous, and considers pluralism as undermining the (homogeneous) ‘will of the people’ and protecting ‘special interests’ (i.e. minority rights).

Who are they?

Logically, the question “what they are” influences the answer to the question “who they are”. In the study of the radical right, however, this is often not the case; authors using very different definitions will come...
up with very similar lists of parties. This is largely the consequence of a lack of attention to the classification of parties. While most authors will devote at least some sentences to explaining the choice of term and definition, few if any will show on the basis of secondary, let alone primary, sources that the listed parties indeed share the definitional features.

This is in part a consequence of a continuing lack of detailed party studies. As happens in other areas, the bulk of the academic writing on radical right parties focuses predominantly on the big European countries: France, Germany, Italy, Poland, and the United Kingdom. It is clear that the choice of these countries is not led by the national relevance of the radical right parties, as both Germany and the United Kingdom lack strong radical right parties. At the same time, some of the most relevant parties that come from smaller countries like Belgium, Denmark, Hungary or Switzerland, are barely studied outside their own country (and sometimes not even within it). This is undoubtedly in part a consequence of the economics of publishing, which rewards studies of phenomena in big countries.

Table 1 lists the electorally most successful radical right parties in European Union member states since 1980. The average highest result of these 13 successful parties is 12.7 percent, while their average most recent result is 9.8 percent. In fact, in only four countries have radical right parties gained more than 10 percent of the national vote. In two of these countries, Hungary and the Netherlands, the successful parties are also very new, and time will tell whether they will follow the common pattern of relative quick disintegration, or the rarer path of party establishment and institutionalization.

It is important to note that Table 1 includes just 12 of the 27 current EU member states. In the other 15 countries radical right parties are either electorally unsuccessful, gaining less than 5 percent of the national vote (e.g. Czech Republic, Germany, United Kingdom), or they do not contest national elections at all (e.g. Iceland, Ireland). In addition, there are some political parties whose radical right status is debated, that is, some scholars include them, but others do not. It would go too far to get into a detailed discussion of these cases here, but the most notably ‘borderline cases’ are the True Finns (PS), Hungarian Civic Union (FIDESZ), Italian Forza Italia (FI) and National Alliance (AN), the Norwegian Progress Party (FP), and the Swiss People’s Party (SVP). All share some of the features of the populist radical right – nativism, authoritarianism and populism – but not all three. In most cases the debate is over the question whether the nativism (most often anti-immigrant sentiments) is ideological or opportunistic, i.e. only used strategically in election campaigns.

**Why are they relevant?**

The last question has two different, if connected, meanings here. First, why are radical right parties successful? In a discipline dominated by ‘why’ questions, even if the ‘what’ question has not been answered completely, most scholars of the radical right study the reasons why radical right parties have been successful in post-1980 Western Europe. Given the many conceptual, data, and methodological constraints and differences, it should not be surprising that different authors come to different conclusions.

In terms of socio-demographic profile, we know that white, blue-collar men are disproportionately represented within the radical right electorate. **In terms of socio-demographic profile, we know that white, blue-collar men are disproportionately represented within the radical right electorate.**
the macro (i.e. national) level. Inconclusive results exist for the influence of levels of economic development, (individual) unemployment, (increase in) number of immigrants or refugees, etc. While these are meant to explain the demand side of radical right politics, institutional variables (like type of electoral and political system) and party variables (like ideological convergence) should gauge the supply side.

While much needs to be done to answer the ‘why’ question convincingly, running roughly the same problematic data over and over again, but using different advanced statistical methods, will not bring us much closer to the truth. Most scholars now agree that the key is not the demand side – through a variety of interrelated processes ‘globalization’ has created, at least since the 1990s, a fertile breeding ground for the radical right in Europe. Hence, the real question is: why, given this fertile breeding ground, are so few radical right parties able to establish themselves as significant political actors in their country?

The full answer to this study will require a broader research agenda, combining innovative qualitative and quantitative methods, and focusing on a wider range of successful and unsuccessful cases. It will have to look more at the supply side, in particular at the role of the radical right party in its own success or failure. Unfortunately, this will mean money- and time-intensive studies of relatively unknown parties in small countries, which is not much rewarded in the contemporary publish-or-perish market.

The second part of the ‘why’ question is the ‘so-what’ question: why are radical right parties relevant to European politics? To a large extent the relevance question is a direct consequence of the public debate: media and politicians alike are obsessed with radical right parties. The main reason for this public attention is the difficult relationship of radical right parties and liberal democracy, discussed above, which is often (for ideological or opportunistic reason) inflated by debaters.

In terms of direct power, i.e. government participation, radical right parties play a fairly secondary role in European politics. Table 2 lists all government participation of radical right parties in European states since 1990. These cases are fairly equally spread over the eastern and western parts of the continent, but most East European governments with radical right participation are of the 1990s, while most West European governments are of the 21st century. Still, in mid-2011, only two European countries have governments that include a radical right party: Italy and Switzerland. In addition, two countries have minority governments that are supported by a radical right party: Denmark and the Netherlands.

The political effects of most radical right parties in government are limited for two reasons: (1) they tend to be the junior partner in the government; and (2) they are controlled by a resilient judicial apparatus that protects the fundamentals of liberal democracy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Coalition Partner(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ)</td>
<td>2000-2002</td>
<td>ÖVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alliance for the Future of Austria (BZÖ)</td>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>ÖVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>ÖVP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Croatia Democratic Union (HDZ)</td>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Northern League (LN)</td>
<td>1994 &amp; 2001-2005</td>
<td>AN &amp; FI &amp; MDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008-</td>
<td>PdL &amp; MpA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>League of Polish Families (LPR)</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>PIS &amp; Samoorna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romanian National Unity Party (PUNR)</td>
<td>1994-1996</td>
<td>PDSR &amp; PSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Romania Party (PRM)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Serbian Radical Party (SRS)</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
<td>SPS &amp; JUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>Swiss People’s Party (SVP)</td>
<td>2004-</td>
<td>SPS &amp; FDP &amp; CVP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The political effects of most radical right parties in government are limited for two reasons: (1) they tend to be the junior partner in the government; and (2) they are controlled by a resilient judicial apparatus that protects the fundamentals of liberal democracy.
immigration laws in Europe, they are not the only ones. In other words, there is a broader European trend towards tighter immigration legislation and stricter law and order policies, which seems at best only partially related to the electoral and political strength of radical right parties.

But while political influence is not limited to government participation, studying the radical right’s *indirect* influence on European politics is not an easy feat. First of all, it is difficult to establish exactly how radical right parties influence other parties to do things. Do other governing parties respond to pressure from radical right parties or from the population (and can these pressures be meaningfully disaggregated)? Second, on many issues we lack longitudinal or reliable data, which makes the study of highly contested issues impossible – like the relationship between the level of support of radical right parties and anti-immigrant sentiments at the mass level or racist violence.

**Conclusion**

Radical right parties are among the most studied political phenomena in contemporary Europe. Consequently, we know more about this relatively new party family than about established groups like the Christian democrats, the social democrats, or the liberals; despite the fact that these party families still constitute the backbone of most government coalitions in Europe. There remains much to discover, but this will require departing from well-beaten paths and from mainstream comparative politics. Let me finish this short overview by suggesting a couple of original research programs on the two aspects of the ‘why’ question, which are highly relevant and long overdue.

First, we still know very little about the context of electoral success. While electoral success varies between countries, it also differs significantly within countries. Intra-national comparisons can have the advantage of controlling for various independent variables, particularly on the supply side (e.g. electoral system, radical right party), and are perfectly set for meso level studies, which look directly at the immediate political and social context in which radical right parties flourish or falter.

Second, what is the relationship between the radical right and religion? More specifically, with the main ‘enemy’ redefined from ethnonational ‘Turk’ into ethnoreligious ‘Muslim’, how has this redefinition affected the self-definition of the host nation (the ‘native’) and the preferred role of (Christian) religion in political life? For example, the FPÖ emerged out of the anticlerical subculture in Austria, but has recently become the most vocal defender of some orthodox Catholic priests in the country. Yet in the Netherlands the PVV seems to be willing to attack long-established Christian privileges in its struggle against Islam.

Third, what exactly are the effects of radical right parties on the various European party systems, particularly on the way the main political parties structurally interact? And what explains the differences? For example, in Belgium the cordon sanitaire against the VB has in many cities transformed de jure multiparty systems into *de facto* two-party systems – i.e. all ‘democratic’ parties are in coalition against the VB. Yet in Italy the LN has been a major component of the two-block system, in which multiple parties are essentially clustered into two opposing blocks.

Fourth, and finally, what have been the effects on European democracy, on the essential features of the liberal democratic political system? This is the key question, as much of the attention paid to radical right parties as well as opposition to them is a direct effect of their alleged anti-democratic program. And while there are clearly tensions between the monist radical right ideology and the pluralist essence of liberal democracy, so far little actual damage seems to have been done... or has it simply not been studied?

(...) what is the relationship between the radical right and religion?
Participation in Lebanon was quoted as
1

S

Belfast by neo-Nazis in 2009, and the
threatening of Romanian refugees in
the Cronulla riots in Australia in 2005, the
more recently the pastor of a small, region-
al church in Florida, USA, achieved inter-
national notoriety by announcing he would
burn copies of the Koran in protest at the
activities of radical Islamists. His plan was
condemned by US Secretary of State,
Hillary Clinton, and in the Middle East.
The Daily Star in Lebanon was quoted as
saying the event would be ‘likely to ignite
a fire of rage that could consume swathes
of the globe’.

since the 2001 terrorist attacks in the
United States, there have been re-
ports around the Western world of
increased hate speech against Muslims and
people of Middle Eastern descent in the
media, reports of authorities tasked with
combating discrimination, by national and
international non-gov-
ernment organizations,
and by parliamentary
inquiries. This has hap-
pened in the United
States, the United
Kingdom, throughout
Europe, Asia and in
Australia. The last few
years have also seen
race-related incidents,
often preceded and
sparked by hate
speech. These include
the Cronulla riots in Australia in 2005, the
threatening of Romanian refugees in
Belfast by neo-Nazis in 2009, and the
sending of hate messages to an Islamic
charity shop in Glasgow the same year,
before it was later torched.

