



THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE SECOND RUSTAT CONFERENCE

Rustat Conferences
Jesus College
Cambridge

Rustat Conferences – The Future of Democracy
13 October 2009



Left to right: Peter Kellner, President, YouGov, Professor Andrew Gamble, Head of Politics Department, University of Cambridge, Matthew Taylor, CEO, the RSA



Left to right: Professor Jean Seaton, University of Westminster; Professor James Curran, Goldsmiths; Peter Horrocks, Director, BBC World Service

THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

PROCEEDINGS OF
THE SECOND RUSTAT CONFERENCE

13 October, 2009

Proceedings by Duncan Kelly

Rustat Conferences
Jesus College, Cambridge
www.rustat.org

Contents

Rustat Conferences – An Overview	5
Preface	6
Acknowledgements	7
List of Conference Participants	8
Conference Schedule – Sessions and Speakers	10
Speakers and Moderators List	11
Conference Proceedings - by Dr Duncan Kelly	
Opening Words – Professor David Marquand	13
Democracy in a Globalising World	14
Rebuilding Trust in Democracy	18
Democracy in a Non-Western Context	23
Britain and Democracy	27
The Media and Democracy	30
Final Words – Professor Andrew Gamble	33
Appendix	
Participant and Speaker Profiles	35

Rustat Conferences

The Rustat Conferences are an initiative of Jesus College, Cambridge, chaired by Professor Robert Mair FREng FRS, Master of Jesus College, and directed by John Cornwell. The Rustat Conferences provide an opportunity for decision-makers from the frontlines of politics, the civil service, business, the media, and education to exchange views on the vital issues of the day with leading academics. They were founded in 2009; the theme of the inaugural Rustat Conference in May 2009 was The Economic Crisis.

The Rustat Conferences format is a round-table discussion: academic speakers set the framework for each session by a brief exposition of points followed by a moderated discussion among all invited participants. The meetings are limited to around fifty participants.

In addition to acting as a forum for the exchange of views on a range of major and global concerns, the Rustat Conferences provide outreach to a wider professional, academic and student audience through the publication of reports in a variety of media – pdf, ebook, video and audio recordings. See the Rustat Conferences website for more information: www.rustat.org

The conferences are held at Jesus College, Cambridge, one of the colleges of the University of Cambridge, and are named after Tobias Rustat (d.1694), an important benefactor of Jesus College and the University. Tobias Rustat is best remembered for creating the first fund for the purchase of books for the Cambridge University Library.

Preface

The inaugural Rustat Conference in May 2009 took as its theme The Economic Crisis and gathered together a group of leading economists, politicians and leaders from the City, industry, the media and the public sector. Initially we had planned the follow-up conference to focus on the future of capitalism, a subject of much debate given the calls for reform of the banking system and regulation. On reflection however, it occurred to us that a more vital issue needed to be addressed: the future of democracy itself, at home and abroad. The continuing global economic crisis, the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, the crises in Iran and Pakistan, the prospects for social and political change in China, all raise fundamental questions about the future of democracy in a non-Western setting. At the same time, Britain is experiencing a profound sense of disillusionment in its democratic institutions, with cynicism towards its politicians and widespread belief that parliamentary democracy and individual honesty and transparency have been permanently eroded.

These reflections prompted a host of questions, some of which were tackled in this, the second Rustat Conference, on the Future of Democracy: can trust be restored in the institutions and individuals responsible for governing? What are the prospects and feasible models of democracy for an increasingly globalised world? To what extent does the power of the media and new information technologies aid or undermine democracy and civil society?

Chaired by the Master of Jesus College, Professor Robert Mair, the second Rustat Conference was held on 13 October 2009 and offered an opportunity for participants to debate and exchange views on these crucial topics. The meeting brought together the country's leading political theorists with a group which included philosophers, economists, historians, sociologists, engineers, theologians, politicians, diplomats, civil servants, journalists, publishers, broadcasters, financiers and NGOs.

