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Throughout the world, governance issues have become increasingly crucial in recent years in all sectors and at all organizational levels – social, economic, cultural, administrative and political.

Members of IPSA’s Executive Committee unanimously decided that “Challenges of Contemporary Governance” would therefore serve as the theme of IPSA’s 23rd World Congress of Political Science, which takes place in Montreal from July 19 to 24, 2014.

Political scientists are frequently viewed not as mere analysts of political matters, but as something akin to engineers shaping the organization of power. They are regularly consulted and solicited for expert advice when new organizational and power-sharing forms and modalities are contemplated or programmed.

Globalization has profoundly altered the work of political scientists, intensifying communication and dialogue on issues pertaining to the manner in which communities, societies, nations and the world are governed.

The current economic situation, marked by growing economic tensions and budget austerity, renders the invention or reinvention of systems of governance that much more vital – but also politically delicate.

The goal of this World Congress of Political Science is to consider contemporary developments related to governance in the face of numerous challenges:

➢ Political, economic and social systems have become increasingly fragmented, making global strategic initiatives even more complex;
➢ The range of values, attitudes and behaviours exhibited by individuals and groups has contributed to greater and more diverse demands for inclusion and participation on the part of citizens, groups and organizations;
➢ As the structure around the representation of interests is further broadened and differentiated, the governance system becomes more complex and progressively less intelligible, decipherable and accountable to lay persons;
➢ There is a growing risk that the democratic quality of our political systems will deteriorate as a result of the rising influence and decision-making capacity of technical-administrative and technocratic experts.

Our hope is that this congress, by promoting comparative analyses and methodological experimentation, will allow us to consolidate and recognize leading expertise on the performance of various forms of governance by taking stock of multiple sectors and organizational types.

This event will also allow the political science community to take a close look at competitive uses and strategies for dissemination, import-export, and even the imposition of models of governance, for example in the name of the “good governance” upheld by international institutions.

Faced with these challenges, a global, comprehensive and multi-tiered approach may be used to study the complex phenomenon of governance, from the local association or political party to the international community, via regional integration or the national regulation of the economic sector. In favouring an approach to political science that is resolutely open to opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration, we must ensure that theoretical frameworks and empirical approaches applied in the northern and southern hemispheres are shared with developed and developing countries alike.

This World Congress will focus mainly on generating the greatest possible number of concrete, innovative answers to questions and concerns raised by citizens as well as political, associative and socio-economic representatives and policy-makers working diligently to improve the quality of governance.

By virtue of the constant alternation, indispensable to the development of research in political science, between theoretical questions and empirical investigations, this World Congress will be enriched by multiple currents and contributions with a focus on the following areas:

• International political economy
• International relations
• Public policy analysis and administrative science
• Comparative politics and institutions
• Gender politics and policy
• Urban and regional politics and policies
• Political attitudes and behaviour

The World Congress in Montreal should enable us to meet at least three objectives, therefore. First, this type of scientific event, traditionally, is meant to bring together the international political science community – with its many currents, traditions and specificities – from the world’s five continents. In the second instance, our objective is to present and challenge current studies on the theories and dynamics of transformation in the area of governance, and in this regard Mikhail Ilyin, José Álvaro Moisés, Andre Melville and Dirk Kotzé have already set out the broad strokes in this issue. And finally, in Montreal and Québec, where universities and scientific institutions have long played a central role in achieving an in-depth understanding of government and governance, IPSA and its members, through news conferences and articles, will widely transmit and disseminate the most probative research results in political science on this essential theme for the future of our societies.
The English word governance is as old as government itself. Both the term and the advent of government date back to the late 14th century, and both are derived, respectively, from the Old French words gouvernance and gouvernement (Étymologie du terme). Initially, their meanings were very close if not identical, with each referring to acts and/or the manner of governing. By the mid-16th century, however, gouvernement denoted a “system by which something is governed,” and by the early 18th century it further evolved to acquire the meaning of a “governing authority.” In time, though, the term governance gradually became marginalized, and by the 19th century it was deemed to reflect an incipient archaism. For the next 100 years, it would hardly be used as a political term. Dictionaries would define government in terms of a governing authority, including the political order and its institutional framework, while governance was treated as the agency and process of governing, and was often viewed as archaic.

With the third wave of democratization in the mid-1970s, the usage of these terms began to change once again, partly in response to the notion sustainable development (Brundtland 1987) and increasing globalization. Now, the term governance, with its emphasis on the process and manner of governing, seemed well suited to embody the shift from a model of asymmetrical top-down government to an alternative vision based on reciprocal partnerships intended to achieve political order. The new emphasis on interaction and networking was applied to many issues and research fields, including national and sub-national policy-making (Kooiman 1993, Rhodes 1997), European integration policies (Bulmer 1994), international relations (Rosenau and Czempiel 1992), public management and new institutional economics. In 1995, the journal Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations was first published by Lynne Rienner Publishers. Meanwhile, organizations such as the IMF, NGOs, the UN and its agencies, the World Bank and international media were quick to pick up the term and use it in a variety of ways. Together with its derived term, good governance (Poluha 2002), the catch-all term governance has since become a buzzword in the vocabulary of policy and administrative reform in developing countries dependent on support from international development agencies (Mkandawire 2010). For a more scholarly overview of the notion of governance, see Mayntz (1998) and Rhodes (2007).

Together, these developments and the emergence of multiple nuances of meaning have served to further broaden the meaning of governance. One might expect, based on the traditional view of terminological systems steeped in classical genus-differentia and Arbor Porphyriana principles, that clearly defined and coherent concepts would give rise to clear and distinct sets or hierarchies of meaning. But this has hardly been the case with the term governance. A host of fuzzy meanings have resulted in an undifferentiated semantical overlap. The various meanings ascribed to the term share a Wittgensteinian family resemblance, and collectively they make up an umbrella concept. The term, nowadays, may be seen to encapsulate a variety of modes of coordinating individual action, or basic forms of social order. This development became particularly prominent in the new institutional economics. Its major proponent was Oliver Williamson (1996; 2005). In political science, an attempt was made to differentiate orders of governance from highly specific to so-called metagovernance (Stoker 1998; Jessop 2003; Sorensen 2006; Kooiman & Jentoft 2009; Evans 2010).

Sadly, in mainstream empirical research a different approach has since prevailed, marking a limited trend toward specificity. Academics and think-tanks have concentrated on highly specific varieties of governance, typically operationalized by a selective albeit arbitrary constellation of shared features. Often, these selections have been motivated by the availability of sound empirical data rather than theoretical considerations. Still, these efforts produced sound research, and examples include the Worldwide Governance Indicators, World Bank Governance Surveys, Sustainable Governance Indicators, International Country Risk Guide, the Quality of Governance Institute in Gothenberg, and the Bertelsmann Transformation Index.

Similarly, the overwhelming majority of our colleagues in mainstream political science would refute both the Williansonian notion of governance modes and the orders of governance approach in favour of a very specific notion of governance meant to operationalize it into an empirical research device. A typical example might be a research track on good-enough governance. This highly focused notion is defined as a “condition of minimally acceptable level of government performance and civil society engagement that does not significantly hinder economic and political development and that permits poverty reduction initiatives to go forward.” (Grindle 2004, p. 526)

This research strategy maximizes contextual factors and properties of governance, summarizing them into a more or less coherent pattern corresponding to a particular research question.

A similar and perhaps more promising venture is a notion of better or enhanced governance (Unsworth 2006). As its proponent Michael Chibba claims, “... the general term ‘enhanced governance’ denotes any and all endeavours to improve governance, including ‘good governance’ and ‘good enough governance’ though each of these two specific terms will continue to be used sparingly, and only where appropriate.” (Chibba 2009, p. 84) Impressive results obtained using a better governance approach stem mainly from research projects undertaken at the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex (GOVERNANCE 2007; An Upside-down View of Governance 2010).

Meanwhile, the US Governance Project at Stanford University’s Center on Democracy, Development and Rule of Law has launched another promising study on a specific brand of governance. Francis Fukuyama justly examines notions of governance along dimensions of capacity and autonomy as part of a state-centered vision (Fukuyama 2013), marking a visible departure from the state-society approach of the 1980s. Empirically, his efforts are amply justified by a highly operational research tool for knowing more about a narrower notion of governance.
The upcoming 23rd World Congress of Political Science should provide opportunities to bring together a host of empirical projects on specific varieties of governance and to link disparate attempts to know more about less within a broader vision of basic forms of social order and modes of governance. We can only hope that this newfound knowledge produces a breakthrough in our understanding of how to shape a better world.

The Challenges of Research on Executive-Legislative Balance of Power

José Álvaro MOISÉS
Professor in the Department of Political Science and Director of the Center of Public Policy Research at the University of São Paulo
Member of the IPSA Executive Committee

A
fter the major expansion of democracy in the 20th century, the emergent political climate in the early blush of the 21st century presents a paradox. Recent decades have witnessed a surge in political discontent, dissatisfaction and mistrust in old and new democracies alike. On the one hand, many countries define themselves as democratic, even where democratic values have been slow to take root; conversely, democratization processes have also given rise to a considerable number of so-called “hybrids,” illiberal or not fully realized democratic regimes, and particularly assess-systemic analyses of democratic governance are allowed to take hold. Systemic analyses of democratic regimes, and particularly assessments of their quality, provide a rich and complex area of study. Arendt Lipshart, Guillermo O’Donnell, Leonardo Morlino and others, including Robert Dahl, have called attention to aspects directly or indirectly related to the quality of democratic governance. This new approach involves innovative analytical and methodological perspectives that call for qualitative and quantitative analyses, and these allow us to compare all types of existing democracies and their respective political institutions.

Major features unique to democratic governance have helped us renew our efforts to carry out comparative analyses of political institutions. One of the most important outcomes of this development is the study of inter-institutional accountability — the obligation of elected political leaders to be accountable for their decisions. Holding them to account are institutions and collective actors with the expertise and power to control their behaviour. Inter-institutional accountability hinges on a legal system of checks and balances by various public institutions, which in theory must be autonomous and independent of government. In addition to a responsible and vigilant political opposition, this form of accountability, to be effective, requires a strong and independent legislative authority, along with well-established intermediary structures, including parties, independent media, and a network of active and informed civic organizations with shared democratic values.

Important as it is, the study of the balance of power between the executive and the legislature has acquired renewed theoretical relevance. Juan Linz has pioneered work in this area with his reflections on the inherent conflict between these powers under the presidential system. Other contributions, including those of Shugart and Carey (1992) and Mainwaring and Shugart (1997), focus on the legislative and non-legislative powers of the executive. A parallel body of literature has justly dealt with the current role of theory, policy and practice. World Economics, 10 (2), 79-108

executive and legislative powers are not homogeneous branches; instead, they involve varying degrees of power distribution. The focus of the debate has shifted, then, from the governing capability of the executive to the quality of governance in various democracies.

On the whole, these developments draw attention to the importance of measuring the powers of the legislature. Fish and Kroening (2009) and Montero (2009) have done just that. Of particular interest are the efforts by Fish and Kroening to establish a global index of legislative power: They brought their measurements to bear on hundreds of national parliaments in an effort to qualify the analysis of political institutions beyond the simple division of countries classified on the basis of their form of government, be it parliamentary, presidential or mixed. They argue that differences in the distribution of institutional power can exist within each of these forms of government, thus alerting us to the need to refine indicators for measuring power distribution under democratic governance.

The work of Montero (2009) constitutes another promising contribution in this area. In essence, her research sample – which is quite theoretical and involves in-depth analysis – covers Latin American case studies. Montero’s chief aim is to explain the varying degrees of legislative activity in Latin America (participation and success) through the use of institutional variables and policy indicators. Thus, her Institutional Legislative Power Index (IPIL) is intended to serve as an explanatory variable of legislative activity. The index is composed of a variety of topics, including parliamentary initiatives, legislative proceedings and the effectiveness of parliaments, and regular legislative processes. These topics are meant to correspond to different stages in the legislative process, such as agenda-setting, the exclusive power of committee-based initiatives, the relationship between lower and upper houses, and the existence and treatment of vetoes. All these variables are essentially drawn from constitutions and legislative bylaws.

Ultimately, assessments of legislative power are a function of the kind of variables included in analytical models and the types of legislature to which they refer. Figueiredo and Limongi (2004), for their part, have shown that typologies such as those advanced by Polsby (1975) and Cox and Morgenstern (2002) – two of the best-known analytical models – are hampered by theoretical and empirical inconsistency owing to the fact that they are disproportionately anchored in two extreme examples of presidential and parliamentary systems: the English and the American. In contrast to American presidential systems, for example, Latin American systems are usually characterized as having too strong an executive and too weak a legislative, though this is not always the case. This suggests that the decision to choose indicators of legislative power should force us to consider the singularities specific to different forms of democratic regimes in order to contribute to the advancement of knowledge.