More recently the pastor of a small, region-
al church in Florida, USA, achieved inter-
national notoriety by announcing he would
burn copies of the Koran in protest at the
activities of radical Islamists. His plan was
condemned by US Secretary of State,
Hillary Clinton, and in the Middle East.
The Daily Star in Lebanon was quoted as
saying the event would be ‘likely to ignite
a fire of rage that could consume swathes
of the globe’.

The Power of Hate Speech in
a Globalized World

Political science is often defined as the
study of power, or more specifically of
inequalities of power. One form of power
that political scientists have been relatively
slow to engage with is the power of hate
speech. While discourse has become a
favourite theme within several sub-fields
of political science, the content, meaning
and force of hate discourse are often either
overlooked, or assumed to be much more
straightforward phenomenologically than
they actually are.

This has left the terrain mainly – but not
exclusively – to legal scholars, who tend to
emphasize whether certain laws target spe-
cific behaviour, or whether laws are con-
sistent with international norms or domes-
tical constitutional arrangements. Yet there
is much more to the hate speech debate than
this. Hate speech has long been recognized
as harmful, and therefore warranting a pol-
icy response. In this sense, it is a public
policy problem.

However, these norms do not enjoy unani-
mous support. In the United States, which
is the outlier on speech regulation due to the
First Amendment, hate speech laws of the
kind that routinely exist in Europe and
elsewhere have been declared invalid by the
Supreme Court. The First Amendment
(in its contemporary interpretation) means
that the United States protects free speech
to a greater degree than any other country.

In stark contrast, Germany possesses a range
of criminal prohibitions on hate speech
–including for Holocaust Denial, which
does not attract the protection normally
accorded to the freedom to express one’s
opinions because it communicates informa-
tion that is known to be incorrect. The crim-
inal law also prohibits ‘threats to the demo-
cratic constitutional state’, including the
dissemination of propaganda or symbols of
unconstitutional organizations, and incite-
ment to hatred and violence against minori-
ty groups in a manner likely to disturb the
peace.

The international legal system set up
in the post World War II period by the
multilateral human rights treaty
system of the United Nations speci-
fied the obligations of states to take
action against hate speech on racial
and religious grounds.

The German approach – in so far as it crim-
inalizes racial hatred and Holocaust Denial –
is not unlike the
approach in many
other European juris-
dictions. An exception
is Hungary, which has
adopted an approach to
free speech protection
that is unusual among
post-communist states,
and much more like
that of the United
States. Hungary has enacted a law pro-
hibiting incitement to hatred, which is
reliant upon a ‘clear and present danger’
test, adapted from First Amendment
jurisprudence. It also, in a manner more
akin to other European countries, prohibits
the display of totalitarian symbols. In
Canada, a criminal law approach is also
used to prohibit the incitement of hatred
that is likely to lead to a breach of the
peace, and to prohibit the wilful promotion
of hatred.

There are of course differences between
these regulatory approaches, differences
that are of interest because they relate to
the kinds of questions about phenomenol-
ogy and meaning that interest political sci-
entists. In the case of Holocaust Denial, for example, simply expressing the idea is sufficient for an offence to be deemed to have been committed. Those countries that prohibit Holocaust Denial do not view such speech as a serious attempt to enter into a debate about a historical issue, since the history of the Holocaust is so well documented. Rather, engaging in Holocaust Denial is regarded as an inherently anti-Semitic act, one that seeks to couch virulently anti-Semitic sentiment in the guise of a historical debate. The role and effects of Holocaust Denial are widely discussed in the literature in this field.

In relation to other examples of hate speech, there are two distinct policy approaches. The first is that for an offence to be sustained, the expression must have constituted incitement in a manner that constitutes an imminent threat to the peace. The second is that an expression that promotes ‘hatred’ in and of itself constitutes a criminal offence. The difference between these two approaches has been the cause of significant and ongoing debate and tension in the literature. This tension is unresolved, and perhaps unsolvable, as it relies on (often implicit) disagreement about the meaning and effect of a speech act itself.

The picture is complicated even more by the existence of an anti-discrimination approach to hate speech policy in many countries. This is the case in several provinces in Canada, and is also widespread in Australia. The kinds of outcomes that are likely to result from this policy include the ordering of an apology, an agreement to desist, or an agreement to publicize a retraction. The threshold required for these kinds of provisions to be invoked is necessarily lower than that applied in the criminal law.

This differentiation in regard to threshold has concrete policy implications. Some commentators regard the civil approach as more effective, since it can be applied more often and to a greater range of speech. This means that more mundane, or moderate, expressions may be able to be countered. There is interesting evidence in the literature that more moderate forms of hate discourse may in fact be more harmful than the extreme cases. This is because, in being pitched in more moderate terms, they are more likely to be regarded as legitimate contributions to public debate. Thus, they are likely to contribute over time to a climate within which prejudice and discrimination may flourish.

On the other hand, there are commentators who regard the civil approach as far too interventionist, arguing that where such lower-level hate speech occurs, there is no role for the state in regulating speech. They argue that because freedom of speech is a core liberal democratic value, it ought not to be regulated in response to such matters. Indeed, some argue that even the more egregious examples of hate speech that are targeted by criminal penalties ought not to be regulated by the state. Rather, these more mundane expressions (and, according to some, also the more egregious ones) deserve a community response: they deserve to be counteracted and contradicted by the counterspeech of others. This suggestion, while attractive in many ways because it supplants the requirement for state involvement in remediying the harms of hate speech, is also complex because it in turn raises the question of whether, how, and how effectively, targeted minorities may be able to engage in counterspeech. Where inequalities of power are keenly felt by marginalized communities, is it appropriate to expect them to respond spontaneously to discursive marginalization?

In the end, these policy debates divide on the question of what constitutes ‘hate speech’ itself. What exactly is hate speech? When should incitement to racial or religious hatred constitute an offence? Is incitement to violence, or a disturbance to the peace, necessary? These are perennial questions in the free speech versus hate speech debate. Yet new developments in the globalized era have raised these questions afresh, and increased the complexities involved in answering them. There are three main points of contention that challenge even scholars who have long been engaged in this area of work. These are: new modes of communication; regulatory avoidance; and the emergent counter-terrorism context.

New modes of communication
There is little doubt that the internet has had both positive and negative effects on the ability of marginalized communities to speak and be heard. The internet has created a new medium where those without access to the mainstream media can be heard. Many have cited the Zapatistas’ internet campaign as an example of the positive potential of the internet, in permitting communities to reach out internationally for support. The Wikileaks phenomenon is an example of the claimed power of the internet to create open access to information.

Yet others are much more cautious in their appraisal of the impact of this new terrain. There is important new work emerging arguing that the anonymity and accessibility of the internet have created new platforms for the purveying of hate. There is significant evidence, for example, that some individuals devote their time to post-
ing hateful messages on blogs, targeting anyone they choose for victimization with grossly sexist, racist and homophobic taunts and threats. Sometimes their targets are sites set up to support victims of crime, or community-based activists. There are also recognizable hate-purveying organizations that use the internet to reach wide audiences much more easily than before. Often, these organizations are well-versed in the relevant anti-hatred laws that apply in their jurisdictions, and they construct their sites in a way that avoids confronting the limits of those laws. New research by Gail Mason, for example, shows that white supremacist organizations are adept at utilizing a new ‘discourse of care’ that suggests there is a humane side to their racism, and that sidesteps completely any potential legal response to their views.

The question of regulating the internet is fraught with difficulty. Of course, the technical difficulties involved in trying to do so are legion, and internet service providers are understandably reluctant to be put in the position of arbitrating what their customers can or cannot see, read or hear. The mechanisms for pursuing effective regulation, and the cross-jurisdictional applicability of national laws are questions that are not yet settled. There have been some successful prosecutions of the hosts of web sites for material downloaded in a jurisdiction other than the one the host is located in. Yet the transnational character of the internet can make applying normal defamation or anti-hatred laws on the internet extremely difficult.

Yet the transnational character of the internet can make applying normal defamation or anti-hatred laws on the internet extremely difficult.

The use of codes – whether symbolic or verbal – to achieve regulatory avoidance is an artefact of the criminal prohibition of well-known symbols of hatred. To some scholars, such as Peter Molnar, the use of such codes contributes directly to the spread of racist speech rather than its reduction, and highlights the futility of prohibiting specific symbols through the criminal law, rather than engaging in the much more comprehensive activities required to change people’s views over the longer term. These would include widespread education campaigns; anti-discrimination measures; and community understanding of, and engagement with, the effects of hate discourse on both its targets and the community as a whole.

In this vein, it is also important to note that some hate speakers appear actively to pursue prosecution. Their motives vary, but can include a desire to be seen as martyrs to the cause, a strategy to be provided with a platform from which to continue to express their views, and an opportunity to mount an absolutist freedom of speech argument in their own defence. Where this has happened, those concerned with hate speech are forced to rethink their policy approaches and their understanding of what is most beneficial, or harmful, to targeted communities, lest the policy outcomes produce worsening inequalities of power over time.

Counter-terrorism context
A further new development is the counter-terrorism climate that has emerged globally in the last decade. Within this environment, many liberal democracies have enacted new laws that impinge on freedom of speech and other human rights. This has been recognized in a 2009 report by the International Commission of Jurists, Assessing Damage: Urging Action: Report of the Eminent Jurists Panel on terrorism, counter-terrorism and human rights. The report expressed grave concern in relation to speech-limiting provisions, and argued that counter-terrorism laws should avoid capturing a wide range of behaviour in vaguely-worded offences.

Yet at the same time as these risks to free speech are posed, the broader counter-terrorism policies pursued in many Western democracies have left Middle Eastern and Muslim minorities feeling more vulnerable than ever in the face of racial and religious hatred. Their perceptions of vulnerability are increased by the pincer-like coexistence of two forces. On the one hand there has been a documented increase in incidences of vilification and hatred. On the other, members of these communities feel targeted by government for suspicion of terrorist activities, which renders them less likely to utilize the policies that exist to help them combat hatred. Overall, this context may mean that the current counter-terrorism climate does more to undermine both freedom of speech and anti-hatred strategies than any other event of the post World War II era.

These ideas will be pursued and debated at a Main Theme Panel at the Madrid World Congress in 2012. The panel will be co-chaired by Peter Molnar and Katharine Gelber, and will feature key speakers in the field including Eric Heinze, Wayne Sumner, Catriona McKinnon and Mary-Kate McGowan.