The lively discussions and debates of this meeting were written up as these proceedings by Dr Duncan Kelly, University Lecturer in Political Theory, Cambridge University. All photographs are by Tudor Jenkins. Videos and recordings of the conference sessions will be available in the Rustat Conferences Archive on www.rustat.org.

Acknowledgements

This second Rustat Conference on the Future of Democracy was a success thanks to the advice, encouragement and assistance of a number of people. Professors Andrew Gamble and John Thompson, both of Cambridge University, generously helped to identify the key topics for discussion as well as the main speakers, moderators and respondents, to whom we are also most grateful – a list of their names appears on the next page. Rustat Conferences are round-table events and so rely for their success on the active participation of all those who attend and add value to the discussion. The conference was chaired by the Master of Jesus College, Professor Robert Mair, whom with Margaret Mair, kindly hosted the conference lunch in the Master's Lodge at Jesus College. The role of conference rapporteur was taken on at short notice by Dr Duncan Kelly, University Lecturer in Political Theory at Cambridge, and Fellow of Jesus College. His expert handling of the subject matter allows the critical ideas and round-table discussions to be communicated very clearly. I also thank Tony Crouch, Senior Bursar, Richard Dennis, Development Director and Alison White, Development Office, Jesus College, Cambridge for their time and assistance. Dr Thierry Morel also provided valuable help on the day. Dr Tudor Jenkins filmed and recorded the proceedings. Jonathan Cornwell produced the proceedings and the Rustat Conferences website. Finally, my thanks to the Master and Fellows of Jesus College, Cambridge for their continued support of the Rustat Conferences.

John Cornwell
Jesus College
Cambridge

Rustat Conference - The Future of Democracy

Participants

Professor Robert Mair FREng, FRS Master, Jesus College and Chair, Rustat Conferences

John Cornwell Director, Rustat Conferences, Jesus College, Cambridge

Ali Ansari Director Institute for Iranian Studies & Professor of Iranian History, St Andrews University

Rev Dr Michael Banner Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge

Professor Nicholas Boyle Schröder Professor of German, University of Cambridge

Professor George Brock Professor and Head of Journalism at City University

Dr Christopher Catherwood Historian and author, University of Cambridge

Jonathan S. Cornwell Publisher

Professor James Curran Director of the Goldsmiths Leverhulme Media Research Centre

Brandon Davies Senior Non-executive Director of Gatehouse Capital plc

Professor Arnoud de Meyer Director of Judge Business School, Cambridge University

Dr James Dodd Managing Director of Anthem Corporate Finance

Professor John Dunn Professor Emeritus of Political Theory at Cambridge University

Dr Shailaja Fennell Lecturer in Development Studies at Cambridge

Andrew Gamble Professor of Politics and Head of Department Cambridge University

Geoffrey Harcourt Emeritus Reader in the History of Economic Theory, University of Cambridge

Stephen Heath Professor of English and French Literature and Culture at Cambridge University

Peter Horrocks Director of BBC World Service, Deputy Director of the BBC Global News division

Ed Husain Co-Director of the Quilliam Foundation, counter-extremism think tank

Lucy James Research Fellow at Quilliam Foundation

Dr John Jenkins CMG, LVO HM Ambassador designate to the Republic of Iraq (2009)

Dr Tudor Jenkins Director of digital media business Wide Eyed Vision

John Keane Professor of Politics, University of Westminster; author *The Life & Death of Democracy*

Peter Kellner President of YouGov, journalist and political commentator

Dr Duncan Kelly Lecturer in Political Theory, Cambridge University; Fellow of Jesus College

Dr Kwasi Kwarteng Historian, author and politician

David Marquand FBA Professor of Politics, Oxford University, author and former Labour MP

Dr Stoddart Martin Academic, author and publisher

Dr Thierry Morel Research Associate, Faculty of History of Art, Cambridge University