References

State Capacity, Quality of Governance and Regime Change

Andrei MELVILLE
Dean of the Department of Politics at National Research University’s Higher School of Economics (Moscow)

What kind of relationship exists between state capacity, governance, institutions and political regimes? What kind of state and state capacity are indispensable for democracy and democratization? Can democratization and state-building reinforce each other, especially during periods of radical regime change? Are levels of state capacity relatively stable or can they change during regime transformations? Why do developed democracies sustain good institutions with the rule of law, property rights, contract enforcement, low corruption, economic and political competition, freedom of press, etc? On the other hand, why do some autocracies have relatively good institutions where most authoritarian regimes have bad institutions? Do hybrid regimes and regimes in transition demonstrate lower state capacity and institutional quality than authoritarian ones, as some literature claims?

Multidimensional patterns of the relationship between state capacity, quality of governance and trajectories of regime transformations, in particular during the last decades – from the third to the fourth (post-Communist) and even the fifth (“colored revolutions”) “waves” – present us with a comprehensive field of theoretical and empirical research in comparative politics with a substantial potential to enrich our knowledge. Existing literature conceptualizes state capacity as a combination of available resources and institutions, the latter reflecting and being measured, in particular, by the quality of governance (using, for example, World Governance Indicators and other indices). Quality of institutions of governance may be used as an important variable for...continued p. 6
understanding patterns of regime change, although the direction of causality (endogeneity problem) is not obvious.

Though empirical findings may not be always consistent, arguments under discussion today vary from “stateness first” (democratization only after effective state-building) to “building the ship of state at sea” (state building and democratization as complements). Several empirical studies, building upon theoretical arguments by Linz and Stepan (1996), Tilly (2007) and others, reveal a J-curve link connecting levels of autocracy and democracy to levels of state capacity and implying that authoritarian regimes have higher state capacity than hybrid ones (Back and Hadenius 2008, Fortin 2010). This conclusion with important theoretical and political implications is, nonetheless, questionable in the light of recent empirical research using small-N (post-Communist) and large-N (including developing countries in general) samples. This research reveals that the argument about the J-curve link may present an unfounded generalization – modern autocracies (with the exception of a few, like Singapore or Qatar) do not demonstrate high levels of state capacity. Old and new dictators may be characterized as “roving” as opposed to “stationary” (in Olson’s terms); they are not motivated to provide public goods and create sound institutions. This empirical conclusion has special relevance to a variety of regimes in transition, ranging from defective democracies and hybrid regimes to new autocracies (especially post-Soviet ones).

Why is this so? A plausible answer may point at specific priorities of modern nondemocracies, particularly post-Soviet ones. Most of these autocratic (to varying degrees) regimes rely on the extraction of rents and do not need to provide high-quality institutions and state capacity to maintain status quo. A non-formal model of the “king of the hill” may help to illustrate this and visualize the main argument (see graphic). This model represents a monopolistic position of the new autocrat supported by client-elites who became the only “winners” in derailed or stuck post-Communist (post-Soviet) transitions. Hellmann’s (1998) “winners take all” argument, which emphasizes economic motivations to resist further reforms, is supplemented by the argument pointing at the crucial factor of political rent. Political rent, i.e. monopolistic control over political competition, provides the “king of the hill” and his inner circle with a guaranteed access to the extraction of economic rent. Political rent becomes a precondition for the economic one. As a consequence, there are no motivations to improve state capacity and the quality of institutions because competition, transparency, control of corruption, government efficiency, etc. would only endanger political and economic monopoly. Institutions of poor quality are “good” (useful) for the “king of the hill” since they perform exactly the function for which they have been created – to guarantee political and economic monopoly. Thus they reinforce an institutional trap for further reforms and preserve the immobility of the status quo. Under these conditions, systemic reforms improving state capacity and institutional quality are virtually impossible.

An important question remains, however: Are there hypothetical factors which could, nonetheless, lead to reforms under the “king of the hill” scenario? Comparative case studies of political transformations during the last four decades of all the “waves of democratization” suggest a variety of scenarios: Elite splits at the top; mass protest from the bottom; ascent of alternative elites aside; pressures from the global outside, etc. It remains to be seen (and analyzed) which of these and/or other factors and their combinations may provide impact on the “king of the hill” scenario. In any case, history does not know “eternal” kings.

Democratic and autocratic theories present notions concerning executive-legislative relations that are universal in nature. These depend largely on European, North American and Latin American experiences. The results of executive-legislative relations are often considered in the context of good governance, while their institutional entrenchment relates to the quality of democracy.

New approaches and practices are emerging in other regions, however. The African continent is not only home to a diversity of peoples, but also a broad spectrum of political cultures and approaches, including designs of executive-legislative relations. On the legislative side, distinctions between majority parties and government are difficult to maintain in many African states. This overlap means that government resources are often used for the purposes of political parties, including for election campaigns, while other parties are excluded. Even more problematic is the symbiosis between party and state, which stifles legitimate opposition by criminalizing it as unpatriotic. This has the effect of severely curtailing the balancing function of opposition parties. The privileges of the majority party become so valuable and zero-sum, therefore, that electoral contestation becomes mutually exclusive, with the stakes so high that election results are disputed and conflict often ensues. Angola (1992), Madagascar (2001), Kenya and Zimbabwe (2007 and 2008) and Côte d’Ivoire are a few examples.

Conversely, the executive in Africa is dominated by directly elected presidents. Presidential systems on the continent range from the purely presidential (Mozambique) to semi-presidential (most African states), and from a presidential-parliamentary hybrid (South Africa and Botswana) to parliamentary (Ethiopia, Lesotho and Mauritius). More often than not, the executive is regarded as the strongest component of the trias politica and is determined by the fact that the president largely depends not on government in general but more specifically
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Executive-Legislative Relations and Quality of Governance

Governance has become a problematic concept for those subject to the conditionalities of international financial institutions.

on support from security and intelligence services together with regional support. The military, for its part, is frequently dominated by people from a specific region, like the Makonde from Cabo Delgado in Mozambique, the Tutsis in Rwanda, and (previously) the Acholi in Uganda. Regional affiliations are indeed the main criteria for securing positions in the Kenyan executive.

In presidential and semi-presidential systems, the president, in theory, is directly elected and therefore not directly accountable to the legislature. A quality system, conventionally, depends in the first instance on the legislature; in the absence of an assertive legislature in several African states, however, the alternative could be a well-organized civil society and an independent judiciary to serve as watchdogs. With a few exceptions, such as South Africa and Ghana, the alternative, regretfully, is not well developed. Shugart (2005), for one, presents executive-legislative relations in the form of transactional relations among co-equal intra-state institutions. It may be argued that it is equally relevant for the alternative of executive-judicial plus civil society relations.

The fact that most presidents in Africa do not depend on the confidence of their parliaments has the effect of eroding the significance of parliaments. At the same time, the fact that the president is often from the same party as the parliamentary majority party – and that cohabitation is thus seldom required – means that the party’s majority depends in the first instance on the president’s popularity and not on the opposite, which would see the president depend on the party’s popular support. Only a few exceptions exist: In Zambia in 2001, the MMD retained the presidency but lost the legislature; in 2008, similar circumstances unfolded with ZANU-PF in Zimbabwe, while the MDC gained a parliamentary majority.

A relatively recent phenomenon spurring new dynamics in executive-legislative relations is the advent of a government of national unity, notably in South Africa, DRC, Sudan, Madagascar, Côte d’Ivoire, Zimbabwe and Kenya. In GNUs, conventional linear and vertical executive-legislative relations are normally converted into cross-cutting relations. The fact that the executive consists of rival parties for purposes of post-conflict stabilization and that it is mirrored in the legislature means that the cohabitation will be more likely in the future. This has the potential to establish new executive-legislative relations independent of a president-party or a party-government symbiosis.

Ultimately, though, what do these trends imply for the quality of governance and democracy in these states? Governance has become a problematic concept for those subject to the conditionalities of international financial institutions. Today, governance, in African states, is often confined to notions of corruption, transparency, budget deficits, sovereign debt and the size of the public sector – by implication, the “minimum state.” It does not really deal with the quality of government. Yet, the quality of democracy as perceived by Africans is not normally determined by procedural criteria but by quality of life (Human Development Index) and the Gini coefficient’s indication of socio-economic equality.

The result is that executive-legislative relations are judged not so much from a procedural or constitutional perspective, but rather as a means to an end. Thus, quality of democracy will trump quality of governance.

The Sixth Russian Congress of Political Science

The Sixth Russian Congress of Political Science was held at Moscow’s MGIMO-University from November 22 to 24, 2012. Under the theme “Russia in the Global World: Institutions and Strategies of Political Interaction,” the event drew over 1,300 participants from 65 regions of Russia, with representatives from over 100 state universities and 30 private universities, 17 institutes affiliated with the Russian Academy of Sciences, research institutes and think-tanks, and all 52 regional chapters of RPSA.

The event also had a distinctly international flavour. Some 65 foreign guests and participants from 33 countries took part, and a special session on international cooperation attracted representatives from international, regional and national associations. IPSA was officially represented by Secretary General Guy Lachapelle, Vice-president Teresa Sasinska-Klas and EC member Werner Patzelt.

The congress program was rich in diversity. Some 721 papers were presented, together with 186 sessions including 17 main-theme discussions, 67 subfield sessions, 24 special panels, 15 roundtable discussions, 12 project presentations, 21 research committees meetings and three plenary lectures.

The Third Forum of Young Political Scientists was an integral part of the congress, as students from 18 regions of Russia and four foreign countries presented 57 papers.

Discussions centred on the main theme – Russia in the world and its role in global development – as well as specific research issues raised by Russian universities and academic centres. The event provided further proof that Russian political scientists form a vibrant part of the international political science community and that they have a vital contribution to make to the advancement of our discipline.

The Second Polish Congress of Political Science in Poznań

The Second Polish Congress of Political Science took place on October 19 and 20, 2012 at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Over 1,000 participants from more than 30 countries – including from every region in Poland – took part in the activities offered as part of the event. The program was rich and well thought-out, with a full 100 sections and 1,070 papers presented.

The opening address was followed a special session on the interface between political science and politics. The second session dealt with practical considerations of political research and teaching, including financing and normative and organizational frameworks. The day’s final session concentrated on methodological issues and challenges facing political science in Poland and beyond. All plenary sessions were well attended and generated spirited discussions, with many people in the audience taking the floor. The debate contributed to a more in-depth understanding of the current state of political science in Poland.

The program for the second day featured numerous panel debates, two of which I was able to attend. The first was on methodology, the second on Russia or rather the Eurasian context of Russian politics. Both were so well attended that extra chairs had to be brought in. The debates were also rich in content. In the methodological session, for example, an ambitious project on the state of Polish political science was introduced and discussed. While the project is still in its infancy, it has already yielded impressive results.

A special session on the state of the art was also presented, with former IPSA vice-president Krzysztof Palecki serving as chair. Also giving a presentation was incoming ECPR chair Simona Piatoni, who had high praise for the São Paolo conference, pointing up prospects for greater cooperation between ECPR and IPSA.

On Day 1 and particularly on Day 2, I spent most of my time discussing prospective joint projects involving IPSA and the Russian PSA with Polish colleagues. There is plenty of room for Polish political scientists to become more involved in our RC activities, just as efforts should be made to heighten IPSA’s presence and that of political science in Polish journals and publications.
The ISSC is very pleased to announce that the next World Social Science Forum (WSSF) will take place in the Palais des Congrès of Montreal on 13 to 15 October 2013 and focus on the topic of Social Transformations and the Digital Age.

This forum is organised in partnership with a Canadian consortium led by the Montreal secretariat of the International Political Science Association (IPSA).

Information: www.wssf2013.org
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World Congress of Political Science 2012: Reshaping Power, Shifting Boundaries

The 22nd IPSA World Congress of Political Science held in Madrid from July 8 to 12, 2012 drew a record 3,081 participants, not including staff and exhibitors. Participants from 83 countries came to share their ideas and discuss the event’s main theme, “Reshaping Power, Shifting Boundaries.”

More than ever, women played a significant role in the event, representing 42% of registered participants. Students accounted for 19% of congress participants.

The Largest Program Ever!

A total of 5,254 paper proposals were submitted and close to 3,000 abstracts were accepted for the final congress program. Over the five busy days spanning our congress, some 609 panels and 2,285 papers were presented, making the 2012 program the largest ever!

Research committees played an important role in World Congress program, offering 377 cohesive panels on their respective areas of research, 24 of which were jointly organized by RCs with shared interests.

Papers presented in Madrid may be downloaded from IPSA’s new permanent Online Paper Room at http://paperroom.ipsa.org. Only papers submitted to the IPSA secretariat and presented at the World Congress are available online.