Biographical note
Katharine Gelber is an Associate Professor in the School of Political Science & International Studies at the University of Queensland and President of the Australian Political Studies Association. She has recently published Speech Matters (University of Queensland Press, 2011) and is co-editor of Hate Speech and Freedom of Speech in Australia (Federation Press, 2007).
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IPSA World Congress of Political Science
Now Every Two Years!
Montreal 2014 & Istanbul 2016

Following a decision taken at the last IPSA Executive Committee meeting in Madrid (October 29-30, 2010), IPSA will now hold its World Congress of Political Science every two years, with Montreal (Canada) and Istanbul (Turkey) selected to host the 2014 and 2016 congresses, respectively.

After careful consideration, the IPSA Executive Committee has decided to hold the IPSA World Congress of Political Science every two years. Several factors contributed to this historic decision. In the last ten years, a growing chorus of members has called on IPSA to expand its activities. In an effort to respond to these requests, IPSA initially opted to offer more in the way of interim conferences, such as the Montreal Conference (2008), the Luxemburg Conference (2010) and IPSA-ECPR joint conference in Sao Paulo in February 2011. Additionally, however, the Executive Committee (EC), faced with an exponential surge in participation and in the quality of proposals, decided to evaluate the possibility of holding the world congresses more often. Two factors – the overwhelming success of IPSA’s world congresses in Fukuoka (2006) and Santiago (2009), and the fact that IPSA has had a permanent Secretariat since 2006 – weighed heavily in the EC’s final decision to stage world congresses more frequently.

This initiative also speaks to IPSA’s success in pursuing its mission – namely to promote the development of our discipline. Holding a world congress every two years will allow IPSA to visit more countries and regions and thus heighten its international profile and create new opportunities for collaboration. Consequently, the EC decided to accept the offer from the Canadian Political Science Association/Quebec Political Science Association and the Turkish Political Science Association to host the 2014 WC in Montreal and the 2016 WC in Istanbul. IPSA will continue to hold interim conferences in 2013 and 2015.

The next world congress will be held in Madrid from July 8 to 12, 2012, under the theme “Reordering Power, Shifting Boundaries.” Keynote speakers will include political scientist Elinor Ostrom, co-winner of the 2009 Nobel Prize for Economics. Mark the date in your calendar and visit the web section regularly for details www.ipsa.org/events/congress/madrid2012/congress-theme.
107th IPSA Executive Committee Meeting (Seoul, South Korea)

The 107th IPSA Executive Committee Meeting was held at the ultra modern Korea University in Seoul, South Korea from April 30 to May 1, 2011. The meetings were a great success, and details on EC decisions will be announced shortly.

In keeping with IPSA tradition, the meetings were held in conjunction with academic activities sponsored by the Korean Political Science Association. On April 30, Prof. Leonardo Morlino, President of IPSA, delivered a special lecture titled “The Quality of Democracies Compared” (Europe and Latin America), and he was followed by Prof. Hyug Baeg Im (EC Member), who gave a presentation titled “The Development of Quality of Democracy in Korea since Democratization in 1987.”

On May 2, Prof. Leslie Pal (EC Member), Prof. Werner Patzelt (EC Member) and Prof. Wyn Grant (Vice President, Africa and Europe, Program Chair for the XXII IPSA World Congress of Political Science) took part in an international workshop and special conference titled “Prospects for South and North Korean Relations after the Yeonpyeong Clash,” also held at Korea University.

The Second Edition of the Annual IPSA Summer School at the University of São Paulo: An even Greater Success!

Again this year, the annual Sao Paulo IPSA Summer School was an unqualified success. Held at the University of São Paulo from January 31 to February 11, 2011, the Summer School built on the scholarly achievements of the first year, as enrolment surged by almost 50% with the addition of four new courses. Some 16 countries were represented, compared to 10 the first year.

The First Edition of the IPSA Summer School at Stellenbosch University

The first summer school in social science research methods was held in January 17-28 2011 by the African Doctoral Academy at Stellenbosch University, in conjunction with IPSA, and under the leadership of Prof Johann Mouton (ADA) and Prof Dirk Berg-Schlosser (IPSA).

The Summer School offered a wide range of one- and two-week courses covering the epistemology of the social sciences, designing research, quantitative and qualitative approaches to social research as well as a basic course on impact evaluation. It brought together 8 instructors from 7 universities in South Africa, Germany, Switzerland and the United States and 90 participants from 17 countries. Altogether it can be considered to have been a very successful international event as testified in the highly positive course evaluations by the participants. In this way, the groundwork has been laid for future events of this kind and a successful capacity building for methods teaching in the social sciences in Sub-Saharan Africa.
The IPSA-ECPR Joint Conference in São Paulo, Brazil

The IPSA-ECPR Joint Conference titled “Whatever Happened to North-South?” wrapped up on Saturday, February 26 after three-and-a-half days of panels discussing the continued relevance of the international North-South divide. The event was hosted by the Brazilian Political Science Association (BPSA) at the University of São Paulo. More than 700 participants were welcomed onto the sprawling grounds of the University of São Paulo campus. In this first-ever collaboration between IPSA and ECPR, participants from Germany to Argentina and (of course) Brazil took part in thought-provoking panels grouped under three themes: (1) changing patterns of international relations/regional integration; (2) political regimes, democratic consolidation and the quality of democracy; and (3) economic trends and political, social and cultural changes.

In particular, we were very pleased that a large number of local academics attended, taking advantage of the proximity of a major international conference to share ideas with colleagues from around the world. IPSA extends a warm word of thanks to all participants and to ECPR, BPSA and the Local Organising Committee for helping to make this event a great success.

IPSA at the 2011 ISA Convention in Montreal, Canada

IPSA was active at the International Studies Association’s Annual Convention in Montreal, Canada, sponsoring three panels on the topic of global governance.

- Where is the “Global” in Global Governance? Perspectives from China, India and Brazil

- Southern Countries and Global Governance: Their Roles in the United Nations Systems

- Fragile States and Global Governance: Exploring the Links

The IPSA Secretariat operated a booth for the duration of the convention and ensured liaison with ISA delegates by providing information on the upcoming IPSA World Congress of Political Science in Madrid in 2012 and on services offered by IPSA. Available at the table were membership brochures, Madrid 2012 flyers, copies of the International Political Science Review, International Political Science Abstracts and History of IPSA, as well as promotional items. Many participants also took the opportunity to subscribe to IPSA’s monthly newsletter.

Among the many IPSA Executive Committee (EC) members attending the convention were Lourdes Sola, Past President of IPSA; Helen Milner, First Vice-President, Vice-President Americas; Leslie Pal, Chair of the Committee on Research and Training; Bertrand Badie, editor of the upcoming IPSA Political Science Encyclopedia; Hyug Baeg Im, member of the EC; and Guy Lachapelle, Secretary General of IPSA. A number of IPSA members also dropped by to introduce themselves.
To reward dedication and excellence in political science, to enhance the quality and diversity of participation in its World Congress of Political Science, and to encourage more women, graduate students, young scholars and scholars from emerging countries to take part in IPSA activities, IPSA has created the following awards.

For details on application procedures and criteria for the awards, please visit the “Awards” section at [www.ipsa.org](http://www.ipsa.org).

### Karl Deutsch Award

The purpose of the Karl Deutsch Award is to honour a prominent scholar engaged in the cross-disciplinary research of which Karl Deutsch was a master. The recipient presents the Karl Deutsch lecture or leads a special session at the IPSA World Congress of Political Science. The award is made on the recommendation of the Committee on Awards. It is supported by the Karl Deutsch fund.

### Prize of the Foundation Mattei Dogan awarded by the International Political Science Association for High Achievement in Political Science

The prize is offered to a scholar of high international reputation in recognition of his/her contribution to the advancement of political science. The prize is awarded at every IPSA World Congress of Political Science. The recipient is invited to present a prize lecture during the IPSA World Congress of Political Science and receives a cash prize from the Foundation Mattei Dogan.

### Stein Rokkan Award

The Stein Rokkan Award is offered as a travel grant. The purpose of the Stein Rokkan fellowships is to assist a small number of graduate students to attend the World Congress of Political Science by covering their basic travel and accommodation costs. The awards are made on the recommendation of the Committee on Awards, and they are supported by the Stein Rokkan fund.

### Francesco Kjellberg Award for Outstanding Papers Presented by New Scholars

The purpose of the Francesco Kjellberg Award is to encourage young, new scholars to write and present papers at the World Congress of Political Science. The recipient is offered a complimentary two-year IPSA membership and funding of his/her travel costs to the following World Congress of Political Science. The award is made on the recommendation of the Committee on Awards on the basis of nominations by convenors and chairs at the world congress and is based on normal criteria of academic excellence.

### Wilma Rule Award on Gender and Politics

This award is designed to encourage research in the area of gender and politics. It is given to the best paper on gender and politics presented at the IPSA World Congress. The subject matter of the paper should include issues relating to women’s participation and representation in politics and society, especially the identification of entry barriers to decision making arenas.
GLOBAL SOUTH AWARD

The Global South Award was created to celebrate the achievement of a political scientist concerned with issues related to the Global South. The award was offered for the first time at the 2009 IPSA World Congress of Political Science.

MEISEL-LAPONCE AWARD

The Meisel-Laponce Award was created by the International Political Science Review (IPSR) to honor John Meisel and Jean Laponce, the first two editors of IPSR. The prize is awarded at every second World Congress of Political Science to the best article published in IPSR in the previous four years. The prize is jointly sponsored by IPSA and SAGE Publications. It will be awarded for the first time in 2012.

AWARD FOR CONCEPT ANALYSIS IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

The IPSA Research Committee on Concepts and Methods (RC01-C&M) gives this award at every IPSA World Congress of Political Science to published scholarly work that covers concept analysis, concept formation or conceptual innovation as well as the fields of operationalization, measurement, and data collection. It is co-sponsored by C&M and the Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE) in Mexico City.

BEST C&M WORKING PAPER AWARD

The Committee on Concepts and Methods (RC01-C&M) publishes two highly regarded series of working papers. Every year, at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA), the Committee chooses the best paper published in either of its two series during the preceding calendar year.