Dr Véronique Mottier Director of Studies, Social & Political Sciences, Jesus College, Cambridge

John Naughton Professor of the Public Understanding of Technology, Open University

Peter Nolan Sinyi Professor of Chinese Management at Judge Business School, Cambridge

Baroness Onora O'Neill Professor Emeritus of Philosophy, University of Cambridge

Pier Luigi Porta Professor of Economics, University of Milano-Bicocca

Nicholas Ray Reader Emeritus in Architecture, University of Cambridge, Fellow of Jesus College

Dr David Runciman Senior Lecturer, Politics, Cambridge University, Fellow of Trinity Hall

Dr. Siddharth Saxena Advanced Research Fellow at the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge

Jean Seaton Professor of Media History, University of Westminster, Historian of the BBC

Brendan Simms Professor of the History of International Relations, University of Cambridge

Matthew Taylor CEO, the RSA; former Chief Adviser on Political Strategy to the Prime Minister

Ambassador José Turpin Molina Spanish Ambassador to Afghanistan

John Wilkins Journalist and former Editor of The Tablet

Lord Wilson of Dinton Master, Emmanuel College, Cambridge; former Cabinet Secretary

Tony Wright Labour MP for Cannock Chase and author

Sam Younger Interim CEO, Shelter and former Chair of the Electoral Commission



Rustat Conference Schedule - The Future of Democracy Tuesday, 13 October, 2009 - Jesus College, Cambridge

Conference Chair Professor Robert Mair FREng FRS, Master, Jesus College, Cambridge

Conference Registration – Prioress’s Room (off Cloister Court, Jesus College) 08.45-09.45

All conference sessions are held in Upper Hall apart from lunch in the Master’s Lodge.
Position papers (10 minutes per speaker) followed by moderated discussion.

Sessions and Speakers:

Opening Words - Setting the Agenda 09.45-10.00
David Marquand

1. Democracy in a Globalising World. Panel (speakers / moderator) 10.00-11.00
John Keane, John Dunn, Tony Wright MP (moderator and respondent)

Break – Coffee 11.00-11.15

2. Rebuilding Trust in Democracy. Panel (speakers / moderator) 11.15-12.15
Onora O’Neill, David Runciman, Richard Wilson (moderator and respondent)

Lunch – Master’s Lodge, Jesus College 12.15-13.30

3. Democracy in a non-Western Context. Panel (speakers / moderator) 13.30-14.20
Peter Nolan, Ali Ansari, John Dunn (moderator and respondent)

4. Britain. Panel (speakers / moderator) 14.20-15.10
Peter Kellner, Matthew Taylor, Andrew Gamble (moderator), Tony Wright MP (respondent)

Break - Tea 15.10-15.25

5. Media and Democracy. Panel (speakers / moderator) 15.25-16.15
James Curran, John Naughton, Peter Horrocks, Jean Seaton (moderator and respondent)

Final Words and Comments 16.15-16.30
Andrew Gamble

End 16.30

Rustat Conference – The Future of Democracy

Speakers and Moderators

Conference Chair	Professor Robert Mair FREng FRS, Master, Jesus College, Cambridge
Ali Ansari	Professor and Director of Institute of Iranian Studies, St Andrews University
James Curran	Professor of Communications, Goldsmiths, University of London
John Dunn	Professor of Political Theory, University of Cambridge
Andrew Gamble	Professor of Politics, Head of Department, University of Cambridge
John Keane	Professor of Politics, University of Westminster
Peter Kellner	President YouGov, journalist and political commentator
Duncan Kelly	Lecturer in Political Theory, Cambridge University, Fellow, Jesus College
Peter Horrocks	Director, BBC World Service
David Marquand	Former Principal, Mansfield College, Oxford and former MP
John Naughton	Professor of Public Understanding of Technology, Open University
Peter Nolan	Sinyi Professor of Chinese Management, University of Cambridge
Onora O'Neill	Baroness O'Neill of Bengarve, former President, British Academy
David Runciman	Senior Lecturer in Political Theory, University of Cambridge
Jean Seaton	Professor of Media History, University of Westminster
Matthew Taylor	CEO, RSA and former Chief Adviser on Strategy to the Prime Minister
Richard Wilson	Lord Wilson of Dinton, Master, Emmanuel College, Cambridge; former Cabinet Secretary and Head of the Civil Service
Tony Wright	Member of Parliament for Cannock Chase, author and academic