Travel Grants

IPSA offered a number of travel grants to assist researchers and young scholars from the Global South and developing countries with the travel costs associated with attending the World Congress. Some 35 candidates, 75% of whom were women from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe and Latin America, received grants ranging from US$500 to US$1,000.

Qualified candidates were selected based on IPSA’s traditional point system, which ensures that younger scholars, women, participants from developing economies and new applicants are favoured and given a chance to be part of the congress program.

What You Thought of the Event...

At the conclusion of the event, a satisfaction survey was posted online to help us learn more about our participants and their experience at this year’s congress. Of 3,081 attendees, some 912 (30%) completed the online survey, thus providing IPSA with important feedback and suggestions that will help the secretariat better plan future IPSA events. We learned that 71% of participants attended the World Congress for the first time, with 79% stating that the main reason for attending was to present a paper or take part in the congress program. Some 87% of participants were satisfied with the overall congress organization, and 94% were satisfied with the on-site registration process. There was a high level of satisfaction (93%) with the fantastic volunteers in orange shirts who provided friendly assistance throughout the congress.

...continued p. 12
program. Meanwhile, we are working on making the full program available in electronic format and in app form (web-based application).

Montreal 2014 - Lucky Winners!

By completing the survey, participants were automatically entered in a draw, with the winner receiving a 50% discount on registration for the 23rd World Congress of Political Science, which runs from July 19 to 24, 2014 in Montreal. We are pleased to announce that Dr. Erkki Berndtson of Finland was randomly selected the winner of the draw!

Madrid congress participants were also invited to enter an on-site draw for a chance to win a prize for the next World Congress. The lucky winner of the 2014 World Congress Registration and Tour Package is Ms. Marlene Elwell (Bilkent University, Turkey). Her prize from IPSA and Tourisme Montréal includes free congress registration and admission for two to Montreal’s Botanical Garden & Insectarium as well as the Biodôme and the Olympic tower.

We look forward to seeing you at the 2014 World Congress in Montreal!

### List of 83 countries represented
Top 10 marked in blue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Palestinian Territory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grand total** 3081
Klaus von Beyme: The Political Scientist as Global Scholar and Public Intellectual

Address Delivered at the Matthei Dogan Award Session, July 12, 2012, 22nd World Congress of Political Science, Madrid

Klaus von Beyme was nominated for the Matthei Dogan High Achievement Award by the German Political Science Association. The nomination was supported by 10 other national associations across Europe – from the Balkans to the Baltic, and from Spain to Russia – attesting to the high esteem in which Beyme is held. To quote a single sentence from the Hungarian Political Science Federation’s support letter, signed by its president Zsolt Enyedi: “Beyme’s works have socialized generations of scholars in political science.” Beyne’s lifetime achievement could hardly be characterized in more appropriate terms.

In analyzing the politics at play in relations between Madrid and Moscow, Klaus von Beyme once wrote that each country should be treated with as much empathy as his own, and this principle served to guide him. No wonder: Beyme is fluent in seven languages, and his works have been translated into 10 languages, including Chinese, Korean, Polish, Croatian, Slovenian, Italian, Greek and Spanish. He has written about political theories and systems, particularly those of the United States, Soviet Russia, Spain, Italy and Germany (there are 10 updated editions of his work on Germany), as well as variety of other subjects, including Central-Eastern Europe’s transition from communism, interest groups, political parties and comparative politics, and policy fields such as health, traffic, and residential construction. He has brought a sophisticated brand of political thought to bear on the relationship between political science and the social and cultural world around us, with a focus on architecture and art. Anyone intent on broadening their field of inquiry beyond the discipline’s traditional limits may draw inspiration from Mr. Beyne.

Beyme was the first West German exchange student to study in Moscow during the late 1950s, and he went on to distinguish himself as a Research Fellow at Harvard University’s Russian Research Center. Just two years ago, Lomonosov University made him Honorary Professor for his significant contribution to the development of political science and relations between the Moscow-based university and its German counterparts. In addition, Beyme served on the Research Council at the European University Institute in Florence for seven years. He was also a Fellow at both the Wissenschaftskolleg Berlin and at the Maison des Sciences de l’Homme in Paris. The holder of an honorary doctorate from Berne University in Switzerland and the former president of the German Political Science Association in the 1970s and IPSA in the early 1980s, Beyme is a rare example of the political scientist as global scholar and public intellectual.

A public intellectual has been defined as one who seeks to advance both knowledge and human freedom. Beyme has always been quite reticent to publicly acknowledge his fundamentally humanist orientation. On occasion, however, he has cited the vivid memory of fleeing the burning city of Breslau as a 10-year old boy, only to end up in the city of Halberstadt, which was also in flames. It’s no small wonder that he concluded his 1987 work on post-World War II architecture and urban development policies in two German states with a remarkably unequivocal sentence: “The surviving Germans’ sense of having escaped, in the Second World War, by the skin of their teeth needs to be transformed into the awareness that, in a Third World War, people would lose more than their cities’ visual identity.”

Even before he became IPSA President, Beyme strongly supported this idea of bringing the German Democratic Republic into the IPSA fold. At the time, East German delegates had to perform minor miracles just to attend IPSA conferences: They boarded their plane as jurists, economists or philosophers, but exited it as political scientists. “Change through closer ties” was Beyme’s oft-stated policy. He and Secretary General John Trent even found a face-saving formula that allowed the Republic of China – at least for half a decade – to join IPSA without alienating Taiwan.

About Beyme, colleague Wolfgang Merkel remarked that “his theoretical creativity has always been constrained by the scruples of his enormous historical and empirical knowledge.” Beyme’s 1994 work on System Transformation in Eastern Europe (translated into English and Korean) stands as a perfect example of a work saturated with conceptual and historical insight and sophisticated observations. Any such study would have looked at institution-building, social and ethnic cleavages and their effects on the establishment of political parties, and the daunting problem of synchronizing political and economic transformation, but Beyme did not stop there.

He provided an incisive analysis of “transformation without elite exchange” in the areas of administration, the economy, academia (with the exception of the former GDR), and in the politics of Albania, Bulgaria, Romania, Serbia and Russia, in particular, arguing that the notion of civil society, as a counter-ideology to socialism, reflected an anti-political stance and a lack of familiarity with economic matters among many intellectuals. In Beyme’s studied opinion, the notion’s idealistic features were poorly suited to the often harsh new political and economic realities. He identified nationalism as a much more potent force for political legitimation and psychological gratification under conditions marked by an economic downturn, and he correctly predicted that nationalism, for a considerable period, would fill the ideological vacuum. Beyme’s ironic account of ethnic policies under socialism “culminating in the right to establish folk dance groups” and their mobilizing post-1989 consequences, together with the emergence of new minority policies, is among the book’s most perceptive chapters.
In another masterful, tightly argued chapter linking the three dimensions of the political (polity, politics and policies), Beyme explored the complex processes steadily eroding the legitimacy of the socialist system. As he has emphasized time and again, however, the discipline absolutely failed to predict the collapse of existing socialism, and theories of totalitarianism, with their emphasis on terror and coercion, hindered rather than helped any attempts at assessing future developments. Different paradigms did not prevent their advocates from making false assumptions. Here, Beyme was characteristically candid: He himself preferred the interest-group approach pioneered by Gordon Skilling. Ever the skeptical realist, Beyme maintained then, and remains convinced to this day, that political science cannot predict processes on a macro level. The student rebellion, the oil crisis, the rise of fundamentalism: The discipline failed to forecast any of these developments. “Informed guesswork,” according to Beyme, is the best we can expect.

Published two years ago, Comparative Political Science, his latest book, features 21 articles and chapters from the past decade, divided into three sections: “Comparing Theories,” “Comparing Institutions,” and “Comparing Policies.” These pieces attest to Beyme’s undiminished intellectual curiosity and creativity. To cite but one example, the book includes a tightly structured review of five decades of German health policy covering the visions and conundrums, decisions and non-decisions, attempts at regulation and related obstacles, and the interplay of historical inheritances, institutional structures and organized interests. The ten pages devoted to these subjects are nothing short of brilliant.

Three of the book’s chapters focus on cultural and art policy. When Klaus von Beyme first wrote about culture and politics in 1987, he began with a book on the role of architecture and urban planning in the process of rebuilding the two Germanys after 1945, arguing that “no field of art is as strongly impregnated politically as architecture and urban development.” Similar works on German cultural policy followed; they included The Art of Power and the Countervailing Power of Art: Age of Avantgardes: Art and Society, 1905-1955; and Fascination of the Exotic: Exoticism, Racism and Sexism in Art.

The Art of Power and the Countervailing Power of Art contained the gist of Beyme’s thought on the relationship between art, polity and politics. I quote:

“Since the Renaissance, politics increased its autonomy by a symbiosis with art, which served the aesthetic legitimation of authority… In democracies with universal suffrage and parliamentary responsibility of governments, art and power abandoned that temporary symbiosis and began growing apart… Nowadays, aesthetical orchestration of politics pushes aside art as a technique for legitimating authority… To the extent that the state promotes art only marginally…, economics finds its way into art production.”

In a chapter on “Architecture in the Service of Awe and Intimidation,” Beyme identified early modern monumentalism as an expression of agonistic societal pluralism and subsequent 20th century sites for mass rallies of indoctrinated crowds as a distinguishing feature of totalitarian dictatorships. In another chapter on “The October Revolution’s Political Myths in the Arts,” he argued that “mythologizing the collective” was the revolution’s most important integrative mechanism, the lynchpin on which Stalin was later able to stage his show trials.

In 2008, Klaus von Beyme received the Schader Foundation Award, one of the most distinguished German awards presented to social scientists, for his contribution to the “dialogue between the social sciences and practical life.” Beyme’s work provides an enduring reminder not to settle for political studies in the sense of a reductionist science focused on the “management” of parliamentary and party government. Rather, political scientists should sharpen their minds and open their hearts in order to address pressing national, regional and global challenges that transcend the self-imposed confines of our discipline. In conclusion, I would like to refer to a single instance that speaks to the issues which a political science informed by Klaus von Beyme’s example might address more widely.

In his treatise on world poverty and human rights, Yale political philosopher Thomas Pogge argued that Western political and financial institutions are deeply involved in keeping the corrupt and oppressive rulers of impoverished states in power, since affluent democracies have an vested interest in securing access to natural resources and issuing lucrative loans. Pogge’s essays contain enough material to spark a debate, one that might incite those in the discipline to speak out in favour of a more just and equitable organization of political processes and institutions, both nationally and internationally.

I am profoundly convinced that awarding the Matthei Dogan Prize to Klaus von Beyme for his outstanding achievements will provide a powerful boost to the kind of political science which does not shy away from incorporating historical dynamics, societal conflicts, and embedded power relations, and which supports men and women – wherever they may live – in their quest to participate more freely and effectively in today’s political decision-making.
History of Political Science in Russia

Mikhail ILYIN
Professor at the National Research University - Higher School of Economics (Moscow)
IPSA Vice-President for Russia, Central and South Asia and the Middle East

Political science, as an academic discipline, first emerged in Russia during the Great Reforms of the 1860s and 1870s. Its development was bolstered by the emancipation of serfs, coupled with judicial and university reforms and an overall growth in civic activity. Its founding fathers – Boris Chicherin, Konstantin Kavelin, Alexander Stronin, Alexander Gradovsky, Alexander Vasilchikov and others – produced highly topical research on par with the political science emerging in Western Europe at the time. Two such examples are Edward Freeman’s seminal book Comparative Politics and Maxim Kovalevski’s Historical Comparative Method in Law. The next generation of Russian political scientists produced a number of ground-breaking works, such as Civilization and the Great Historical Rivers by Lev Mechnikov, Democracy and the Organization of political parties, and The Rights of Women. A Comparative Study in History and Legislation by Moisei Ostrogorsky. Prior to the First World War, political studies in Russia played an integral role in consolidating political science at the international level.

The Revolution and Civil War in Russia ushered in a new period of change. Some scholars would not survive the turmoil, while others went abroad. Those who stayed were unable to pursue their studies. Political studies, sociology and the other social sciences were replaced by the all-encompassing “science” of historical materialism. Still, seasoned academics and new scholars alike would conduct their political studies surreptitiously by presenting them in the form of disciplines recognized by authorities. These disciplines may have included history, historical materialism, theories of state and law, oriental studies, and (starting in the 1960s) system analysis, scientific communism, international studies, and labour studies. Taken together, these fields of academic inquiry – their sheer scope – amounted to a kind of “hidden political science” (criptopolitologia). Despite such awkward conditions, however, experts managed to obtain valuable scientific results, particularly when their research material was historically or geographically remote from areas of direct concern to the CPSU.