CHARLES H. LEVINE MEMORIAL BOOK PRIZE

Every year, IPSA’s Research Committee 27 on the Structure and Organization of Government (SOG), sponsor of the journal Governance, awards the Charles H. Levine Prize. The Prize is awarded to a book that makes a contribution of considerable theoretical or practical significance in the field of public policy and administration, takes an explicitly comparative perspective, and is written in an accessible style. It is named in honor of Charles H. Levine, who was an accomplished member of the Research Committee and served on the editorial board of Governance. The prize is awarded on the recommendation of a distinguished committee.

ULRICH KLOETI AWARD

The Ulrich Kloeti Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Study of Public Policy, Administration, and Institutions is given in honor of Ulrich Kloeti, a founding member of IPSA’s Research Committee 27 on the Structure and Organization of Government (SOG) and its co-chair for ten years. It is presented annually to a scholar who has made exceptional contributions to research in the field through a sustained career. Awardees must have involved themselves significantly within SOG - both with respect to research and leadership.
IPSR Editors’ Choice Collections - Regimes and Regime Change

The International Political Science Review (IPSR) is inaugurating a feature to highlight especially noteworthy articles published in the journal in the past decade on important themes within political science. Each year, several themes will be selected by the journal editors, and made available free to view online at http://ips.sagepub.com/cgi/collection/regimes.

The first theme in the series is Regimes and Regime Change, a central focus of scholarly attention in recent decades.

The selected articles are:

Vladimir Gel’man
Out of the Frying Pan, into the Fire? Post-Soviet Regime Changes in Comparative Perspective

Javier Rodríguez, and Javier Santiso
Banking on Democracy: The Political Economy of International Private Bank Lending in Emerging Markets

Doh Chull Shin, and Byong-Kuen Jhee
How Does Democratic Regime Change Affect Mass Political Ideology? A Case Study of South Korea in Comparative Perspective

Abraham Diskin, Hanna Diskin, and Reuven Y. Hazan
Why Democracies Collapse: The Reasons for Democratic Failure and Success

Jay Ulfelder
Contentious Collective Action and the Breakdown of Authoritarian Regimes

Staffan I. Lindberg
Forms of States, Governance, and Regimes: Reconceptualizing the Prospects for Democratic Consolidation in Africa

In consultation with IPSR’s newly revamped Editorial Board, the editors have selected the recipient of the first Meisel-Laponce Award. The award recognizes the best article published in IPSR since IPSA’s 2009 World Congress.

The winners are Jørgen Møller and Svend-Erik Skaaning for their article, “Beyond the Radial Delusion: Conceptualizing and Measuring Democracy and Non-democracy” 31:3 (2010). We congratulate Professors Møller and Skaaning for considerably advancing our understanding of democratic theory and practice.

The winning article is available on the IPSR home page (http://ips.sagepub.com), as are the five other articles nominated by the editors. The award will be presented at IPSA’s next World Congress in Madrid in July 2012.

Jørgen Møller holds a PhD from the European University Institute in Florence, Italy (2007), and he is currently Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science, Aarhus University, Denmark. His research interests include conceptualization of democracy, post-communist political change, comparative historical analysis of democratization and state formation, and qualitative methodology.

Svend-Erik Skaaning holds a PhD from the Department of Political Science at Aarhus University, Denmark (2007), where he is currently associate professor. His research interests include the conceptualization and measurement of democracy, civil liberties and the rule of law, political regime change, state capacity, and comparative methodology.
Co-Editor Sought for the *International Political Science Review (IPSR)*

www.ipsa.org/news/news/international-political-science-review-ipsr-editor

The *International Political Science Review* (IPSR), the flagship publication of the International Political Science Association, is seeking a co-editor to join Mark Kesselman for a four-year (renewable) period starting in July 2012. The new editor will be selected in time for the IPSA World Congress in Madrid in July 2012. A transition period of several months will allow the appointed editor to become familiar with the editorial process.

IPSR is a general interest political science journal from SAGE Publications. SAGE publishes excellent scholarship in all fields related to political science. Contributors hail from all regions of the world, as the journal actively seeks to promote diversity in both its authorship and readership. The journal is quite selective as well: less than one in five articles submitted are accepted for publication. Moreover, IPSR’s impact factor has increased steadily. Its five-year impact factor was 0.936 in 2009 (up from 0.729 in 2008), ranking it 48/122 over a five-year period (2004-09). Its 2009 impact factor was 0.592, up from 0.581 in 2008.

Since 2009, IPSR has introduced a number of innovative features to promote the journal and make more of its content available through open access. The new editor will be expected to support the journal’s efforts to improve the quality of scholarship published and expand its readership throughout the world. Mikhail Ilyin, chair of the IPSR Editor Search Committee (a sub-committee of the IPSA Publications Committee), and his colleagues will want to know how the new editor plans to build on this success and further heighten the journal’s profile and standing during her or his tenure as co-editor.

The co-editor will be expected to:

- actively acquire manuscripts;
- oversee the peer review process using the ScholarOne Manuscripts online management system;
- select appropriate peer reviewers from IPSR’s reviewer pool to evaluate submissions;
- make decisions regarding the publication of submitted manuscripts;
- edit manuscripts to ensure that they are published in acceptable English;
- collaborate with key personnel at SAGE, particularly the production editor, marketing manager and managing editor;
- develop ideas to strengthen the journal’s standing in political science.

The successful candidate for this position must have:

- a record as a distinguished academic in his or her field;
- a demonstrated commitment to international political research;
- previous editorial experience and fluency in written English;
- familiarity with the work of IPSA and its research committees.

Furthermore, the successful candidate will be expected to become an individual member of IPSA, help prepare an annual report and present it in person to the IPSA Executive Committee, contribute to IPSA’s Publications Committee, and sit on the IPSA Executive Committee (which meets once or twice annually) as a non-voting member. The editor will receive an honorarium and adequate resources to cover expenses stemming from these commitments.

Enquiries may be forwarded to Mikhail Ilyin (Mikhaililyin48@gmail.com) and Mark Kesselman (mjk3@columbia.edu). Applicants are asked to forward their CV by email to Professor Ilyin, along with a statement describing their objectives for taking IPSR forward.

The application deadline is December 1, 2011.
Austrian Political Science Association (AuPSA)

CEPSA Annual Conference 2011, Vienna
Multilevel Politics: Intra- and Inter-level Comparative Perspectives
In conjunction with the IPSA Research Committee 47 meeting
27-29 October 2011, Vienna

Programme committee
Kristina Arató (ELTE University Budapest)
Karín Liebhart (University of Vienna)
Silvia Mihalikova (Comenius University Bratislava)
Anton Pelinka (CEU Budapest)

Conference topic
Against the backdrop of a changed European political landscape — a multifaceted interplay of local, regional, national and supra-national institutions, actors and stakeholders — the overarching conference topic focuses on political agenda-setting, decision-making and the implementation of politics from a comparative perspective.

Contact: karin.liebhart@univie.ac.at

Organizers
• Austrian Political Science Association (AuPSA)
• Central European Political Science Association (CEPSA)
• Department of Political Science, University of Vienna

Portuguese Political Science Association

CALL FOR PAPERS – VI Conference ISCSP-UTL, Lisbon, 1-3 March 2012

The Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP) is accepting submissions for panels and papers, for presentation at its sixth conference, which takes place at ISCSP-UTL, Lisbon, from March 1 to 3, 2012. Proposals should be forwarded by email to congressos@apcps.pt. The submission deadline is OCTOBER 31, 2011.

Submissions should not exceed 200 WORDS and must include the following information:

1. Section number and title of the submission
2. Title of the paper
3. Author’s full name
4. Author’s institutional affiliation and position
5. Author’s full contact details, including postal and email addresses, and telephone and fax numbers.
6. Short abstract of the submission

Proposals should also include a BRIEF CURRICULUM VITAE (max. 150 words). APCP will only accept two proposals per author (one as an individual and one as a co-author).

Panel proposals should include a title, a moderator and the respective papers. The latter should include the above requirements for individual papers.

The conference will include the following sections (this list may be subject to change depending on the number of submissions approved and the theme of the submissions):

Section 1: Portuguese society and politics
Section 2: Portuguese-speaking countries
Section 3: European studies
Section 4: Comparative politics
Section 5: Governance and public policy
Section 6: International relations
Section 7: Political theory

Submissions are open to all interested parties, with the final selection based solely on academic criteria.

Registration fees are as follows:
20 Euros for APCP members
70 Euros for non-members
30 Euros for accredited students

APCP welcomes Portuguese and non-Portuguese applicants conducting research at Portuguese institutions or writing dissertations dealing with Lusophone themes.

The Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP) will present the third edition of its prize for best Ph.D. Thesis in political science and international relations.

APCP will accept theses written in English, French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

Submissions must be forwarded to congressos@apcps.pt by no later than OCTOBER 31, 2011. PROPOSALS RECEIVED AFTER THE DEADLINE WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Prize for Best PhD Thesis presented for the third time by the Portuguese Political Science Association

The Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP) will accept theses written in English, French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

Submissions deadline for applications: November 31, 2011
Value of the prize: € 1500

The winner will be announced at the 6th Congress of the Portuguese Political Science Association, which takes place in Lisbon from March 1 to 3, 2012.

For details please write to us at info@apcps.pt

Nouvelles des associations nationales

National Association News

Austrian Political Science Association

Monsieur Patrice Bigombe Logo, secrétaire général de la Société Camerounaise de Science Politique (SOCASP), a participé aux travaux du 4e Congrès international du Réseau des associations francophones de science politique, à l’Université Libre de Bruxelles du 20 au 22 avril 2011, sur le thème « Être gouverné au 21e siècle ».


Société Camerounaise de Science Politique

Association Portuguesa de Ciência Política

Portuguese Political Science Association

CALL FOR PAPERS – VI Conference ISCSP-UTL, Lisbon, 1-3 March 2012

The Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP) is accepting submissions for panels and papers, for presentation at its sixth conference, which takes place at ISCSP-UTL, Lisbon, from March 1 to 3, 2012. Proposals should be forwarded by email to congressos@apcps.pt. The submission deadline is OCTOBER 31, 2011.