The Rustat Conferences are an initiative of Jesus College, Cambridge and directed by John Cornwell. The meetings bring together academics, leaders in politics, the civil service, the media and business in a round-table discussion. For more information email jc224@cam.ac.uk , telephone +44 (0)1223 328 316 or go to www.rustat.org and www.jesus.cam.ac.uk/rustat



Tony Wright MP



Left to right: Professor George Brock, City University,
and Professor Robert Mair, Master, Jesus College

Conference Proceedings

Opening Words – David Marquand

The conference saw some opening remarks from David Marquand, who stressed four theses about the issue of democracy in a globalizing world that it would be worth at least considering.

First, the EU and its role as both an 'agent of democratization', particularly in the context of the recent Lisbon treaty decisions, and in terms of its complex structural integration of 'federal' and 'confederal' elements. Examples of the former are the Parliament, the Court of Justice, monetary union and the ECB and, in some respects, the Commission. Examples of the latter are the Council and the remaining role of national governments in fiscal policy, defence, foreign policy etc. The net result is a hideously complex governance structure, which hardly any European citizens understand. That is the true meaning of the much-touted term 'democratic deficit'. How can or will or should the EU evolve in the light of that, or can such opacity and legitimacy problems continue as they are?

Second, Marquand pointed in general terms to transformations in the contemporary modern state, transformations that would continue as themes throughout the day. He alluded to Philip Bobbit's discussion of the transformation from a warfare to a market state, and reflected upon the disintegration of the traditional bargain between state/citizen as reflected in the transformed character of the modern army. Arguably, democracy was a product of (and at the same time a facilitator of) inter-state warfare in the days of mass conscript armies. 'We conscript you, and may well cause you to lose your life. In return you get the chance to change the government in control of the state at regular intervals'. However, the welfare-warfare state is a thing of the past, because mass-conscript armies have been replaced by small, professional, and essentially mercenary outfits. Thus, traditional state-delivered social welfare is under enormous pressure, and we might therefore ask whether the disappearance of the traditional welfare/warfare state has made democracy redundant.

This leads on to a third thought, concerning the question of leadership in modern (or perhaps post-modern) conditions. Has parliamentary democracy of the traditional sort given way to populist democracy, and traditional parliamentary leadership to more-or-less charismatic, 'heroic' leadership? Certainly, that seems

to be the case in Britain. Lloyd George might be the first illustration of this in the UK until Thatcher, but perhaps there is a pattern here. Callaghan and Wilson (archetypal traditionalists) were followed by the charismatic 'heroine', Thatcher, and then Major was followed by Blair, another charismatic 'hero'. It seems clear that Brown - essentially a Major re-tread - will soon be followed by Cameron, who shows all the signs of being another charismatic hero too. And, of course, on the other side of the Atlantic, Obama is an absolutely classic charismatic hero, following the distinctly non-charismatic Bush, just as the rather flawed charismatic hero, Clinton, followed Bush Sr. Whether this is right, Marquand affirmed the point that any discussion of the future of democracy must come to grips with democratic leadership in the context of what Rhodes has termed a 'managed' populism, or in Marquand's gloss a 'manipulated populism'. Indeed, if this is a correct diagnosis, then it might mean that debates about constitutional or parliamentary reform rather miss the point, or in his phrase, could simply be 'spitting in the wind'.