The “Thaw” of the 1950s gave Russian political scholars an opportunity to reach out to their international brethren. In 1955, Soviet scholars formally joined the International Political Science Association (IPSA) through the Soviet Society for Friendship and Cultural Links. The actual creation of a professional political studies association also dates back to 1955, though it was not until December 1960 that it was formally inaugurated as the Soviet Political Sciences (State Studies) Association (SPSSA). It was at this time that criptopolitologia became de facto politiligia. Now, political research was carried out in the open, though no formal education was provided and no degrees were awarded.

The association’s emergence provided better conditions for international outreach. In practice, however, only a limited number of Soviet scientists became active in this regard. Still, in the formative early years of de facto politologia, international cooperation exerted a vital impact. International contacts and greater access to international political science literature incited a younger, bolder generation of scholars to demand formal recognition of political studies in the USSR. In early 1965, Feodor Burlatski published an article claiming that the time had come to develop the discipline of political science in the Soviet Union – a view shared by many. A group of young scholars – political researchers in their late 20s or early 30s – banded together to lend the idea the impetus it needed. For the most part, they were advisers and staff members of the CPSU Central Committee, and some had links to the Soviet Political Science Association.

The hardliners and conformists held that Burlatski’s claim and efforts to promote political science were alien to “true Marxism.” In the summer of 1965, Pravda clarified, suggesting that “all Marxist sciences are political” and that there was no need for a specific political science. By the 1960s, therefore, two rival traditions emerged, each with its own formal structures and informal networks. One sought to consolidate the discipline, while the other sought to establish a tradition of interdisciplinary “Marxist-Leninist” learning.

By the late 1970s, critical appraisals of achievements in world political science became possible, with political scientists leading the push to integrate Soviet researchers into international political science and consolidate the discipline at home. They used their professional association to those ends. In 1973, Georgy Shachnazarov became president of RPSA and later vice-president of IPSA. As an influential party apparatchik and researcher at the Academy of Sciences’ Institute of State and Law, he succeeded in securing support from the highest echelons of the Communist Party – from none other than Leonid Brezhnev – for an initiative aimed at hosting the IPSA World Congress in Moscow. The 1979 World Congress represented a major breakthrough both for the integration of Soviets into world political science community and for IPSA going east.
The efforts of Georgy Shachnazarov and his colleagues paid dividends in the mid-1980s, as political science was officially recognized by the country’s new leadership. In 1989, political science was formally recognized as an academic discipline.

The collapse of the Soviet Union provoked a major crisis with an accompanying impact on political science in the country. The gradual consolidation of the discipline against a background of growing interdisciplinarity in political studies was replaced by the spontaneous development of low-quality politiligia, which entered the mainstream and served to marginalize the efforts of more senior IPSA-affiliated scholars.

The conditions under which political studies are carried out have changed dramatically. The teaching of political science as a discipline began in 1991, when separate chairs of political science were established at Leningrad University, the Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO) and Tula University. In the faculties of philosophy at Leningrad University and at the Moscow State Institute, departments of “scientific communism” gave way to political science departments. At the MGIMO, a new political science department was created as part of the Faculty of International Relations. Within a few years, faculties and/or departments of political science in 30 higher education institutions in Russia, including 17 regional institutions (10 state and seven non-state), were offering bachelors and masters degrees in political science.

State-funded foundations accounted for new forms of support and coordination. In 1991, the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Sciences was established, and in 1994 its offshoot, the Russian Foundation for Humanities, came into being. Foreign foundations were instrumental in providing support for research activities initiated by Russian political scientists. Particularly active and effective were the Soros Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and Friedrich Ebert Schítitung.

The Russian Political Science Association emerged as the successor to the SPSA in 1993. First published in 1991, the political science journal Polis played an important role in consolidating political science by spawning a discussion on the state of the discipline. Collectively, these efforts led to the integration of existing structures into a network of sorts, culminating in the staging of the first All-Russia Congress of Political Scientists in February 1998.

By the late 1990s, political science was taught throughout the country by nearly 300 professors. That number has now decreased, together with the number of universities teaching political science as a major specialization. They now number less than 100, though twice that many have formal accreditation to teach political science. Meanwhile, the quality of teaching and research has improved significantly. Universities currently providing a high-level education include the MGIMO and NRU HSE in Moscow, the EU in Saint Petersburg, and NRU in Perm. The Moscow and Saint Petersburg universities have opened new specialized departments (faculties) of political science, while universities in Kazan, Nizhny Novgorod, Vladivostok, Kaliningrad and elsewhere are catching up.

The consolidation of Russian political science has been accompanied by new challenges related to its domestic and international roles. In response, the RPSA has renewed the discussion on the state of the discipline, with a series of debates that began in February across all major universities as well as regional chapters of RPSA and its RCs. It is clear, now, that new grounds for consolidating political science in Russia may be secured and that IPSA and national associations and partners of Russian political scientists will play a crucial role.

**Israeli Political Science Association**

**News and the Next Annual Conference**

In June 2012, Prof. Itzhak Galnoor was elected chair of the Israeli Political Science Association (ISPSA), the professional organization devoted to the study of political science, international relations and public policy in Israel. The association serves 300 members. ISPSA has created a forum for chairs from all departments in these fields to advance research and teaching and address public issues. In addition, the association established a publishing house for specialized books in our field.

The next annual ISPSA International Conference takes place on May 2, 2013 at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem. This year’s theme is “Democracy at 50+” and its focus is on democracies that came into being after World War II (i.e. Germany, Japan, India, Austria and Costa Rica) as a comparative framework for examining democracy in Israel. The call for papers asked participants to analyze factors contributing to the stability and viability of democracies, as well as factors explaining current weaknesses. The general purpose is to determine what makes democracies succeed or fail. Prof. Larry Diamond of Stanford University will serve as the event’s keynote speaker.

During the conference, the association will announce the awards for best book and best dissertation and master’s thesis, and a special award for career achievement in political science will be presented.

For complete details, please contact Dr. Omri Shamir, ISPSA secretary, at shamirol@zahav.net.il.

**Political Studies Association (UK)**

The PSA’s 63rd Annual Conference was the staging ground for the unveiling of the brand new PSA website.

About 600 delegates, among them PSA members, international academics, journalists, researchers and practitioners, gathered in a packed hall to gain a first-hand glimpse at our dynamic and exciting new site. PSA chair Charlie Jeffery delivered a keynote address detailing the website’s main features as well as some new features, including the PSA blog and PSA community pages. Charlie’s keynote address will be made available on the PSA website, so please log onto psa.ac.uk, or follow us on Twitter (polstud-iesassoc) to access the content.

A great deal of attention has been paid to the new site’s design, navigation and interactivity. The design is clean and modern and the navigation flows intuitively, as a result of a lengthy consultation on the architecture of the site meant to ensure that it is built with our audience in mind. As mentioned above, the blog is an all-new feature intended to provide a strong platform for academics to communicate ideas, research and views on a range of topical issues to the public.
The PSA’s 63rd Annual Conference was held at Cardiff City Hall from March 25 to 27, 2013. Highlights included a plenary roundtable on the future of political journalism after Leveson, the Annual Leonard Schapiro Lecture presented by Professor Donatella Della Porta (EUI), and the address given at the conference dinner by the Rt. Hon. Carwyn Jones AM, First Minister of Wales. The full program may be viewed at www.psa.ac.uk/2013.

Email contact information (in Spanish, Portuguese or English): 11congreso@saap.org.ar

Kazakhstan Political Science Association

The Kazakhstan Political Science Association is planning a series of events this year. The expert roundtable on “National Security: Risks and Perspectives” took place on April 20, 2013. The roundtable discussion contributed to a more in-depth understanding of potential problems connected with terrorism, extremism and elite politics, as well as integration projects and its possible solutions.

The next event – the Summer School for Political Scientists – is slated for August 2013. The summer school curriculum will feature a lecture series, workshops, and applied theoretical research on such topics as the practice, theory and methodology of political management. Lectures will be given by seasoned political scientists and young experts, including masters and PhD students, as well as local and foreign specialists.

Another important event on the association’s agenda is the Second Eurasian Congress of Political Scientists, which is set to take place next November in Astana. This event offers a unique opportunity to share ideas and experiences with experts from all regions of Kazakhstan and beyond. The congress program is currently being discussed with the expert work team. It would be a pleasure to welcome IPSA representatives to the congress.

Finally, two councils of the Kazakhstan Political Science Association are planned for March and September. These meetings will serve to analyze association activities and identify new projects and plans.

South African Association of Political Studies (SAAPS)

Developing Stronger International Relations

SAAPS’s more active participation in IPSA in recent years has prompted the association to place greater emphasis on its international relations. With this objective in mind, a number of initiatives are in the works in 2013.

Discussions with the Political Studies Association (UK) are ongoing with a view to developing an exchange program. As part of this emerging relationship, Prof. Gerry Stoker attended the recent SAAPS National Conference in 2012 as a representative the PSA’s Executive Committee. Further discussions are planned in 2013-2014.

Prof. Carlos Milani, general secretary of the Brazilian Political Science Association, travelled to South Africa to meet the SAAPS president and secretary and explore closer cooperation between the two associations.
With the demise of the African Association of Political Science (AAPS) after the Cairo conference in 2005, no transnational political science forum exists at the moment (CODESRIA is geared to the social sciences in general). The Department of Political Science at the University of South Africa (UNISA) has convened a roundtable of Southern African political scientists in May 2013. Billed as an “Africa Day,” this event is intended to spark a discussion on professional issues. It coincides with the SAAPS initiative discussed at the last national conference, notably to create a forum for Southern African political scientists, one that will establish an institutional channel linking it to IPSA.

The 2013 SAAPS will host four provincial research colloquia, while the next national conference will be held in September 2014.

Portuguese Political Science Association
Call for Applications, APCP Prize for Best PhD Thesis

The call for nominations for the Portuguese Political Science Association’s best PhD thesis is open until November 30, 2013. A cash prize of 1,500 euros will be awarded to the winner.

Eligible PhD theses include all those authored by Portuguese citizens and foreign citizens who develop their research in Portuguese institutions or whose dissertations focus on Lusophone themes. Submitted theses, published or non-published, must be defended by November 30. Theses written in Portuguese, Spanish, French, English and Italian will be accepted.

The jury will consider the following criteria: originality of the presented work; scientific grounds; and the relevance of its contribution to research.

For more information: www.apcp.pt/en/about_apcp_statutes_phd_prize.php info@apcp.pt

Belgian French-speaking Political Science Association
New Projects & Publications

During the past three years, the ABSP-CF has devoted much of its attention to organizing the conference of French-speaking political science associations in Brussels (April 2011). In 2012, the association elected a new executive committee for 2012-2015. Headed by Geoffroy Matagne, the new executive includes members Pierre Baudewyns, Emille Van Haute, Virginie Van Ingelgom, Gilles Biaumet and Min Reuchamps. Meanwhile, the new board of directors of the Belgian French-speaking Political Science Association (ABSP-CF) has initiated several new projects.

First, the association’s working groups will hold annual meetings aimed at planning their calendar of activities and research orientations for the coming year. These working groups are intended to serve as the association’s scientific backbone.

Secondly, the association plans to jointly organize a second edition of the “Belgium: the state of the federation” conference together with the Flemish Association for Political Science (VPW). This event is slated to take place in the fall of 2013. Its aim is to bring together international and Belgian scholars working on Belgian politics in the broadest sense.

Thirdly, the association will play an active part in the fifth congress of French-speaking political science associations, which will be held in Luxemburg from April 24 to 26, 2013. The association will jointly organize 11 of the 24 panels given, and many of its members are expected to attend, including PhD students, some of whom will benefit from travel grants. To mark the occasion, the edited volume on the 2011 Brussels Conference will be unveiled.

Finally, several edited volumes have been published or are set to be published as part of the association’s “Science politique” series in collaboration with Academia-L’Harmattan.

The series includes two edited volumes on federalism:
• Les relations communautaires en Belgique. Approches politiques et linguistiques (edited by Julien Perez and Min Reuchamps)
• Le fédéralisme belge. Enjeux institutionnels, acteurs socio-politiques et opinions publiques (edited by Régis Dandoy, Geoffroy Matagne and Caroline Van Wynsbergh)

One edited volume on public affairs:
• La reconfiguration de l’action publique en Belgique (edited by David Aubin, Fabienne Leloup and Nathalie Schiffino)

One edited volume on citizenship:
• Imaginer la citoyenneté. Hommage à Bérengère Marques-Pereira (edited by David Paternotte and Nora Nagels)

The association currently has about 200 members. The membership is open to all individuals interested in the association’s objectives. For more information: www.sciencepolitique.be

Italian Political Science Association
Congress and Reviews

The SISP is honoured to announce that its 27th congress will be held in Florence from September 12 to 14, 2013. The congress will be hosted by the University of Florence. The theme of the event will be “500 Years Later: Machiavelli and his Prince.” Works are organized into 14 thematic sessions covering all sub-fields of political science. The call for papers is now open. Persons interested in taking part are asked to forward a paper proposal to the panel chairs ([www.sisp.it/convegno/2013/sezioni]) before May 15, 2013. A number of plenary sessions and social events will also be held as part of the event.