Submissions must be forwarded to congressos@apcps.pt by no later than OCTOBER 31, 2011. PROPOSALS RECEIVED AFTER THE DEADLINE WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

Prize for Best PhD Thesis presented for the third time by the Portuguese Political Science Association

The Portuguese Political Science Association (APCP) will present the third edition of its prize for best Ph.D. Thesis in political science and international relations.

APCP welcomes Portuguese and non-Portuguese applicants conducting research at Portuguese institutions or writing dissertations dealing with Lusophone themes.

APCP will accept theses written in English, French, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish.

Submissions deadline for applications: November 31, 2011
Value of the prize: € 1500

The winner will be announced at the 6th Congress of the Portuguese Political Science Association, which takes place in Lisbon from March 1 to 3, 2012.

For details please write to us at info@apcps.pt
Representing a Global Community of Committed Scholars: Introducing IPSA RC Chairs (Part 2)

At its 18th World Congress in Munich (1970) some 40 years ago, IPSA decided to institutionalize worldwide research activities in our discipline by establishing research committees. The rich variety of such committees has proven to be one of IPSA’s greatest assets. In the past and in this issue, Participation acknowledges their work by introducing ten scholars currently chairing some of our most vibrant RCs. Presenting a broad 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 the sheer scope of our discipline.

Participation’s previous issue introduced Hal Colebatch, Australia (RC32), Sharda Jain, India (RC39), Jim Björkman, Netherlands (RC25), Fred Lazin, Israel (RC5) and Linda Cardinal, Canada (RC50). This issue features John Higley, USA (RC2), Adrian Guelke, United Kingdom (RC14), Ken Endo, Japan (RC3), Christ’l de Landtsheer, Belgium (RC21) and Mariel Lucero, Argentina (RC7).

Rainer EISFELD
RC Liaison Representative

At its 18th World Congress in Munich (1970) some 40 years ago, IPSA decided to institutionalize worldwide research activities in our discipline by establishing research committees. The rich variety of such committees has proven to be one of IPSA’s greatest assets. In the past and in this issue, Participation acknowledges their work by introducing ten scholars currently chairing some of our most vibrant RCs. Presenting a broad 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 the sheer scope of our discipline.

John Higley – Chair of RC2
jhigley@austin.utexas.edu

John Higley has chaired RC2 (Political Elites) since its illustrious founder Mattei Dogan retired. With colleagues, Higley has formulated a ‘neo-elitist’ theory of politics, highlighted democracy’s elite foundations, reassessed Schumpeter’s theory of democratic elitism, and studied Australian, Norwegian, and other national elites empirically. During his chairmanship, RC2 has sponsored four inter-congress conferences and produced half a dozen books and special journal issues canvassing elites and politics in an array of countries.

Adrian Guelke – Chair of RC14
a.guelke@qub.ac.uk

Adrian Guelke is a professor of comparative politics and director of the Centre for the Study of Ethnic Conflict at the School of Politics, International Studies and Philosophy at Queen’s University, Belfast. Recent publications include The New Age of Terrorism and the International Political System (IB Tauris, 2009), Terrorism and Global Disorder (IB Tauris, 2006) and Rethinking the Rise and Fall of Apartheid (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), as well as the co-edited second edition of A Farewell to Arms? (Manchester University Press, 2006) on the Northern Ireland peace process. Studies he has edited in the field of politics and ethnicity include The Challenges of Ethno-Nationalism (Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) and Democracy and Ethnic Conflict (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004). Adrian Guelke has served as chair of the International Political Science Association’s Research Committee on Politics and Ethnicity since 2006. He is also editor of the journal Nationalism and Ethnic Politics.

Ken Endo – Chair of RC3
endo@jurs.hokudai.ac.jp

Ken Endo served as advisory expert at the “Cellule de Prospective” (Forward Studies Unit), the in-house think-tank of the European Commission created by former president Jacques Delors in 1992-1993, and in 1996 he obtained a D.Phil in Politics from St Antony’s College, Oxford. He is currently professor of international politics at Hokkaido University’s School of Law. His publications include The Presidency of the European Commission under Jacques Delors: The Politics of Shared Leadership (Macmillan/St. Martin’s, 1999), and he has contributed to various journals, including International Affairs, the Journal of Common Market Studies, and Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica. Ken Endo recently published two tomes in Japanese: A History of European Integration (Nagoya UP) and The Frontiers of Global Governance (Toshidono).

Christ’l De Landtsheer – Chair of R21
christl.delandtsheer@ua.ac.be

Christ’l De Landtsheer is a professor of political communication at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. After obtaining her PhD. from the University of Ghent, Belgium, she became an associate professor at the Amsterdam School of Communication Research ASCoR, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. She has been received as a visiting scholar at various universities, among them the University of York, (UK), the University of Padova and University of Perugia (Italy), Lomonosov Moscou State University (Russia), China University of Mining and Technology (Xuzhou, China), and San Diego State University (USA). Christ’l De Landtsheer has published a number of international journal articles, special journal issues, books and book chapters. Her research interests lie in political communication, political psychology and political socialization. She is director of the Political Communication Research Unit and master’s program at the University of Antwerp, and chair of IPSA’s Research Committee on Political Socialization and Education (RC21).

Mariel Lucero – Chair of RC7
marielluc@gmail.com

Mariel Lucero is a professor of contemporary international policy, Argentine foreign policy and the inter-American system at the Universidad de Mendoza, Argentina. A member of COFEI (the International Studies Federal Council), representing the Cuyo region, and of SAAP (the Argentine Political Science Association), she previously worked at the Universidad de Buenos Aires (UBA) and the Universidad del Salvador (USAL) in Buenos Aires. She also teaches at Universidad Nacional de Cuyo (UNCuyo). Basing her research on a critical feminist international relations perspective, Mariel Lucero has published several chapters and articles on the armed forces and women in Latin America. She is currently working on women’s participation in Argentina’s foreign policy ministry.
RC01 – Committee on Concepts and Methods: Call for Papers and Award Competition

The next IPSA World Congress of Political Science will be held in Madrid from July 8 through 12, 2012. Like all other IPSA research committees, the Committee on Concepts and Methods is entitled to sponsor at least two panels. We encourage all committee members to submit proposals for individual papers on conceptual or methodological issues. C&M members may submit individual paper proposals through the IPSA 2012 conference website. Deadline: October 17, 2011.

Award Competition
The Committee on Concepts and Methods (C&M) is accepting submissions for its 2012 Award for Concept Analysis in Political Science. Co-sponsored by C&M and the Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE) in Mexico City, the award is presented every three years at the World Congress of the International Political Science Association (IPSA). The fourth C&M award will be presented at IPSA’s 2012 World Congress in Madrid for a scholarly work published between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011. A formal publication in any category may be submitted, including a book, a book chapter or a journal article. Only English-language publications will be considered.

The notion of “concept analysis” should be understood broadly to cover concept analysis, concept formation, conceptual innovation as well as fields of operationalization, measurement, and data collection. The winner will receive a cash award of US$1,000.

Submissions are open to authors, journal editors, and book publishers. We encourage self-nominations. When submitting the work of others, please make sure you have the author’s express consent.

All submissions must be mailed by December 31, 2011 (date as per postmark) and must include four paper copies of the work submitted, a brief justification (one paragraph), and the author’s mailing address, phone, fax and email. Please send one paper copy by standard mail to each member of the 2012 award committee and to the C&M chair:

Professor Bernhard Kittel (chair)
Zentrum für Methoden der Sozialwissenschaften
Ammerländer Heerstrasse 114-118
Carl-von-Ossietzky-Universität Oldenburg
D-26129 Oldenburg
Germany
Email: Bernhard.kittel@uni-oldenburg.de

Professor Amy Poteete
Department of Political Science
Concordia University
1455 de Maisonneuve Blvd. West
Montreal, QC H3G 1M8
Canada
Email: amypoteete@gmail.com

RC02 – Political Elites
In collaboration with RC37 (Rethinking Political Development) and its chair, Prof. Zillur Khan, members of RC02 will take part in a joint workshop on the multifaceted roles of elites and on transforming leadership in political development. The workshop takes place at Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida, from November 7 to 8, 2011. Prof. Oxana Gaman-Golutvina of MGIMO University in Moscow, currently president of the Russian Political Science Association, will serve as RC02’s chief representative.

RC03 – European Unification
IPSA RC03 is holding a joint international conference on “European Regulatory Governance: Developments and Change” together with the Danish Society of European Research. The conference takes place at the Copenhagen Business School in Denmark from October 27 to 28, 2011.

Its aim is to identify and analyze the challenges and dynamics at work in European regulatory governance, based on the following questions: What are the major institutional characteristics of European regulatory governance, and what forces are shaping these characteristics? What are the consequences of these developments and changes in relation to efficiency, effectiveness and legitimacy?

Sitting on the international program committee are Ken Endo (Hokkaido University, Japan), Susana Borrás (Copenhagen Business School, Denmark), Magali Gravier (Copenhagen Business School, Denmark), Carlos Closa Montero (CSIC, Spain), David Levi-Faur (Hebrew University of Jerusalem & the Freie Universitat Berlin), Patrick Le Galès (Sciences Po, Paris), Adriaan Schout (Clingendael Institute, The Netherlands) and Claudio Radaelli (Exeter University, UK).
RC10 – Electronic Democracy

In June 2011, RC10 presented a workshop on electronic direct democracy as part of “Twenty Years of Slovenian Statehood,” the conference held by the Slovenian Association of Political Science in Portoroz, Slovenia.

New information and communication technologies can play an important role in the evolution of public spaces. The Internet has lent renewed impetus to the worldwide growth of direct democracy. Political associations in countries like the Czech Republic make extensive use of online polls for internal democracy. Are new media largely a reflection of “symbolic politics”? The analysis of the socio-political impact of the Internet and the ensuing debate raised the following questions: Is there a virtual public sphere for deliberation? Are online discourses progressing from the expression of personal opinion to real deliberation? Also subject to critical scrutiny were online communications such as weblogs and petitions in Asia, America, Europe (Slovenia, Hungary, Russia, Portugal), with mixed results. (http://rc10.ipsa.org/)

RC11 – Call for Participants in a New Cooperative Project on Higher Education and Scientific and Technological Development

In today’s globalized world, all countries recognize the importance of developing a capacity for innovation in science and technology. Many states are considering new institutions to promote scientific and technological change, therefore, while others are considering various reforms.