Finally, there is the large-scale and structural problem of how democratic equality can be aligned, or justified, with the massive economic inequality of our globalized world. For although few pioneers of democratic struggle (the Levellers, Paine, Mill on socialism) believed in complete equality, they did agree that 'inordinate market power' was the 'enemy of democratic self-government', and this was something like a consensus from 1945-1980. The Gini co-efficient leapt up under Thatcher, stabilized somewhat under Major, and continue(s) to rise under Blair and now Brown.

Session 1 Democracy in a Globalising World

Speakers John Keane and John Dunn

Moderator Tony Wright

From this beginning, John Keane proposed that the recent Westminster parliament expenses scandal highlighted immediately the importance of rethinking contemporary democracy. Bidding to 'inject some incoherence', Keane offered his own four theses, based on an appreciation of democracy as requiring a leap of the imagination, or a gestalt switch, in cultural meaning. This could show how out of kilter contemporary theories of democracy are given present global realities.

First, the 'indigenization of democracy', its rootedness in the different contexts in which such ideas are made manifest. How can typically 'western' theories adequately deal with this (indeed, we should lose the 'pet zombie term' liberal

democracy completely), or can they learn from the ideas of democracy that are mutating and evolving in, say, India, Taiwan, the Pacific Islands, and so forth?

From this a second claim concerned the rise of 'monitory' democracy, a fundamental transformation since 1945, which has sent politics 'viral'. This has brought forth a host of new monitoring agencies, which seems to explain something about the weaknesses of democracy.

Third, we should consider the how, if at all, the biosphere can itself be 'represented' and given the voice it currently lacks. Can politics deal with such 'unintended consequences' as global warming?

Finally, the question of cross-border democracy was raised, and whether mechanisms of supranational accountability are likely or viable in these contexts.

In response, John Dunn began with the 'pedantic' question of what we think we are talking about when we talk about democracy, as word, idea, or state form. If the first is conceptually understandable but limited, the second is nebulous, so the third might offer more promise. Claiming that whatever happened to modern democracy, it was unlikely that the dynamism or otherwise of the EU would have much of a say in it. The paradox of our situation seems to be that a relatively weak institutional form has been able to take the weight of such a heavy conceptual load for so long. Furthermore, Dunn suggested that if Marquand's thesis about populism held, it was surely best personified best in Italy under Berlusconi. Focusing therefore on the transformations in the modern representative state, particularly in the past half century, Dunn suggested that the complexity of the relationship between representation and the increased professionalization of politics led to a serious weakness of managerial capacity and ability, but which manifested itself in ways that nobody really understands. The credit crisis was but one illustration of this.

This prompted the question of whether it was even possible politically to re-establish any sense of control over the distribution of property rights, in order to prevent irreparable resentment between persons. Transparency mechanisms of a 'monitory' sort are little more than band-aids to a deeper wound, he suggested. To this, Tony Wright responded that democracy should rather be seen as a shorthand, with a bundle of attributes attached, whose nature we fill in through the activities of politics. Equally, in a theme he would return to later on concerning an apparent 'crisis' in our civic culture, Wright claimed that there were simply cycles in politics, whereby demands for transparency create regimes in which people get accustomed to information, with that information they seek to change politics, and changed politics then requires new mechanisms of control and so forth.

The problem today is that a 'new way of doing politics' has not been found, but our mechanisms and procedures and norms are still much the same as they had been for a long time. His own constituency had changed out of all recognition, but the ways of operating politically hadn't caught up, so perhaps a cultural transformation in thinking about democracy is required, which could relate back to Keane's account of democracy as culture itself. Indeed, one might note parenthetically the deep roots (in America at least) of such ideas in the work of writers like Emerson and Thoreau, which many scholars (e.g. Cavell, Kateb) have resuscitated in recent memory.