SISP is also proud to announce the renewal of its review series. The Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica (RISP – Italian Review of Political Science) is SISP’s official and most prestigious journal. First published in 1971 by Giovanni Sartori, it has made a vital contribution to the development of political science in Italy. RISP publishes peer-reviewed research articles on any aspect of government, politics and policy and from any subfield of political science, including international relations, comparative politics, public administration, public policy and political theory. At the behest of current editor Luca Verzichelli (University of Siena), SISP will publish articles solely in English starting in 2014. The association has also appointed Fabio Franchino (University of Milan) as editor and Amie Kreppel (University of Florida) as co-editor for the 2014-18 term.

IPS (Italian Political Science, www.italianpoliticalscience.eu) is the online journal of Italian professionals in political science. It is published twice a year in English in order to reach both the association’s members and a specialized international readership. Its goal
2. In March 2013, the textbook *PR in a Political Sphere* was published. It was written by Larysa Kochubei (PhD), a professor of political science and leading scientific collaborator from the Institute of Political and Ethnic Research. This volume brings together key directions in PR studies in the political sphere, including fundamentals of PR, principles and ethics of PR activities, and the practice of PR activities in the political sphere. The book also examines such key issues as PR tools, media planning, political advertising, and the Internet in political communications.

3. On March 30, 2013, the monograph *Ukrainian Regional Civilization: Past, Present and Future* was published. This publication is the work of Mykola Myhalchenko (PhD in Philosophy), a member of Ukraine’s National Academy of Sciences.

**Ukrainian Political Science Association**

1. The International Political Science Conference under the theme “Parliamentary Elections in Ukraine in 2012” was held on March 14 and 15, 2013. Current issues concerning participation in the 2012 parliamentary elections by political parties were discussed:
   - The electoral system and political parties in Ukraine: factors and consequences
   - Political parties and their leaders: electoral strategies and technologies of participation
   - Sociological surveys of parliamentary elections
   - Election campaigns in the context of European values

**European Confederation of Political Science Associations (ECPSA)**

Annual General Meeting

The European Confederation of Political Science Associations (www.ecpsa.org) held its Annual General Meeting in Berlin on February 1 and 2, 2013. The confederation’s membership currently includes 27 national political science associations. Its goal is to promote the development of political science as a discipline in Europe.

ECPSA has successfully lobbied the European Parliament to secure proper recognition of political science in EU research funding programs, and it acts as a forum for knowledge-sharing on subjects of “open access” publishing in the social sciences, academic careers in Europe, and civic education in European countries. It is also considering proposals for an advisory core curriculum in political science, with the conviction that major efforts must be made to study the career destinations of political science graduates at the undergraduate and graduate levels throughout Europe.

At the close of the meeting, Pablo Oñate (Spain) was elected president, and four others were elected to the executive committee: Terrell Carver (UK), Didier Georgakakis (France), Oddbjorn Knutsen (Norway), and Cirila Toplak (Slovenia). Former president Suzanne Schüttemeyer (Germany) and Luciana Ghica (Romania) were enlisted to serve as additional EC members.
Research Committee News
Nouvelles des réseaux de chercheurs

Research Committee Liaison Representative – Passing the Torch

The IPSA Executive Committee, the IPSA Secretariat and the broader IPSA community extend a warm word of thanks to Rainer Eisfeld (University of Osnabrueck, Germany) for his great work as Research Committee Liaison Representative. From 2006 to 2012, Rainer’s dedication to IPSA was unmatched. As someone who is very proactive and who always brings new ideas to the table, Rainer has served as an example of hard work and cordial collaboration for anyone involved with IPSA. Thank you, Rainer, for putting in years of impressive work!

We would also like to take this opportunity to introduce the new Research Committee Liaison Representative, Christ'l De Landtsheer (University of Antwerp, Belgium). Christ'l has an in-depth knowledge of the IPSA RC management style, acquired during her tenure as president of RC21 on Political Socialization and Education. We are confident that she, too, will succeed in making her mark as a great RC representative. Christ'l can be reached at christl.delandtsheer@ua.ac.be

RC01 – Concepts and Methods
New Working Paper Series Editor

The Research Committee on Concepts and Methods (C&M) hereby announces that Andreas Schedler of CIDE Mexico City is stepping down as editor of our two C&M working paper series, and that Cas Mudde of the University of Georgia will be taking over as new editor.

Founded by Giovanni Sartori and friends, C&M was the first research committee to be recognized by IPSA in 1970. As well as promote conceptual and methodological discussion in political science, it gives a platform for debate to proponents of divergent methodological schools who would otherwise conduct their deliberations at separate tables.

C&M publishes two series of working papers, both of which are available for free download and consultation on the C&M website (www.concepts-methods.org):

- **Political Concepts** features high-quality works on political concepts and political language. It emphasizes innovative contributions to concept analysis, language usage, and concept operationalization and measurement.
- **Political Methodology** features high-quality works on methods and methodology in the study of politics. It invites innovative work on fundamental questions of research design, on the construction and evaluation of empirical evidence, and on theory building and theory testing.

C&M owes a great debt of gratitude to Andreas, who founded the working paper series back in 2005 and served as its editor ever since. Over the past eight years, he has published almost 100 working papers; collectively, they have been viewed and downloaded thousands of times. The two working paper series may well stand as C & M’s leading – and certainly most visible – activity. Andreas leaves a strong and vibrant legacy. Cas is a long-time member of the editorial board, and she brings an exciting vision to the working paper series, one that consolidates the work achieved by Andreas and continues to develop it in exciting ways.

C&M would like to take this opportunity to invite IPSA members to submit manuscripts for the working paper series. We are particularly interested in (a) interpretive and quantitative research; and (b) conceptual or methodological work from students of American politics, international relations, political theory, and comparative politics outside Europe and Latin America.

Given that most papers in the series are still under development, suitable submissions will be reviewed with the aim of providing constructive feedback. The series thus offers both a platform for scholars to get their work out in preliminary form and an opportunity to receive what we hope are helpful suggestions for future revision.

For further information on the C&M working paper series and to download the published papers for free, please visit the website at www.concepts-methods.org/WorkingPapers

To submit a manuscript to the C&M working paper series, simply forward it to wp@concepts-methods.org

If you are not sure whether your paper is suited to the series, please feel free to take the matter up with Cas Mudde (mudde@uga.edu).
RC10 - Electronic Democracy
Partner of the DEL symposium "Online Political Participation and its Critics", Paris, June 19 and 20, 2013

Organized by the research network “electronic democracy” (DEL) – which is connected to the CEDITEC at the University of Paris Est Créteil and the CERTOP-CNRS – and with support from IPSA RC10, the international symposium “Online Political Participation and its Critics” looks at research from a wide range of disciplines. Topics will include changes brought about in contemporary political life by the growing integration of digital technologies, especially the Internet, into various areas of social life.

In academic studies, the last 15 have been marked by a growing focus on electronic democracy practices, and the Internet – in terms of architectures and interfaces – has evolved considerably during that time, as new features and functionalities give rise to new social and political practices. Recent studies have called into question the relevance of theoretical and epistemological frameworks advanced by the scientific community to identify digital practices used to promote political involvement and participation.

More specifically, this conference aims to explore the digital practices as they relate to political participation by questioning both their empirical manifestations and the consistency of the concepts used to date to qualify them.

The symposium will take place over two days:
- June 19, 2013: Presentation and discussion of papers by young researchers selected following a call for papers (closed);
- June 20, 2013: Presentation of two roundtables for researchers invited to examine the relevance of their analytical framework in relation to two questions: Can we analyze online political participation by using theoretical approaches from the social sciences? Does research on the political uses of the Internet and social networks revisit some of these theoretical approaches or foster the development of new concepts?

Scientific organizers: Gérard Loiseau (CERTOP-CNRS) and Stéphanie Wojcik (UPEC-CEDITEC)

Contact: stephanie.wojcik@u-pec.fr
More information: http://colloquedel2013.fr/

RC12 - Biology and Politics
News and Notes

RC12 coordinates an annual book publication in partnership with Emerald Press. This year’s volume is due out in the spring. Edited by Albert Somit and Steven Peterson, its working title is The World of Biology and Politics: Organization and Research Areas. Contributors include Albert Somit and Steven A. Peterson, David Goetzke, Milton Lodge, Andrea Bonnicksen, Rebecca Hannagan, Tatu Vanhanen, John Friend, Bradley Thayer, Johan van der Dennen, Odelia Funke, Robert Gilbert, Robert Blank and Michael Bang Petersen.

Somit and Peterson are also organizing two panels for the upcoming American Political Science Association meeting in Chicago, which runs from August 29 to September 1, 2013.

Finally, officers have been elected to serve on Research Committee 12. Steven Peterson (Penn State Harrisburg) will serve as president; Bradley Thayer (Utah State University) will serve as vice-president, and Albert Somit (Emeritus, Southern Illinois University) will serve as secretary.

RC16 – Socio-Political Pluralism
Recent and Upcoming Events

In the few months following the last World Congress in Madrid, a new board was appointed and given a mandate to expand and rejuvenate the membership of RC16. At the same time, new webmaster Stéphanie Yates was entrusted to update the membership roll and revamp the committee’s website (www.ipsa-pluralism.com). These efforts will continue during the coming months. Meanwhile, Panjab University Chandigarh in India will host a conference before the end of October 2013 titled “Pluralist Democracy and National Identity.” A call for papers will soon be issued and posted on the RC16 website. Subsequent to this meeting, a major effort will be deployed to prepare for the next World Congress, which takes place in Montreal in 2014. At this point in history, it appears especially appropriate to re-examine notions of sociopolitical pluralism at a time when traditional political institutions and organizations face daunting challenges against a background of drastic change, and when new social and political movements are advocating for recognition and rights. Under these circumstances, many societies are hard-pressed to find ways and means to establish new models of legitimacy, develop mutual tolerance practices and adopt new rules to make accommodation acceptable.

Anyone interested in these issues is invited to contact RC16 chair Raymond Hudon (raymond.hudon@pol.ulaval.ca) or secretary Stéphanie Yates (yates.stephanie@uqam.ca).

RC18 – Asian and Pacific Studies

Since its establishment at the 1976 IPSA World Congress in Edinburgh, the Research Committee on Asian and Pacific Studies (RC18) has presented panels at every world congress and held international roundtable conferences in a variety of locations.

At the 22nd World Congress in Madrid, Spain (July 8 to 12, 2012), RC18 staged 13 panels under the general theme “World Perspectives on Asia and the Pacific.”

To mark the 35th anniversary of RC18, world renowned pianist and Grammy winner Angelin Chang presented a concert at Madrid’s Centro de Arte de Alcobendas on July 11 as part of the Festival Eucuentro International de Music. The recital was given before an audience of
IPSAs World Congress participants and members of the Spanish public. Dr. Angelin Chang also gave concerts at the IPSA world congresses in Buenos Aires, Durban, Fukuoka and Santiago. Secretary General Guy Lachapelle has invited her to perform at the 23rd World Congress, which takes place in Montreal, Canada in 2014.

In the last 35 years, RC18 has contributed to the development of Asian and Pacific studies within IPSA and in general thanks to its dedicated members. We are sorry to be losing a few colleagues: Dr. Robert Scalapino, director of the Asian Research Institute at the University of California, served as a panelist at RC18’s First International Roundtable Conference on Asia, held in Chicago in 1978. D. Loretta Makasier Sicat, the chair of the political science department at the University of the Philippines and president of the Philippine Political Science Association, has served as secretary of RC18 and as an RC18 panelist since the 1979 IPSA World Congress in Moscow. Dr. Angelin filled the vacancy left by Sicat until she was elected co-chair of RC18 at the 22nd World Congress.

The new leadership of RC18, elected at the 22nd IPSA World Congress:

Chair: Teh-Kuang Chang, Ball State University, USA  
Co-chair: Angelin Chang, Cleveland State University, USA  
Vice chair: Haroon Khan, Henderson State University, USA  
Secretary: Gandzhina Dustova, Tajikistan National University, Tajikistan

17 board members:
Malin Akebo, Umea University, Sweden  
Marceli Burdesliski, University of Gdansk, Poland  
Lee Tae To, National University of Singapore, Singapore  
Sad Malk, King Abdul-Aziz University, Saudi Arabia  
Luis Ernesto Nava Molero, Simon Bolivar University, Venezuela  
Gozalo S. Paz, George Washington University, Argentina  
Walter Sanchez, University of Chile, Chile  
Pushpa Thambipillai, University of Brunel Darassalam, Brunei  
Meena Bardia, Jai Narain Vyas University, India  
Helen Sullivan, University of Melbourne, Australia  
David Capie, Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand  
Igor Okunev, Moscow State Institute of International Relations, Russia  
Marta Burgos Gonzalez, Universidad Autonoma de Madrid, Spain  
Richard Stubbs, McMaster University, Canada  
Machiko Hachiya, Kyushu University, Japan  
Jong-Yun Bae, Yonsei University, South Korea  
Mikhail Rybalko, University of Irkutsk and University of North Texas, USA

RC18 encourages board members to hold international roundtable conferences in their respective countries. It also welcomes membership applications, suggestions for world congress panel topics, and paper proposals for the 23rd IPSA World Congress slated to take place in Montreal, Canada in 2014. Interested parties are invited to contact the chair (TCHANG@BSU.EDU).