Universities play a leading role in fostering and maintaining this innovative capacity by performing three vital functions. First, as research institutions, they give rise to new ideas, concepts and knowledge, all of which culminate in a range of technological outcomes. Second, they train scientists and engineers to design and implement innovations stemming from research activities. Third, they promote a climate of acceptance and offer recognition and prestige to people practicing innovation.

Not all universities perform these functions well, however. There are marked differences in the way universities train scientists and engineers, conduct research, and contribute to an innovation climate. There are issues, as well, surrounding the teaching curriculum, and broader questions concerning the kind of professionals we need to train, and the education our students should receive.

RC11 is organizing several panels on these and other issues for the 2012 World Congress, in cooperation with the American Political Science Association’s Science Policy Section and the Standing Group on Politics and Technology of the European Consortium for Political Research. Our goal is to build an epistemic community; if you’re interested, please contact me at joseph.szyliowicz@du.edu

RC12 – Biology and Politics

RC12 (Biology and Politics) sponsored one panel at the American Political Science Association’s annual meeting in Seattle from September 1 to 4, 2011. The committee also organized three panels for the Association for Politics and the Life Sciences meeting in Cincinnati, Ohio from October 14 to 16, 2011.

Representing RC12 were Albert Somit and Steven Peterson, co-editors of a volume in the Emerald Biology and Politics series titled Biology and Politics: The Cutting Edge. The book was published in April 2011 by Emerald Group Publishing, and most of its authors are members of IPSA RC12.

RC13 – Democratization in Comparative Perspective

The new executive committee members of RC13 – created at a business meeting during the 21st IPSA World Congress in Santiago – have been very busy. Executive committee members include: Professor Mario Sznajder of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem as chair, and Dr. Chuku Umezurike of the University of Nigeria (Nsukka, Nigeria) as secretary. Other committee members include Professors Dirk Berg-Schlosser, Wolfgang Merkel, Laurence Whitehead, Hans-Jürgen Puhle, Anja Mihr, and Dr. Anna Dimitrijevics. These committee members, in particular its chair and secretary, have kept close tabs on the research committee’s activities.

Our IPSA research committee has a fast-growing membership, and the new executive committee’s first order of business will be to update the membership roll. Members have now been contacted by mail to verify current membership, and efforts to increase membership are ongoing. Given that RC13 members do not pay a membership fee, the committee continues to look for sources of financing so that it can host panels. When these efforts bear fruit, the executive committee will apply for the stipend normally accruing from the IPSA executive. In the meantime, news bulletins have been issued to sensitize members to the importance of attending conferences.

As well, the executive committee is in the final stages of preparation for the 22nd IPSA World Congress in Madrid. Expectations are running high, and RC13 hopes to sponsor a number of independent and joint panels.
RC17 – Comparative Public Opinion

Research Committee 17 on “Comparative Public Opinion” was constituted at IPSA’s executive committee meeting in Seoul, South Korea, in April 2011. This new research committee was the brainchild of Dr. Marta Lagos, chair of the Global Barometer Survey Group, and Professor Leonardo Morlino, president of IPSA, and it was first conceived at the annual meeting of the Global Barometer Survey Group in Taipei, Taiwan, in October 2010. RC17 is extremely grateful for the support it receives from Academia Sinica, the Taiwan Foundation for Democracy, the Chinese Association of Political Science, the Asian Barometer Survey Group, and the Global Barometer Survey Group. All helped to provide the resources, infrastructure and inspiring creative environment that held sway at RC17’s founding conference.

Serving as chair of RC17’s executive committee is Professor Christian W. Haerpfer, first chair of politics and director of the European Centre for Survey Research at the University of Aberdeen (United Kingdom), and president of the Eurasia Barometer. The committee’s vice-chair is Dr. Marta Lagos, president of the Global Barometer Survey Group in Santiago de Chile, and chair of the scientific advisory committee of the World Values Survey Association (based in Stockholm, Sweden).

RC17’s Asia representative is Sandeep Shastri, pro vice chancellor of Jain University and director of the Centre for Research in Social Sciences and Education in Bangalore, India. Representing East Asia is Yun-han Chu, professor of political science at National Taiwan University, Distinguished Research Fellow at Academia Sinica, and coordinator of the Asian Barometer in Taipei (Taiwan). Representing Africa is Robert Mattes, professor of political science at the University of Cape Town, director of the Democracy in Africa Research Unit, and coordinator of the Afro Barometer in Cape Town and Stellenbosch (South Africa). Representing the Afro Barometer is Michael Bratton, University Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Michigan State University (USA). Representing Southern Europe and the Mediterranean Region is Juan Diez-Nicolas, professor emeritus of sociology at Complutense University, director of ASEP (Madrid, Spain), and permanent advisor to the executive committee of the World Values Survey Association. Representing Eastern Europe is David Rotman, professor of sociology at Belarus State University, director of the Belarus Sociological “Public Opinion” Service in Minsk (Belarus), and vice president of the Eurasia Barometer.

Representing the World Values Survey Association (WVSA) is Ronald Inglehart, professor of political science at the University of Michigan (USA) and president of the World Values Survey Association. And finally, representing the Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP) is Richard Gunther, professor of political science at Ohio State University (USA) and international coordinator of CNEP in Lisbon, Portugal.

RC21- Political Socialization and Education: From Krakow to Xuzhou

In spite of the impressive program on psycho-political socialization in the Internet age, not all RC21 members were able to attend the inter IPSA World Congress meeting at Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland, from June 23 to 25, 2011. The meeting was held at the new Institute of Journalism and Social Communication and was hosted in splendid fashion by Teresa Sasinska-Klas. In her keynote lecture, the conference chair highlighted current challenges in political socialization and political communication. Other lectures were dedicated to new media: Steen Sauerberg (University of Copenhagen, Denmark) gave a presentation titled “The Fall of Censorship: Cell Phones, the Internet and Social Media,” while Arkadiusz Zukowski (University of Warmia and Mazury in Olsztyn, Poland), presented a lecture on the Internet as a social and political tool in Poland. There were also presentations on political education: Lars Monsen (Lillehammer University College, Norway) gave a lecture on the struggle for participatory democracy in Norwegian schools, and Ingo Juchler (University of Potsdam, Germany) spoke about freedom, equality and human rights in the Internet age. On the topic of political socialization, Marion Reiser (University of Frankfurt, Germany) presented “Legislative Socialization of State Deputies.” Robert E. Gilbert (Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts) examined the role of leadership in a lecture examining Dwight Eisenhower’s commitment to peace. Christ’l De Landtsheer (University of Antwerp, Belgium) analyzed “the psychological profiles of populist politicians in the Low Countries.” And, in the area of public opinion formation, there were presentations by Marceli Burdelski (University of Gdansk, Poland) on the mass propaganda system in North Korea, and by Lieuwe Kalkhoven (University of Antwerp, Belgium) on the imagery of Geert Wilders.

The meeting gave rise to a vigorous debate on some burning issues, a debate that continued over dinner with live music at Ariel’s Restaurant in the Jewish Quarter. The closing lecture was given by Maria Magoska, director of the Institute on Media and Politics, Cooperation and Confrontation.

Subsequent RC21 inter World Congress meetings were held in Budapest (Hungary, 2004), Wuppertal (Germany, 2005), Antwerp (Belgium, 2007), Oslo (Norway, 2008), Aalborg (Denmark, 2010), and Krakow (Poland, 2011), and future destinations include Moscow (Russia, 2012) and Xuzhou (China, September 2013) thanks to Helen Shestopal (Lomonosov Moscow State University) and Song Ying-Fa (China University of Mining and Technology).

RC21 panels at the IPSA World Congress in Madrid (July 8 to 12, 2012) will focus on the following themes: international political socialization and its effects; democracy and education in the 21st century; and political or educational leadership: explanations for successes or failures. Paper proposals are still being accepted until October 17.
RC21 will continue its fruitful cooperation with RC29 (Psycho-politics) chaired by Paul Dekker (Tilburg University, The Netherlands).

RC21 is proud to report that the RC21-RC29 journal *Politics, Culture and Socialization* (Barbara Budrich Publishing), in just its second year of publication, has become the leading peer-reviewed journal in several countries, including Norway and Belgium.

Details on RC21’s activities and on *Politics, Culture and Socialization* are available at [www.politicalsocialization.org](http://www.politicalsocialization.org).

Christ'l De Landtsheer, chair RC21
Trond Solhaug, general secretary RC21

This workshop has drawn a terrific lineup of leading-edge scholars in this field of study. The preliminary workshop program and all paper abstracts are now available on our website at [www.ipsa-ecp.com](http://www.ipsa-ecp.com). The workshop sessions will break down as follows. All sessions are open to the public.

**Sat. July 7 Panel Thematic topic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>Thematic topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30-11.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The concept and measurement of electoral integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-01.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The cause of electoral malpractices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-01.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Challenges of electoral integrity in Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.00-02.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Buffet lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.00-03.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Keynote address: Professor Stephen Stedman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.00-04.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The impact on citizens and democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.00-04.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Challenges of electoral malpractice in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.15-05.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The implications for public policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electoral integrity – or rather, the lack thereof – presents a major challenge for societies throughout the world. It can take the form of flaws in the execution of elections, which raise issues of transparency, accountability, accuracy and ethical standards. Problems related to integrity can influence all stages of the electoral process from voting procedures, boundary delimitation, voter education and registration, party/candidate registration, campaigns, media, financing, and voting and vote counting, to the final declaration of the results.

Challenges to electoral integrity stem from a range of malpractices deemed to violate international standards, with varying degrees of severity; they include practices that fail to respect basic political rights and civil liberties; undermine the independence of electoral commissions; restrict ballot access; repress opposition forces; limit fair and balanced access to campaign finance resources; disenfranchise citizens; coerce voters; buy votes; manipulate election rules; limit campaign news; generate fraudulent ballot counts; and prevent legitimate victors from taking office.

Further details on this event, including the exact location and downloadable copies of workshop papers, will be posted at our website at [www.IPSS-ecp.com](http://www.IPSS-ecp.com). Colleagues and students alike are welcome to attend.