Perhaps though this was all-too-simplistic and fatalistic. Peter Kellner asked us to be a little more sanguine about the 'goods' of democracy since the war, such that if one were to ask the hypothetical question of one's parents and grandparents, for example, who fought fascism, Nazism and Stalinism, whether our situation wasn't a major improvement in terms of democracy, we might get rather different answers than the academic scepticism around the table here. Also, he then asked, wasn't the right question to be asking about how global institutions might counterbalance huge inequalities, the likes of which Dunn had talked about previously?

The question of indigenization was raised in acute form by Montu Saxena, who posed the issue of colonialism and its legacy for thinking about democracy. Given the historical specificity of Western ideas of democracy, and of the obvious problems raised by and for this concept in its forced imposition onto colonial societies, Western democracy might simply continue to provide a rather easy justification for continued domination. That focus on India was taken up by Christopher Catherwood, who thought the rise of democracy in India was ultimately the sort of triumph that proved Churchill's worries about democracy wrong.

John Jenkins agreed with Peter Kellner that the concept was powerful yet unstable, and asked us to think about the question of institutionalization once more; for example, in the Middle East democracy might be best understood as a challenge to extant power, given the relative lack of intermediary institutions to uphold the rule of law. Again, one might also note here in parenthesis that this was precisely the question posed long ago by Montesquieu, but in relation to England. Such intermediary institutions (which many now think England lacks), which prevented it from becoming the most enslaved nation on earth, and we might wonder whether this account still holds.

Others like Michael Banner brought the debate around to the problem of disinterest and disengagement with politics on the part of the young, noting that for the many Balliol old-boys (and they were boys) around the table there used to

be an easy understanding of democracy, which could be brought out to criticize aberrant or abhorrent rulers all over the place in the common rooms and debating societies. But the kids aren't like that any more, either in terms of the use of 'democracy' or the engagement with world politics, but *why not* is not an easy question to answer? Perhaps it is because government doesn't respond well or fit within the parameters of modern engagement, whether in single-issue or social network style interactions.

Brandon Davies wondered what 'direct democracy' might offer here in terms of overcoming the limitations of national politics, whilst Pier Luigi Porta reminded us of the centrality of the market in structuring all these questions. Meanwhile, Jean Seaton changed the angle of vision, suggesting that the illustration of mild-mannered literary festivals showed a demand and interest in political engagement, so she remained hopeful about the future of argument about politics, but worried that the language associated with democracy (such as that of 'human rights') perhaps meant there were 'too many additives' for us to cope with.

In response to the challenges posed to their arguments, Keane and Dunn responded in kind. Keane claimed that pseudo-triumphalist stories (such as those sketched by Fukuyama and Huntington) were clearly wrong, but that (like Eco's parable of *Kant and the Platypus*) we lacked terms for thinking through the transformations we are subject to. India, he thought, was the land that a new Tocqueville would seek out as a model of the democratic future, and he defended his concept of a monitory democracy as a sphere of engagement that had grown historically both inadvertently and outside of the spheres of traditional politics. Second, he talked again of populism, but in response to Marquand thought that all democracies had always faced this issue, whether in ancient Greek form as a worry about democracy and demagoguery, or other modern forms of mass-control, like those exercised through Robespierre or Hitler. This concern was its 'auto-immune disease'. Unlike Dunn, however, and in line with his rejection of the terminology of liberal democracy, Keane proposed a de-coupling of the territorial state/representative democracy compound. In response, Dunn forcefully argued that although India might be a mass-democracy, it was still the case that corruption ensured the election of many criminals, and that it wasn't at all obvious that this was either a real or desired future. Thus, although indigenization matters, the real question to ask (so far avoided he thought) was whether democracy in the state form we do have, is on balance favoured or not, and why, under conditions of globalization. There was little consensus overall, but certainly a range of questions opened a conversation that led into session two, under the heading of 'Rebuilding Trust in Democracy'.