RC21 - Political Socialization and Education

IPSAs Research Committee 21 has set out political socialization and education as its main area of interest. Its aims are to advance the study of political socialization and education by encouraging research, especially cross-national studies; disseminate relevant information at international meetings, workshops and conferences; publish scholarly research; and provide a framework for cooperation between individuals and organizations concerned with teaching and research on political socialization and political education as well as civic rights and responsibilities. Owing to their cross-disciplinary scope, these areas of interest relate directly to political psychology, and this shared field of interest has led to an extensive and fruitful cooperation with RC29 on Psycho-Politics.

The main goal of RC21 is to create a professional network of political and social scientists from all over the world. In 2012, RC21 was generously represented at the 22nd IPSA World Congress in Madrid, with six panel sessions. In October 2012, we also attended a joint RC21/RC29 conference in Moscow, hosted by professor Helen Shestopal.

We are pleased to announce that another Expert Meeting will be held in 2013. This year’s destination will be Xuzhou, China. In association with the Institute of Higher Education at the China University of Mining and Technology, RC21 and RC29 will stage a joint conference on the “Comparative Study of the Role of Higher Education and Communication in Political Socialization from the Perspective of Globalization.” Parallel sessions will address the following issues:

- Internationalization, political socialization and communication
- Globalization and political attitudes among students
- Social media and youth civic engagement
- Civic education: theory and practice in the contemporary world

Meetings are already scheduled for 2014, as RC21 will be presented at the IPSA World Congress in Montreal, Canada in July and the Expert Meeting in Lublin, Poland in September.

We take this opportunity to issue a call for submissions to our scientific journal Politics, Culture and Socialization (PC&S). This scholarly journal publishes new and significant work in all areas related to political socialization and civic education, political culture, psychology and communications. PC&S reports on current scientific research and on theory and methodology in its book review section.

Finally, specific changes have taken place within the governing board of IPSA RC21. After years of dedication to the board, Christ’l De Landtsheer and Trond Solhaug stepped down as president and general secretary of RC21, respectively. Both are well deserving of our thanks, and both will remain closely involved with the research committee. Christ’l De Landtsheer (who was elected IPSA RC liaison representative) has been succeeded by Professor Maria Marczewska-Rytko (Maria Curie-Sklodowska University, Lublin, Poland). The position of general secretary goes to Liuwe Kalkhoven (University of Antwerp, Belgium).

For more information on RC21, including details on upcoming conferences, membership and the journal PC&S, please visit our website at www.politicalsocialization.org.
RC22 - Political Communication
International Conference on Political Communication
We are pleased to announce the call for papers for the upcoming International Conference of Political Communication, jointly organized by the IPSA Research Committee for Political Communication (RC22), the University of Granada’s Department of Political Science and Public Administration and its Faculty of Political Science and Sociology, and the Spanish Association of Political Science and Public Administration (AECPA). Titled “Political Communication in Times of Crisis,” the conference will be hosted by the University of Granada (Spain).

Founded in 1531, the University of Granada (UGR) has been a vocal proponent of historical, intellectual and cultural tradition. From the outset, the university’s strong social influence on the city enabled it to become an independent teaching hub and a leader among major European universities. The UGR curriculum is among the most varied in Europe, which explains the university’s high enrollment (over 70,000) and large foreign student body (13%). In 2007, the University of Granada was awarded the Erasmus programme’s “Gold Star” by the European Commission. A safe and modern city, Granada is ideally situated halfway between the sea and the mountains, 40 minutes from the Mediterranean coast’s sub-tropical climate and 30 minutes from the ski resort of Sierra Nevada. As a tourist mecca par excellence, Granada is a hot destination not only for academics but also for tourists drawn to Alhambra – one of the city’s chief attractions. When it comes to culture, the city of Granada offers a variety of attractions, including festivities on flamenco, jazz, tango, theatre, magic, music, dance, comedy, film and poetry. Spanish food is internationally recognized for its quality and variety, and Granada is famous for its tapas. What’s more, Granada is among the more affordable cities in Spain and Europe.

CALL FOR PAPERS: Scholars, researchers and professionals are invited to submit a paper proposal on issues related to political communication, national or comparative studies, theoretical or empirical research, journalism, political marketing, policy developments or new media.

IMPORTANT DATES:
- Paper submission deadline: June 1, 2013
- Paper acceptance notification: June 10, 2013
- Registration deadline: July 30, 2013
- Final paper delivery: August 31, 2013
- Conference: September 12 and 13, 2013

PROPOSALS: Abstracts (200 to 300 words) must be forwarded to Óscar Luengo (ogluego@ugr.es) by June 1. They should be in English and must include the author’s name, institution and position, academic level, address and email.

Full papers must be forwarded to Óscar Luengo (ogluego@ugr.es) by August 31, 2013. They should be in English and should be in pdf and APA quoting format.

Registration: 120 €. Includes delegates fees, refreshments, lunches, dinner and a visit to Alhambra.

Contact: Óscar Luengo (chair of the RC22), ogluego@ugr.es, http://rc22.ipsa.org

RC23 - Elections, Citizens and Parties
Chicago Workshop & Electoral Integrity Project 2013 Annual Workshop

1) Chicago Workshop: Emerging Challenges of Electoral Integrity
American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, August 28, 2013

This one-day workshop is intended to review cutting-edge research on electoral integrity, strengthen networks among young scholars, and identify challenges and opportunities for research and teaching in this emerging subfield.

A rapidly growing body of research by scholars and applied policy analysts explores three core questions: When do elections meet international standards of electoral integrity? When do they fail to do so? What can be done to mitigate these problems?

The evolving subfield studying these issues – which cut across conventional disciplinary boundaries – is characterized by its problem-oriented focus, global comparative framework, and use of pluralistic methods and analytical techniques. This includes research on problems of electoral integrity in the United States and other established democracies as well as in other regimes worldwide.

The workshop will cover the following topics:
(i) Comparative institutions (electoral integrity in hybrid regimes and electoral processes of democratization);
(ii) Public-sector management (problems of electoral maladministration in the United States and other established democracies, including issues of campaign finance, convenience voting and voter registration);
(iii) Political culture (effect of citizens’ confidence in electoral procedures on public opinion and voting behaviour); and
(iv) Peace and conflict (triggers of electoral violence).

There are no separate workshop fees, although participants are asked to stay for the duration of the workshop, where possible. Registered participants will be served refreshments, a buffet lunch, and drinks during an early evening reception. Participants must register online by August 1, 2013 to attend the workshop (www.electoralintegrity.com).

A limited number of graduate travel awards ($100) for younger scholars will be given out. ABD graduate students and post-doctoral participants with no other institutional support for travel and attendance will be considered.

2) Electoral Integrity Project 2013 Annual Workshop: Concepts and Indices of Electoral Integrity
The Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, CGIS-South, June 3 and 4, 2013

Countries the world over face shared challenges when it comes to meeting international standards of electoral integrity. The most overt malpractices include locking up dissidents, harassing adversaries, coercing voters, vote-rigging, and blatant disregard for electoral outcomes. Serious violations of human rights that undermine
electoral credibility are widely condemned by domestic observers and the international community alike. Recent protests against voting malpractices have been mobilized in countries as diverse as Russia, Mexico and Egypt.

In many countries, however, minor irregularities are more common, evidenced by inaccurate voter registers, maladministration of polling, pro-government media, lack of security in absentee ballots, vote counts and gerrymandering. In the United States, these problems are exemplified by the notorious hanging chads in Florida in 2000 and accusations of voter fraud and voter suppression during the Obama-Romney contest.

In response to these developments, there have been considerable efforts in recent years to analyze flaws in electoral integrity using systematic evidence, including cross-national data sets, forensic analysis techniques, and new instruments to monitor mass and elite perceptions of malpractice.

The time to take stock of these developments is now. This workshop seeks to bring together international experts to present leading research on electoral integrity. It will give scholars an opportunity to share new instruments and pilot data sets developed by the Electoral Integrity Project, including the Expert Survey of Perceptions of Electoral Integrity (PEI) and the Global Database of Electoral Laws and Administration (GELA).

This event is co-sponsored by the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation, the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, IPSA-ECP Research Committee 23 on Elections, Citizens and Parties, and the Australian Research Council.

The tentative workshop agenda, paper abstracts, maps, directions, updated information and registration details are available on the conference website at www.electoralintegrityproject.com. Places are limited and colleagues must register to participate.

**RC24 - Armed Forces and Society**

RC24 posted an impressive showing at the 2012 World Congress in Madrid, convening four panels with 16 papers and thus highlighting the scholarship of our active membership. At our business meeting, we agreed to support the next two World congresses in Montreal (2014) and Istanbul (2016) while continuing our strong tradition of triennial gatherings around the world. We are particularly excited that our 2014 triennial meeting – expected to take the form of a one-day workshop – will be held conjunction with the World Congress in Montreal, marking a first for our RC. A subcommittee is hard at work exploring the opportunities for our members within the broader World Congress setting, while ensuring an RC-only setting to facilitate collaboration within the committee. We have targeted 2017 for our next RC-only meeting, with Israel as a potential site.

RC24 scholars have a strong reputation for theoretical and applied research. Many have chosen to specialize in a specific region, and much of their research touches on national policy. RC24 scholars are focusing on leading-edge research on the relationship between the armed forces and society – particularly in societies in transition. One of our panels at the Madrid World Congress covered the role of the military in the Arab Spring. As well, we have strong research clusters in Latin American and Turkish civil-military relations. Recent events in the Middle East, Thailand, Myanmar, Pakistan and Mali have made RC24’s work more relevant than ever. We welcome new members! Please contact RC chair Marybeth Ulrich at marybeth.p.ulrich.civ@mail.mil for more information.

RC 24 is excited to report that we now have a presence on Google+, LinkedIn and the main IPSA.org website. Please check us out! http://gplus.to/rc24 www.linkedin.com/groups?home=&gid=4034002 http://rc24.ipsa.org

**RC26 - Human Rights**

IPSA RC26 on Human Rights will jointly organize a conference on the “Protection of Human Rights: Institutions and Practices” together with the Russian Political Science Association’s Human Rights Research Committee and the National Research University Higher School of Economics in Saint Petersburg. The event takes place in beautiful Saint Petersburg, Russia, on June 13 and 14, 2013. This conference is meant to bring together scholars and practitioners with a view to analyzing and comparing governmental and non-governmental human rights protection mechanisms within and emerging democracies. Topics will include the activities of these institutions, interactions with government officials and international human rights organizations, factors that help or hinder their effectiveness, and their role in human rights education and legislation. Participation from countries currently undergoing a transition to democracy will be encouraged, with a special emphasis on post-communist societies.

**RC30 - Comparative Public Policy**

RC30 has been very active since our inaugural showing at the IPSA World Congress in Madrid in June 2012. We staged the largest number of panels of any RC (over 30) at the World Congress, and we held our first business meetings and elections in conjunction with the event.

Since last June, the new executive – Mike Howlett (SFU/NUS) as chair, M. Ramesh (NUS) as co-chair and Giberto Capano (Bologna) as secretary – assisted by new board members Iris Geva-May (SFU), Eva Heidbreder (Dusseldorf), Darryl Jarvis (HKIED), Stephen Jones (Queensland), Christoph Knill (Konstanz), Raul Lejano (Irvine), Apiwat Ratanawaraha (Chulalongkorn), Christine Rothmayr (Montreal) and Donley Studlar (West Virginia) has been working on several projects and RC-related business.

1. First, on the academic front, we were pleased to consolidate RC30 as a sponsor of two leading international journals on comparative policy and comparative policy analysis:

   Policy & Society (Elsevier)
   www.journals.elsevier.com/policy-and-society

   Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis (Routledge)
   www.tandfonline.com/action/aboutThisJournal?journalCode=fcpa20

   We also established links with a new book series from Palgrave MacMillan titled Studies in the Political Economy of Public Policy; the series is edited by Darryl Jarvis from HKIED and Toby Carroll and M. Ramesh from NUS.