Pippa Norris and Donley Studlar

**RC23 – Elections, Citizens and Parties: Challenges of Electoral Integrity, Pre-IPSA Congress Workshop**

On Saturday, July 7, 2012 – the eve of the IPSA World Congress in Madrid, which runs from July 8 to 12 – IPSA-ECP is presenting a one-day workshop (also in Madrid) on the “challenges of electoral integrity.” The workshop is co-sponsored by International IDEA and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems.
RC24 – Armed Forces and Society: Visit to Ankara

RC24, Armed Forces and Society, held its triennial meeting in Ankara, Turkey, from June 17 to 19, 2011. A warm word of thanks goes out to Bilkent University for hosting the event. Some 100 scholars presented over 80 papers, and more than 20 panels were scheduled. Our Turkish scholars – many of whom are new members of RC24 – showed courage by taking on the controversial topic of civil-military relations in Turkey. The Ankara meeting continued the long-standing tradition of holding RC24 meetings all over the world. In the last decade alone, the committee has met in Santiago, Shanghai, Bucharest, and now Ankara. RC24 scholarship has focused on theoretical and applied research from regional and national perspectives, as well as practical research contributing to national policy.

RC24 scholars continue to be in demand as we address the relevant issues of the day. Look for a strong delegation of RC24 scholars at the 2012 Madrid World Congress. In the meantime, please visit our IPSA website to keep up with our active membership (http://rc24.ipsa.org).

Thanks go out to our outgoing president and chair, David Mares of the University of California at San Diego, for his strong leadership over the last three years, and best wishes to incoming chair Marybeth Ulrich of the U.S. Army War College and the RC24 officers and board members who will move this committee forward.

RC26 – Human Rights: Human Rights Conference in Seoul, South Korea

On June 16 and 17, the Research Committee on Human Rights (RC26) held a joint conference with the Korean Association of International Studies (KAIS) at the Plaza Hotel in downtown Seoul, with the focus on “war, peace and human rights after the Cold War.”

On the eve of the official opening, KAIS members hosted a lovely Korean-style dinner for participants from RC26, thus further consolidating ties between the two groups.

A total of nine panels were held over two days, and 25 presentations were given by participants from 11 different countries, with about half given in English and half in Korean. Day 1 saw Anja Mihr of Utrecht University chair “Human Rights After the End of the Cold War.” She was followed by Chin-Sung Chung of Seoul National University (chair of “Peace and Human Rights on the Korean Peninsula I”) and Yong Soon Yim of Sungkyunkwan University (chair of “Peace and Human Rights on the Korean Peninsula II”). Thursday’s work sessions culminated in an excellent dinner, with congratulatory remarks by Jae-Chang Kim, chair of the Council on Korea-U.S. Security Studies.

Day 2 (Friday, June 17) featured a full day of panels. The incoming chair of RC26, Füsun Türkmen of Galatasaray University in Turkey, chaired “Regional Dynamics and Universal Values: Between Contradiction and Interaction.” He was followed by Euikon Kim of Inha University, who chaired “Korea’s Foreign Policy during the Post-Cold War Era: Globalization, Diversification and Public Diplomacy.” After a delicious luncheon courtesy of KAIS, the afternoon panels saw Tom De Luca of Fordham University chair “Massive Violations: Repair the Past and Preempt the Future”; he was followed by Hyung Kook Kim of Chung-Ang University, chair of “Korea’s Accommodation of New International Relations Theories During the Post-cold War Era.” After a well-deserved coffee break, RC26 chair Zehra Arat of Purchase College chaired “Human Rights from a Comparative Perspective,” and Dalchoong Kim of Yonsei University chaired “Peace and Stability on the Korean Peninsula During the Post-Cold War Era.”

That evening, KAIS hosted a fine dinner for conference participants. Both organizations were pleased with the presentations, the work of the discussants and the level of cooperation. RC26 members thanked the KAIS for graciously hosting the dinner, and a special word of thanks went to Mikyoung Kim of Hiroshima City University for her excellent coordinating role. Both groups look forward to working together again in the future.

RC26’s day did not end there, however, as its executive committee worked well into the evening on future plans, including participation in next year’s IPSA World Congress of Political Science in Madrid, Spain.

On Thursday, June 16, Prof. Sung-joo Kim, president of KAIS, and Prof. Zehra Arat, chair of RC26, got the conference off to an excellent start with their opening remarks. Also offering heartfelt congratulations were Dr. In-Taek Hyun, South Korea’s minister of unification, and Prof. Yoshiko Kojthe, president of the Japan Association of International Relations.
RC28 – Comparative Federalism and Federation

RC28 on Comparative Federalism and Federation will be convening the following panels for the XXII IPSA Congress in Madrid, Spain from July 8 to 12, 2012:

1) “Implications of Public Attitudes for Boundaries of National, Regional and Local Power in Federal and Non-Federal Systems” (chair: John Kincaid, Meyner Center, Lafayette University, USA)

2) “Stability of Federal Systems” (chair: Arthur Benz, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany)

3) “The Jurisdictions of Federalism or the Politics of Scale: Opportunities for Women’s Activism” (co-organized with RC 19) (co-chairs: Melissa Haussman, Carleton University, Canada, and Sonja Walti, American University, USA)

4) “Accommodating Diversity Reconsidered: Shifting Territorial, functional or Cultural Boundaries in Democratic States” (co-chairs: Bettina Petersohn, Technische Universität Darmstadt, Germany, and Nathalie Behnke, University of Konstanz, Germany)

Other RC28 panel sessions will be added by the RC panel deadline for the Congress.

Several RC28 members attended the ECPR congress in Reykjavik, Iceland from August 25 to 27, 2011. Section 43, Panel 603 on “balancing and rebalancing federal systems” featured presentations by RC28 members and was convened and co-chaired by Sonja Walti and Tom Lancaster of the RC28 executive committee.


Finally, in the near future we will be establishing a nominating committee charged with selecting nominees for the new RC28 executive committee for 2012 to 2015. It will be chosen via an email ballot to our paid members shortly after the Madrid Congress.

RC30 – Comparative Public Policy News

RC30 has been very active since its creation at the IPSA executive meeting in early May. The committee has established a mailing list and webpage presence at:

http://rc30.ipsa.org/

and a Facebook page at:

www.facebook.com/pages/Research-Committee-on-Comparative-Public-Policy-RC30/126634394081943

Persons interested in comparative public policy research are invited to notify us of any events or activities relevant to the research committee. Please contact interim RC30 chair Michael Howlett (howlett@sfu.ca) to join the mailing list and (especially) visit our Facebook page for updates on events and happenings of interest to the committee.

RC30 is co-sponsoring a conference in Hong Kong in October 2011 on centralization and decentralization dynamics in Asia and elsewhere (see our webpage or Facebook page for details). The committee is also actively preparing for the Madrid 2012 Congress. With other IPSA RCs, we will be co-sponsoring several panels on comparative development policy and comparative policy work, and we’ve issued several calls for papers and panels on the following topics:

1. Post governance: bringing the state back in again
2. Regulation and the regulatory state
3. Policy work in comparative perspective (jt with RC32)
4. Governance, markets and regulation
5. Re-centering decentralization
6. Policy advisory systems

Paper submissions on these topics will be accepted until IPSA’s October 17 deadline.

Please note that conference papers from these panels will be considered for a $500 cash award for “best comparative public policy paper” (presented with the International Comparative Policy Analysis Forum). As well, authors are encouraged to publish in the scholarly journals affiliated with IPSA RC30: the Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis (Routledge) and Policy and Society (Elsevier). Please visit the RC30 webpage for details.

Michael Howlett
M. Ramesh
Giliberto Capano
Darryl Jarvis

RC30 Interim executive committee
RC32 – Public Policy and Administration Conference

RC32 recently held a highly successful conference in Dubrovnik, Croatia on “policy development in different cultural contexts.” Hosted by the University of Zagreb's Centre for Advanced Academic Studies, located on the outskirts of the Old City, this event was well attended by scholars from both “transitional polities” in the Western Balkans (the former Yugoslavia) and beyond. A number of scholarly and professional perspectives were presented. The conference was co-sponsored by RC5 on Local Government, the Russian Political Science Association’s Research Committee on Public Policy and Governance, the Croatian Political Science Association, and the Croatian Institute of Public Administration.

Discussion topics ranged from analytical constructs to empirical reports, and local, national and continental perspectives were explored. Special focus was placed on policy as a field of specialized activity and the emergence of “policy analysts” as a professional group. The involvement of non-government groups in the policy process was discussed, as was the impact of official recognition on the character and mode of operation of so-called policy analysts.

Several papers focused on the modernization of government processes in the Western Balkans and the impact of external models on this process – OECD standards, expectations of aid donors, and above all, specific EU requirements for candidate countries: the acquis communautaire.

Detail are available on the conference website www.politologija.hr/hr.konferencije.php?id=34&konf=3

RC34 – Quality of Democracy: New Research Committee!

Objectives

This new RC will bring a fresh approach to the empirical analysis of democratic quality by giving scholars a new “space” in which to meet and share methodological and empirical works. This approach is meant to deepen our understanding of democratic mechanisms and processes of change, subversion, anchoring, and so forth. A special workshop and panels will be presented at the 2012 IPSA World Congress in Madrid.

Analyses of democratic regimes have long been part of the core agenda in comparative politics; the last four decades have witnessed a far broader and more comprehensive development coinciding with the so-called third wave of democratization. While research on transitions from democracy, favourable and unfavourable conditions, and factors for enduring democratic governance has been immeasurably enriched, we are only beginning to explore quality of democracy as a new area of academic inquiry.

RC34 has examined recurring problems with democratic regimes, including issues related to government accountability, responsive policy-making as a tool for more accountable government, and the relationship between equality and freedom. These research questions, recast, have profoundly reshaped the traditional empirical theory of democracy, which is largely based on the worldwide expansion of democracy in the last 60 years, particularly since the early 1970s. They’ve also sparked renewed interest in classic political science and in issues related to elections, parties, civil society, institutions and institutional design, decision-making, policies and policy implementation.

In a further step, we intend to focus on new questions and perspectives: What are the reasons for a declining quality of democracy, and what are the outcomes? What aspects are essential to improving democratic quality? Recent historical and systemic analyses of democratic regimes found common ground in the democratic quality assessment stream. RC34 has adopted an innovative analytical and methodological approach: as well as integrating qualitative and quantitative analyses into the assessment of democracy, the committee will stand firm in its epistemological commitment to adopt a comparative perspective with all types of democracy.