Session 2 Rebuilding Trust in Democracy

Speakers Onora O’Neill, David Runciman

Moderator Richard Wilson

Richard Wilson opened the session, with Onora O’Neill and David Runciman talking first. And rather like the way in which Dunn asked us what we really mean by democracy, O’Neill asked whether we could talk about trust at all in this context, and that she would favour rejecting trust (in line actually with much academic literature on this topic) and looking at trustworthiness in democracy more generally. Trust can only come from trustworthiness, and if it is forced, then its both meaningless and counterproductive. This was, in fact, a major problem in the new regimes of accountability under which many public services have to operate; such ‘stupid accountability’ as that which schools, social services, and the NHS work towards can often decrease efficiency and effectiveness, as well as fail to provide the increased confidence (or trust) that they are designed to achieve. Thus, the supposed remedy to a problem of trust is meliorist – one advances new methods of accountability – but the problem is that such melioration is undertaken/provided by ‘interested parties’, so that it’s not undertaken without an agenda already. Therefore we should seek to think about the conceptual movement from trustworthiness→accountability→trust. But even in so doing we would see that, say, from 1980-2000, new mechanisms of accountability might be viewed as a success in terms of the rise of ‘monitory’ democracy, but now they were clearly a failure. One reason for this is a failure in terms of information, and that in fact new institutions are often less obviously accountable than traditional representative-democratic institutions. And, relatedly, this has to do with questions of control; accountability might be seen in this context as something like a positional good, where we trust those whom we feel we have some control over, and who are somehow beholden to us. The commercial analogy here might therefore actually work. Thus, Marks & Spencer, for instance, with a no-questions-asked refund policy, generates something like trust, because it appeals to something deep in our psychology.

In turn, David Runciman combined an historical narrative with a conceptual point about the limitations of thinking about trust in democracy. Conceptually, the question of trust in politics could be delineated with reference to whether we give our representatives freedom to act, or whether we want to focus attention on their actions in order to hold them very strictly to account. This thesis runs hand in hand with the historical claim that there are cycles of economics/politics that can be delineated, such that booms and bubbles burst and crises might ensue, but that this might highlight how trust is formed; i.e. with crisis comes mistrust, and from mistrust we might be able to rebuild trust again. Perhaps the award of the Nobel peace prize to Obama recently really is ‘classic bubble behaviour’. Indeed,

maybe we do have to wait for things to really bottom out before trust can be restored (think of the transformation between 1918-1919; or the recent claims by market analysts that there will have to be blood on the streets before recovery can commence). In this sense, democracy has two main components. First, it requires losers to accept their losses, and with good grace (which in itself might say something about the particular psychology required for democracy to be a success). Second, and relatedly, the losers have to think the game is worth defending/being bothered about, which is a real problem in an age of civic and political disengagement. Therefore, we might look to political forms that can bridge the gap, and perhaps parties could help here. Paradoxically, this would only work if they become more, not less, partisan, for partisanship divides but simultaneously strengthens political attachments and more general claims to the validity of a democratic proceduralism. Now, it might well be the case that hoping to strengthen traditional parties is utopian, and it might be that one possible proposal that could strengthen democracy, namely Europe-wide political parties, is more utopian still, but it might nevertheless be a plausible answer to the problem. Perhaps where there is greatest mistrust (the EU) there is scope for trust to be re-ignited; imagine a Europe of citizens electing by plebiscite a new President. That would force parties to re-align themselves and focus, in order to pursue the election of someone who they actually wanted. This could then help re-engage an apathetic citizenry. As Runciman noted, this is all of course utopian, but it could also be true, which is of course an interesting point about political analysis in general.