   We also worked with ICPA-Forum (www.icpa.ca/icpaf) and Policy Press to create a new International Library of Policy Analysis (ILPA), a series of comparative national studies of policy analysis
practices which will see its first four books published this year on Japan, Germany, Israel and Brazil. Complete details are available on the ILPA website.

We encourage all RC30 members to consider these venues for their research work.

2. Secondly, RC30 was pleased to announce the first winner of the ICPA-Forum Prize for best comparative paper at the IPSA World Congress. The prize went to Adrian Kay of the Australian National University’s Crawford School of Public Policy and Robert Ackrill of Nottingham Trent University’s Nottingham Business School for their paper titled

Policy Capacity for the Transition to a Biofuels Economy: A Comparative Study of the EU and USA. The award comes with a certificate and a $500 cash award, made possible thanks to contributions and support from more than 40 leading schools that come under the ICPA-Forum’s International Institutional Membership Program. In describing the paper, members of the adjudication committee said that it presents “a case that exemplifies the policymakers’ dilemma of maintaining long-term policy goals as credible commitments, even though considerable flexibility and adaptability is required to reach those goals amid conditions marked by high technological and market uncertainty.”

We also worked with the IPSA Executive as well as incoming president Helen Milner and research group officials Giliberto Capano and Christ’l De Landtsheer to amend the cap of six panels announced in Madrid for future IPSA world congresses. We are pleased to report that the cap has been increased to 10 panels per RC, with a provision for additional joint RC panels. Still, this may translate into fewer RC30 activities compared to Madrid, though the reduced number of panels is not as drastic as initially proposed.

We also set up a new Google Group to facilitate communications and electronic mailings. If you are not yet subscribed, you may do so at https://groups.google.com/forum/?fromgroups#!search/rc30

This mailing list replaces our old one, while the RC30 Facebook page is used for announcements and notices: www.facebook.com/pages/IPSA-Research-Committee-on-Comparative-Public-Policy-RC30/126634394081943

3. Thirdly, in regards to our future plans, we have been working on organizing the new International Conference on Public Policy together with other IPSA RCs as well as the APSA and ECPR. The first such conference will be held in Grenoble, France in June 2013. By the call for papers deadline (February 1), over 800 submissions were received. This will make the ICPP the world’s largest dedicated policy research conference, and it bodes very well for the future of this organization and conference. Congress details are available at http://icpp2013.sciencesconf.org

---

RC31 - Political Philosophy

Annual Conference

The Research Committee on Political Philosophy (RC31) convenes its annual conference this year under the theme “Justice: Violence & Forgiveness.”

Hosted by Boston University (May 19 to 21, 2013), the conference is organized by Prof. Walter Fluker. Publishers have expressed interest in producing a volume sourced from the activities offered at part of this conference. Conference details will be made available in due course. Queries may be directed to Preston King pking@morehouse.edu

The subject of violence is plainly of pressing importance. And while it may be more or less prevalent now than in the past, it is certainly more obvious thanks to global connectivity. Ongoing examples of armed violence include Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Tunisia, Libya, Palestine and Somalia. In many cases, however, the violence is less obvious and formal. In Puerto Rico, for example, the murder rate is far higher than in Oakland, Dallas, Chicago or Baghdad, and far greater, even, than in Mexico. Violence within states may be and may increasingly become greater than the violence between countries.

If we take violence to stem less from genetic programming than policy, then it must be viewed as such by most that promote or resort to it. Accordingly, we need to look more carefully at questions of “whether” and “how” and at the role and suitability of forgiveness as a higher form of justice. The Boston conference will cover (1) specific cases of conflict; (2) various theories of justice and forgiveness; and (3) the ways in which 1 and 2 connect.

Though proposals cannot be received at this stage, queries concerning attendance should be addressed to Professor Walter Fluker (wfluker@bu.edu) or (secondly) to Dr. John Medearis (john.medearis@ucr.edu), secretary of RC31. The conference is hosted and supported by Boston University, and sponsored by CRISPP and JPP. New participants are welcome.

The 2011 pre-Madrid conference organized by Prof. Stephanie Lawson and sponsored by CRISPP (Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy) and JPP (The Journal of Political Philosophy) was held in Sydney, Australia. Hosting the event was Macquarie University. Some of the papers from the conference will be published together in CRISPP in due course. Any related queries may be directed to Prof. Lawson at Stephanie.lawson@mq.ac.au

---

RC32 - Public Policy & Administration

Past & Future Conferences

1) Conference on the Europeanization of Public Administration and Policy

In collaboration with Croatia’s Institute for Public Administration, the Croatian Political Science Association, the Faculty of Law and Faculty of Political Science at the University of Zagreb, and IPSA Research Committee 5 on Comparative Studies on Local Government and Politics, IPSA RC32 on Public Policy & Administration staged an international scientific conference titled “Europeanization of Public Administration and Policy: Sharing Values, Norms and Practices.” The event was held at the Centre for Advanced Academic Studies (CAAS) in Dubrovnik, Croatia from April 4 to 7, 2013.
The conference drew international scholars intent on exploring and discussing recent trends and developments in public administration and public policy within the broader framework of European integration. Its aim was to further improve our understanding of European integration and its effects on the public administration structure and function, as well as public sector reforms and policy processes from a comparative perspective. For guest academics and researchers, and for the PhD students in the pre-conference workshop, the presentation of theoretical and research papers sparked a spirited exchange of ideas, with some practitioners invited to offer their views on the issues at hand.

Further details on the conference are available on the Institute of Public Administration website at www.ijiu.hr

2) Joint Conference on Public Policy

Six IPSA research committees are organizing a joint conference on public policy hosted by the city of Grenoble. The event runs from June 26 to 28, 2013. The conference is intended to provide a worldwide forum for researchers interested in public policy, reinforce exchanges between them, and update our knowledge in this area. This project received support from other associations, such as ECPR and APSA, and it is jointly organized by Science Po Grenoble, ENTP, PACTE, LET and AFSP.

The conference will present about 86 panels on various topics, with one to three sessions for each panel (and probably about 600 papers) and three plenary sessions, including one on the principal public policy approaches, one on international academic journals (with eight editors) and one given by Giandomenico Majone. During the conference, both junior and senior researchers will be given a chance to present and discuss new research as well as theoretical, conceptual and methodological insights and empirical findings through a system of panels and workshops with audience participation. They will also have an opportunity to discuss some common papers through a system of conference speakers and plenary discussions.

RC33 – The Study of Political Science as a Discipline

New Executive Committee & RC Book Series

The following members were elected to the RC executive committee at the business meeting held during the IPSA World Congress in Madrid:

Chair: Erkki Berndtson, University of Helsinki, Finland
erkki.berndtson@helsinki.fi
Vice-chair: Cecilia Lesgart, CONICET, Argentina
Secretary: Thibaud Boncourt, Sciences Po Bordeaux

Other members of the executive committee:
Daniel Bouquet, University of the Republic, Uruguay
Luciana Ghica, University of Bucharest
Bahgat Korany, The American University in Cairo
Olga Malinova, Russian Academy of Sciences
Bob Reinalda, Radboud University, Nijmegen
Pere Vilanova, University of Barcelona
John Trent, University of Ottawa

Six new books were added to the series World of Political Science (general editors John Trent and Michael Stein) in 2010-12, bringing the total number of volumes to 12:

Adrian Guelke and Jean Touron (eds.), The Study of Ethnicity and Politics: Recent Analytical Developments (2012) – with RC14

Each of these books was published by Barbara Budrich Publishers, Opladen (www.barbara-budrich.net).

RC34 - Quality of Democracy

Joint Workshop in Partnership with the German Political Science Association

Launched in 2012, RC34 and the democracy studies research group at the German Political Science Association are proud to announce the joint workshop on “Measuring Democracy.” The event runs from September 29 to October 1, 2013 in Frankfurt/Main.

We find it both interesting and important to organize a forum for scholars at different stages in their work on the measurement of democracy, as they bring a variety of approaches and views to bear on the topic.

The workshop provides a forum for debate and discussion to scholars developing indices and working on measuring democracy/autocracy or sub-systems/sub-aspects and studying new trends, problems and perspectives.

The joint workshop will attempt to answer two fundamental questions: Where do we stand in when it comes to measuring democracy and where do we go from here? What shortcomings may contribute to the emergence of innovative approaches?

The measurement of democracy is viewed as essential, as it plausibly reflects the degree and quality of democracy. Moreover, innovative research efforts in this area (i.e. Democracy Barometer or Varieties of Democracy) must be tested. The focus should not rest solely on quantitative measurements, as a number of qualitative and complex approaches have emerged, allowing for multi-layered portrayals of democracy.
The joint workshop program mirrors this last point, as it draws scholars using different methodologies.

Aside from these considerations, discussions are required to determine whether survey data on political culture studies are helpful for purposes of a general assessment. The joint workshop will include a debate on whether policy outputs can be applied as indicators for measuring democracy. The range of related factors varies from social policy to issues related to human rights violations.

Finally, through its opening debate, the joint workshop will address the following issues: The degree of democracy at levels lower than the nation-state, particularly in democracies spanning a vast territory, such as Brazil, India and Mexico; the extent to which globalization (financial crisis, international terrorism) and supranational integration hinder the quality of democracies; the functionality of democracies; and compound procedures of deliberative and/or direct democracies.

We are delighted that Prof. Gerard Munk has agreed to take part. He will open the joint workshop with a keynote address titled “Concepts of Democracy as a Basis for Measuring Democracy.”

The organizing team includes IPSA RC34 chairs José Alvaro Moises (Sao Paulo, Brazil) and Marianne Kneuer (Hildesheim, Germany), who will also represent the German Research Group on Democracy Studies together with Hans-Joachim Lauth (Würzburg, Germany).

**RC36 – Political Power**
**APSA Annual Congress & Interim Conference**

1) **APSA Annual Congress, August 29 to September 1, Chicago**

Together with APSA Political Thought and Philosophy, RC36 will co-sponsor two panels:

**Title:** Power, Persuasion, and Domination across Boundaries

**Title:** Power, Persuasion, and Progressivism: Insights from Early Twentieth Century American Thought

2) **Interim conference, Galway, Friday, September 26 to Sunday, September 28**

Call for papers: “Power with,” “Power to” and “power over”

The original power debates, starting with Robert Dahl in 1957, may be said to have assumed that power is tantamount to “power over.” During the same period, both Hannah Arendt and Talcott Parsons put forward an alternative perspective based largely on a perception of power as the “power to” or capacity for action. Until recently, however, the latter perspective has been largely eclipsed by the dominant “power over” perspective. In the work of Michel Foucault, we find various assertions to the effect that power is “positive”; yet he continuously enjoins us to resist power, which suggests that his concept of power is empirically positive while being normatively negative. In bringing these debates together, Amy Allen provides a vocabulary embodying the three terms within a single language game. Some theorists suggest that “power to” or “power with” should be the primary concepts, as opposed to “power over,” and the debate continues.

This conference seeks to spark a debate on the relationship between “power with,” “power to” and “power over,” which are deliberately listed in reverse order. Theoretical and empirical papers are welcome.

This conference will take place over a period of two days. Papers will be distributed in advance, and anyone presenting a paper will be expected to take part in the entire conference. We expect to begin on Friday and finish on Saturday evening. Participation will be limited owing to the intense nature of the debate.

**RC37 – Rethinking Political Development**

RC37 and RC02, represented by Professor Dr. Oxana Gaman-Golutvina, president of Russian Political Science Association, will hold a joint IPSA workshop on “Rethinking Political Development: Cultures, Civilizations and Identity.” Proposed dates: November 7 and 8, 2013 at Rollins College, Florida, USA; or December 12 and 13, 2013 in Dhaka, Bangladesh.

The workshop will explore various facets of nationalism – secular and non-secular – and sovereignty in the context of evolving perceptions of human identity in different cultures and civilizations. The panels will focus on the spirit as well as the process of democratization in nations with a long history of non-democratic rule and conservative cultures. At least two panels will be on “Rethinking Political Development” (RC37) spearheaded by elites (RC02) in various countries, particularly the emerging BRICS and beyond; panels will also evaluate multiple policy-making options for resolving conflicts before they spiral out of control and end in the highest form of terrorism – interstate wars.

The chair of RC37, Dr. Zillur Khan, and Dr. Oxana Gaman-Golutvina are planning to introduce a volume of papers selected from their joint IPSA workshops as well as joint RC37 and RC02 sessions presented at the IPSA World Congress of Political Science in Madrid.

**RC38 – Politics and Business**
**International Conference on Public Policy & Book Project**

Together with several other research committees, RC38 has joined a new initiative: The International Conference on Public Policy (ICPP), which takes place in Grenoble, France. This event is among those planned between IPSA congresses, and other such activities are under preparation. RC38 will focus on issues that have long held interest among scholars of politics and business, but
Participation

From various scientific disciplines and perspectives. The study of the relationship between "geopolitics and great powers" further challenges the international system. The power shift leads us in the opposite direction. To shape our world in one direction even as a major worldwide dented economic and technological globalization, which continues unprecedent. The international system could go either way owing to unprecedented economic and technological globalisation, which continues to shape our world in one direction even as a major worldwide power shift leads us in the opposite direction.