Taking into account the political shift toward democracy since 1974, the new research committee will explore potential theoretical developments in an effort to respond to a number of questions which have yet to be adequately answered.

RC34 initiatives will cover networking, research coordination, and dissemination. For details please visit http://rc34.ipsa.org/ or contact Chairs Marianne Kneuer (mkneuer@t-online.de), Jean-Michel De Waele (jmdewael@ulb.ac.be), José Álvaro Moisés (jamoises@gmail.com) or Vice-Chair Daniela Piana (d.piana@unibo.it).
RC37 – Rethinking Political Development & RC2 – Political Elites Joint IPSA Workshop

A joint two-day IPSA workshop sponsored by RC2 and RC37 will be hosted by Rollins College, Florida, USA, on November 7 and 8, 2011. The theme of the workshop is “Rethinking Political Development: Multifaceted Role of the Elites and Transforming Leadership in Political Development.”

Nobel Laureate Dr. Muhammad Yunus and Rahul Gandhi, Secretary General of India’s ruling Congress Party, have been invited to serve (respectively) as chief guest and inaugural speaker. Rainer Eisfeld, Sushma Yadav, John Higley, Theodore P. Wright Jr., Oxana Gaman-Golutvina, Rounaq Jahan, Shelley Feldman and Robert Wirsing have all graciously agreed to present keynote speeches and/or papers and to serve as panel chair-discussants. Additional keynote addresses will be given by Professor Oxana Gaman-Golutvina, president of Russian Political Science Association, representing RC02, and Zillur R. Khan, chair of RC37, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Wisconsin and adjunct professor of international affairs at Rollins College.

Presenting papers are Yan Vlasianskiy, Mark Farha, Hassan Mneimneh, Vincent Reyes, Olanrewaju Oloaye, Flavio Gaitan, Neil Padukone, Amna Yousaif Khokar, Deeptima Shukla, Dawood Afzal, Dr. Sharma, Isil Turkan and Tanditae, Panji Anugrah Permana and Albert Ludwigs.

RC38 - Politics and Business: Workshop in Konstanz

RC38 held its mid-congress workshop at the University of Konstanz, Germany on June 3 and 4, 2011, on the theme of “business and sustainability.”

Volcker Schneider and Achim Lang served as our generous hosts, with financial support from the Fritz Thyssen Stiftung, which stepped in to support participation by graduate students. The venue – the Bischofsvilla on the shores of the Rhine – was superb, especially as attendance, for many, entailed a pleasant walk through the old city.

Papers were presented on various aspects of corporate sustainability, including theoretical underpinnings as well as economic, environmental, social and cultural aspects of sustainability. Presenters included Karsten Ronit (University of Copenhagen), Tony Porter, (McMaster University), Aynsley Kellow and Richard Eccleston (University of Tasmania), Claudius Wagemann (L’Istituto Italiano di Scienze Umane), Wyn Grant (Warwick University), Volker Schneider, Achim Lang and Thomas Malang (Konstanz), Harvey Feigenbaum (George Washington), Nicole Helmerich (Freie Universität Berlin) and Rachel Barlow (Robert Gordon University).

The papers sparked a lively discussion, with more issues raised than resolved and RC members vowing to carry the debate forward to Madrid.

The workshop concluded with an administrative session. On the agenda: plans for the Madrid Congress and the future governance of the RC, which was assisted greatly by the presence of Wyn Grant, program chair for Madrid 2012.

RC47 Local-Global Relations

New RC47 Vice-Chair

The RC47 board appointed Nataliya Velikaya temporary vice-chair of RC47. Velikaya is chair of ISA working group 1. Her appointment will be confirmed by ballot after the next RC47 meeting in October 2011.

Upcoming IPSA RC47 meeting

October 27 to 29, 2011, Vienna

The next RC47 meeting will be held in Vienna in conjunction with the 2011 CEPSA (Central European Political Science Association) conference:

- Multilevel politics:
  - Intra- and inter-level comparative perspectives

The committee will hold two sessions:

I. Theoretical implications of cross-national comparative studies of local leadership chair: Jerzy J. Wiatr, Poland

II. Perspectives of the future comparative studies of local-global relations chair: Nataliya Velikaya, Russian Fed.

RC48 – Administrative Culture

RC48 on “Administrative Culture” has a new chair, Dr. Rosamund Thomas, director of the Centre for Business and Public Sector Ethics in Cambridge, UK. Current members and people interested in joining RC48 are invited to contact Dr. Thomas at info@ethicscentre.org. Please include full details, contact information, and a photograph for the new RC48 website.

This research group will host panels at the 2012 World Congress of Political Science in Madrid on two separate themes: ethics in public administration, including corruption/anti-corruption; and current and future issues in public administration as they affect administrative culture.

Persons who wish to present a paper on either of these themes at the Madrid 2012 World Congress of Political Science are invited to contact Dr. Thomas. If business ethics and anti-corruption come under your field of interest, please see Rosamund’s new edited book, titled Business Ethics (ISBN: 978-1-871891-04-1). For details please contact Dr. Thomas at the email address cited above or go to www.ethicscentre.org.
HENRY TEUNE IN MEMORIAM (1936-2011)

Sjur Bergan, Council of Europe
At the Conference on “Reimagining Democratic Societies”, Oslo, June 27 – 29, 2011

A s we set about reimagining democratic societies and the con-
tribution of higher education to this enterprise, our task, we
realize, is a bittersweet one.

Bittersweet because we must remember and bid goodbye to our
good friend, Professor Henry Teune of the University of Pennsylvania, who passed away on April 12; and because, to remember
Henry is to remember why we’re here. The passing of a good friend
and an important member of the academic community is a sad
occasion, yet our burden of sorrow is made lighter by the knowl-
dge that Henry left behind a life’s work that will outlive not only
him but also us. In the immortal words of the 19th century
Norwegian poet Per Sivle (who died young), “The banner remains
standing even if the man has fallen.” Merket det stend om mannen
han stupte.

Henry’s importance to this conference cannot be underestimated: without him, this
event would not have taken place. Henry Teune was instrumental in fostering coop-
eration between academic circles in the U.S. and Europe. His early work included a joint
project on the university as a place of civic action, and ultimately, his efforts prepared
the way for our work on the role of higher education in building our democratic cul-
ture – without which our institutions would not work.

As a pre-eminent political scientist, Henry held prominent positions in professional
political science associations in the U.S. and beyond. His publications were widely read,
studied and quoted. Henry Teune also recognized the importance of democratic insti-
tutions; more importantly, he recognized that institutions alone will not lead to democracy unless they’re
founded on a culture of democracy. Henry’s interest in empirical
and comparative studies on local-global relations spawned a life-
long fascination with Europe and a strong commitment to trans-
Atlantic cooperation. From his unique vantage point as a faculty
member at the same prestigious research university – Penn – for 50
years, Henry was a tireless explorer of our world.

Europe, the continent Henry became intimately familiar with
through his research, was also the land of his forebears. He was
both acutely aware of and proud of his Swiss and Dutch roots dat-
ing back to the mid-17th century, and as a third-generation
American, he stood as an example of what it means to be American
in the most positive sense.

Henry Teune was a leader when it came to making the link between
political science and human rights. He was convinced that while
countries and states are important, neither intellectual curiosity nor
democratic culture stops at national borders. It was no coincidence,
therefore, that Henry set his gaze on Europe and Asia (the home of
his wife) and ultimately on the Council of Europe. With his good
friend and long-time research partner, Krzysztof Ostrowski, who is
with us at this conference, Henry was persuaded that the study of
higher education – more specifically how it promotes the values
and practices of democracy and human rights – was crucial to
improving democracy itself.

Henry Teune helped create and develop the International
Consortium jointly responsible for organizing today’s conference.
He played a vital role in linking the Consortium to the Council of
Europe’s higher education program, and for several years he was
an observer on the Council’s Steering Committee for Higher
Education and Research. He had prepared to be with us in Oslo, but alas it was not
meant to be. We can best honour his memo-
ry by continuing on the path Henry blazed
for us.

A shining example that no human being is
the mere sum of his positions and publica-
tions, Henry proved himself to be a great
scholar as well as a fine human being. He
was always ready to listen, yet he also held
strong convictions. Any person who be-
lieved that business schools are the future of
higher education would find his match in
Henry. Any mention of Wharton – the insti-
tution where he began his career – would
evoke the firm assertion that higher educa-
tion is about values more than about value
added.

Henry passed away on April 12, 2011. I can scarcely bring myself
to believe it was pure coincidence that on April 12, the U.S. com-
memorated the 150th anniversary of Fort Sumter, which marked
the start of American Civil War. This symbolizes Henry’s life and
work, for as a scholar and a human being Henry worked hard to
overcome divisions created by politics and economics, by institu-
tions and man-made borders, by a culture of the past and a lack of
faith in the future.

As we begin our two days of reimagining democratic societies,
please join me in a moment of silence to fondly remember Henry
Teune – a scholar and humanist, an American and a citizen of the
world, a human being, and a friend we will sorely miss. Let us
prove, through this conference and the hard work that follows, that
even if Henry is no longer with us, the mark he made and the
course he set live on.
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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 ‘BRICs’ 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 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.

The nation-state remains the key crucible of power in terms of elections, public policy and in international negotiations, but it faces new challenges. 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.

The main congress themes are:

- Comparative Politics and Political Institutions
- Gender, Religion, Identity
- International Political Economy
- International Relations
- Political Behavior
- Political Theory
- Public Policy

The co-winner of the 2009 Nobel Prize for Economics, political scientist Elinor Ostrom, will be amongst the key note speakers. We invite you to share your research on the reshaping of power and shifting boundaries and visit the web section regularly for more information. Don’t miss this great opportunity to present your work to peers, learn from others and meet political scientists from around the world.

Submissions
Paper proposals, including a brief abstract of 1500 characters should be submitted by October 17, 2012 via IPSAs online submission process. For more information on the congress, please visit the IPSA website http://www.ipsa.org/events/congress/madrid2012/congress-theme. If you have questions regarding the congress, please write to madrid2012@ipsa.org.