RC40 – New World Orders
International Conference on Public Policy & Book Project

Ulrike Lorenz-Carl (Potsdam University, Germany) and Maria J Garcia (University of Canterbury, New Zealand) recently took over the management of RC40 on New World Orders. The RC40 website will be up and running shortly. We look forward to suggestions from and exchanges with RC members. For further information, please contact Maria Garcia at maria.garcia@canterbury.ac.nz or Ulrike Lorenz-Carl at loenzul@uni-potsdam.de.

RC41 – Geopolitics
Second Conference on Geopolitics

The International Political Science Association’s Research Committee on Geopolitics (RC41) is pleased to announce an international workshop on emerging regional contests and contestants, to be held in Jerusalem from November 25 to 27, 2013. This follows our successful 2010 Moscow conference and the 2012 Madrid panels.

The contours of today’s evolving global system suggest two contradictory futures, the first a "great convergence" of humankind, the second an emerging "G-zero" leaderless planet.

The international system could go either way owing to unprecedented economic and technological globalisation, which continues to shape our world in one direction even as a major worldwide power shift leads us in the opposite direction.

Economic, domestic and regional uncertainties in the United States, Europe, the Middle East, Asia and the Americas further challenge students of international affairs to define the political superstructure of tomorrow’s world and identify its potential leading actors.

The workshop format will provide the opportunity for careful study of the relationship between “geopolitics and great powers” from various scientific disciplines and perspectives. Part of the IPSA RC41 workshop program will be devoted to looming regional contests in the Eastern Mediterranean-Persian Gulf area, the Pacific Basin and elsewhere. These individual case studies on the impact of great powers on geopolitics are meant to strengthen general insights at the theoretical level.

Persons interested in participating in the 2013 RC41 Jerusalem International Workshop on Geopolitics and Great Powers are cordially invited to submit a paper proposal.

The proposal and/or abstract (maximum 750 words) may be forwarded to Professor Aharon Klieman at aklieman@gmail.com.

The submission deadline is May 1, 2013.

For further information please visit rc41.ipsa.org

RC43 – Religion and Politics

A new RC43 executive committee was elected at the 2013 World Congress in Madrid. The following people make up the current executive committee:

Chair
Professor Jeffrey Haynes
Associate Dean, Research and Postgraduate, Faculty of Law, Governance and International Relations, London Metropolitan University, UK

Director, Centre for the Study of Religion, Conflict and Cooperation
Convenor, ECPR Standing Group, “Religion and Politics”

Board
Alex Christoyannopoulos, UK (membership)
Yolande Cohen, Canada
Sharyl Cross, US
Emilce Cuda, Argentina (Latin America representative)
Miroslav Jevtic, Serbia (Balkans/Eastern Europe representative)
Mika Luoma Aho, Finland (social networking)
Carimo Mohomed, Portugal
Luca Ozzano, Italy (webmaster)
Jolanda van der Noll, Belgium (newsletter editor)

Members of the board agreed that it was important to work with as many people as possible who share a broad research interest in religion and politics. Consequently, the board invites anyone interested in our topic to contact RC43 for links to websites or to distribute information on various activities of mutual interest, including research, conferences and other events. The newly reconstituted RC43 website is at http://rc43.ipsa.org. It features information on the far-reaching topic of religion and politics, including details on upcoming events, calls for papers, announcements and new publications. We are always pleased to receive new material for the website.

Persons who wish to join RC43 and receive our periodic newsletter are asked to contact Dr. Alex Christoyannopoulos (Loughborough University, UK) at a.christoyannopoulos@gmail.com.
RC47 – Local-Global Relations

In November 2012, RC47 conducted an email ballot and the following members were elected to its board:

President: Jerzy Wiatr (Poland), jwiatr@ewspl.edu.pl

Vice-president: Nataliya Velikaya (Russian Federation)

Secretary/treasurer: Krzysztof Ostrowski (Poland)

Members of the Board:

Kusein Isayev (Kyrgyzstan)
Da-chi Liao (Taiwan)

Stefan Szucs (Sweden)

The new board is planning to post an RC47 webpage in the spring of 2013 and to stage a conference in the summer of 2013.

RC48 – Administrative Culture

International Seminar, New Book & Website

RC48 presents four successful panels at the 22nd World Congress in Madrid: “The Changing Role of the Military in the 21st Century”; “The Changing Role of the Military within a Country”; “The Comparative Study of the Military’s Role in Two or More Countries”; and “The Future of the Military or the Military in the Future.” All were very well attended.

We decided to issue a call for papers for an edited volume titled Fighting for Peace based on RC48 papers presented at various IPSA conferences and/or current research by our members and others interested in this theme. This volume will be published either from India or IPSA, if possible. Please forward an abstract (maximum 250 words) to the convener co-convener by no later than May 15, 2013. We are also looking for people willing to serve as editors for this volume. We hope to present four panels at the Montreal World Congress on the congress theme and on themes suggested by the May 15 deadline.

Dr. (Mrs.) Asha Gupta (University of Delhi), ashagupta3452@gmail.com

RC44 – The Military’s Role in Democratization

RC44 presented four successful panels at the 22nd World Congress in Madrid: “The Changing Role of the Military in the 21st Century”; “The Changing Role of the Military within a Country”; “The Comparative Study of the Military’s Role in Two or More Countries”; and “The Future of the Military or the Military in the Future.” All were very well attended.

The seminar itself will be multidisciplinary in character and open to legal, philosophical, political, sociological and other perspectives. Its main goal is to pool various scientific approaches to public values research and analyze contemporary trends as they relate to the development of political and administrative cultures in Russia and the world.

The seminar will be given in English and Russian. Some 40 participants are expected to attend. Details on accepted proposals and invitation letters will be forwarded after May 1, 2013.

Abstracts (200 words) must include your name, university, position, contact information and email, and they may be forwarded to Liudmila Vedmetskaya at values.seminar2013@gmail.com

Coordinators: Rosamund Thomas (Cambridge University) & Leonid Smorgunov (Saint Petersburg State University)

RC50 – Politics of Language

(formerly Language and Politics)

New Name and Publication

RC50 announces the forthcoming publication of State Traditions and Language Regimes. Edited by Linda Cardinal and Selma K. Sonntag (past and current chairs of RC50), this volume features 16 contributions, almost all of which were presented as part of RC50 panels at the IPSA/AISP 2012 World Congress in Madrid or the RC50 inter-congress conference at the University of Ottawa in September 2011. The volume is meant to reposition the debate on language politics within the discipline of political science. Contributors analyze language policy from a political science perspective, focusing on the role of the state - its traditions, institutions, structures and processes - in informing language choice. The analytical tools of political science are used to develop middle-level theories of language politics, a field of study that has been relatively neglected by political scientists. The language regimes featured in the volume include official language regimes, language regimes in bureaucracy, education and economic development, local language regimes in Basque country and Wales, and emerging global language regimes. Featured states include Canada, the United States, France, Poland, Taiwan, Malaysia, and Ireland. The editors expect the volume to be published later this year by McGill-Queens University Press.

RC50 would also like to announce a change in our research committee’s title, from “Language and Politics” to “Politics of Language.”
Les défis de la gouvernance contemporaine

Les politologues sont souvent considérés non seulement comme des analystes du politique, mais sont également assimilés à de véritables ingénieurs en organisation du pouvoir.

La mondialisation réactive leur rôle en entraînant une intensification de la communication et des échanges sur les questions portant sur la façon dont on peut gouverner les communautés, les sociétés, les nations et le monde.

L’ambition de ce congrès mondial de science politique organisé à Montréal, consiste à interroger les évolutions contemporaines de la gouvernance confrontée aux principaux défis suivants:

- Les systèmes politiques, économiques et sociaux sont soumis à un processus accéléré de fragmentation, rendant de plus en plus délicates les actions de pilotage global
- La différenciation des valeurs, attitudes et comportements des acteurs individuels et collectifs entraîne une demande renforcée et diversifiée d’inclusion et de participation
- Au fur et à mesure que la structure de représentation des intérêts s’élargit, le système de gouvernance se complexifie et devient moins lisible, déchiffrable et responsive aux non-initiés
- Le risque s’accroit d’une détérioration de la qualité démocratique de systèmes politiques confrontés à une montée en influence et en capacité décisionnelle de l’expertise techno-administrative et de la technocratie
- Pour un secteur ou un type d’organisation donné, l’analyse comparative et la démarche méthodologique d’expérimentation sont censées favoriser une meilleure connaissance de la performance des différentes formes de gouvernance
- Il est d’autant plus pertinent de se pencher sur les usages et stratégies concurrentielles de valorisation, voire d’imposition de modèles de gouvernance (au nom par exemple d’une « bonne gouvernance » revendiquée par des institutions internationales)

Face à ces principaux défis, le phénomène à multi-facettes de la gouvernance suppose une approche globale, comprehensive and multi-tiered approach: from the local association or political party up to the international community, via regional integration or the national regulation of an economic sector.

Dans une perspective de science politique résolument ouverte à l’interdisciplinarité, il doit également permettre de faire circuler les cadres théoriques et les approches empiriques applicables tant au Nord qu’au Sud, aux sociétés économiquement développées qu’aux pays émergents.

L’objectif principal de ce congrès sera de générer le plus grand nombre possible de réponses concrètes et innovantes aux questions des citoyens et de leurs représentants politiques, associatifs et socio-économiques, ainsi que des décideurs politiques et administratifs qui travaillent en permanence à améliorer la qualité de la gouvernance.

Challenges of Contemporary Governance

Political scientists are often seen not merely as analysts of political matters, but as something akin to engineers sculpting the organisation of power.

Globalisation has profoundly altered the work of political scientists, intensifying communication and exchange on issues pertaining to the way in which communities, societies, nations and the world itself are governed.

The ambition of this international political science congress, to be held in Montreal, is to reflect upon contemporary evolutions in governance in the face of numerous challenges:

- Political, economic and social systems have become increasingly fragmented, rendering global strategic initiatives ever more complex
- The variety of values, attitudes and behaviours exhibited by individuals and groups makes for a greater and more diverse demand for inclusion and participation
- As the structures through which these interests are represented continue to expand, systems of governance become increasingly complex, more difficult to interpret and understand and less responsive to the uninitiated citizen
- There is a growing risk that the democratic quality of our political systems will deteriorate as a result of the rising influence and decision-making capacity of technical-administrative and technocratic experts
- For a given sector or type of organisation, comparative analysis and an experimental methodological approach should help better evaluate the performance of different forms of governance
- It may also be fruitful to focus on the various competitive strategies and means by which models of governance are promoted, or even imposed (in the name of ‘good governance’ demanded by international institutions, for example)

Faced with these challenges, the multi-faceted phenomenon of governance requires a global, comprehensive and multi-tiered approach: from the local association or political party up to the international community, via regional integration or the national regulation of an economic sector.

Adopting an approach to political science which is resolutely open to the opportunities offered by interdisciplinary collaborations, we must also support the circulation of theoretical frameworks and empirical approaches which are applicable in the northern and southern hemispheres, to the most developed nations and the panoply of emerging and developing countries.

The main focus of this congress will be to generate the greatest possible number of concrete, innovative answers to the questions of citizens, their political, associative and socio-economic representatives and the policy makers who are working constantly to improve the quality of governance.
APPEL À CONTRIBUTIONS
Les défis de la gouvernance contemporaine
Nous vous invitons à partager les résultats de vos recherches sur des questions touchant directement les citoyens, leurs représentants politiques, associatifs et socioéconomiques, ainsi que les décideurs politiques et administratifs qui travaillent en permanence à améliorer la qualité de la gouvernance.
Veuillez soumettre vos propositions en ligne à partir de mai 2013
www.ipsa.org

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS
Challenges of Contemporary Governance
We invite you to share your research on innovative answers to the questions of citizens, their political, associative and socio-economic representatives and the policy makers who are working constantly to improve the quality of governance.
Submit your paper online as of May 2013
www.ipsa.org

International Political Science Association (IPSA)
Association internationale de science politique (AISP)
1590, av. Docteur-Penfield, bureau 331
Montréal (QC) H3G 1C5 - Canada
Tel/Tél : +1 514 848 8718  |  Fax: +1 514 848 4095  |  Email/Courriel : Montreal2014@ipsa.org

DATE LIMITE :
Soumission de panels : 1er juillet 2013
Soumission de propositions individuelles : 7 octobre 2013

DEADLINE:
Call for panels: July 1, 2013
Call for papers: October 7, 2013