Left to right: Baroness O'Neill of Bengarve, Lord Wilson of Dinton, Dr David Runciman, Professor David Marquand

Geoff Harcourt raised the spectre of compulsory voting (as in his native Australia) which could help solve some of these institutional problems, whilst John Keane agreed with the centrality of cycles of boom and bust in politics. Questioning O'Neill's analysis, though, he thought that although the politics of audit was uninformed, but suggested that this was still better than no mechanisms at all. That left the way clear for hubris, groupthink, and so forth. He used the example of the recent financial crash to claim that the lack of regulation in the banking sector highlighted the dangers. Though, by way of interpolation, one might also note the claims of many analysts that the language of political explanation about the crisis is currently trapped between regulation/deregulation precisely because it reflects the dominant interests of those setting this agenda for explanation. In fact many have argued that the banking sector (especially in the UK) was and remains one of the most highly regulated of all, so the root cause of contemporary issues lies outside the current frame of reference. The problem then becomes how and why such regulation failed, and whether it was because it demanded 'stupid accountability', to return to O'Neill's thesis.

The debate continued, though, with Montu Saxena claiming that modern politics was rather like mass-sporting spectacle, you buy a ticket, watch, get momentarily excited and then go home, thinking little more about it. So, is there a difference that we should think about, between governance and politics perhaps, especially in a global context? Replying to this, and to Runciman, Pier Luigi Porta also spoke of the need to strengthen parties, particularly in the case of his own home country of Italy, where he also noted that only one traditional party, the Liga Nord, remained 'classical' in any meaningful sense in light of the populist Italian media-state run by Berlusconi. He nevertheless asked Runciman whether it wasn't idealistic to hope for strengthened parties. Runciman's later reply incorporated a direct response to this, reiterating that just because it was idealistic and self-consciously utopian, it didn't mean it wasn't the right, or at least one possible right answer. O'Neill replied that she was more interested (looking at the Italian case as outlined famously by Putnam about social capital) in how anachronistic suggestions about social capital in a world we have certainly lost are still being applied to modern politics and globalized political economies. Marquand added that he thought intuitively that Putnam was wrong about Britain (though as he would later suggest, Tony Wright by contrast really did think there was a civic crisis in modern Britain), he did recognize the loss of trust in journalists and others. He also wryly commented on the fact that people still seemed to trust academics, though in turn one might counter that the long-held anti-intellectualism of English public life offers another dimension to this claim, for what use is such trust if nobody listens anyway? But that was a tangential thought to the main discussion as it took place. It might simply also be the case, according to Marquand, that the trust we have lost was never as high or as deep rooted as it sometimes appears in these discussions.

In return, Andrew Gamble reminded us of the early 1950s and Seymour Martin Lipset's classical dissection of *Political Man*, investigating the connections between less participation and stronger democracy, which suggested that the question of whether increased participation leads to increased conflict (a mirroring of Runciman's claims about the possibilities of party) was something still worth thinking about. Véronique Mottier continued the discussion of the paradoxical quality of trust in politics, such that the problem of trust leads to increased accountability which in turn leads to increased distrust: the politics of control leads to distrust. So instead we might look at particular mechanisms of decision making in context, in order to clarify what we mean when we think of a decline in trust. Indeed, Thierry Morel asked whether in fact we idealize democracy when talking about trust in this way, and from such ideal heights we are always going to fall short. Indeed, as John Dunn reminded everyone, governmental institutions are different in kind and in form from intermediate institutions, and questioned whether there ever was a properly trustworthy institution, because if not, then what sort of general approach could be brought to bear on this question? He agreed that patterns/cycles are discernible, but the question of causality was particularly opaque, particularly if one always personalizes the question to ask how well institutions are doing for me, rather how well they are doing in general. Whether institutions 'cope' is causally indeterminate, while the problem of parties doesn't lie with politicians, but in their distance from the world of citizens. Taking this one step further, Jean Seaton amplified her earlier contribution to suggest, in fact, that transparency is not always a good thing. The recent 'scandals' with the BBC, its decision-making procedures, and the glare of publicity and the demand for public, rapid action, was a case in point. Perhaps in fact we live in a 'post-trust' world, or at least we might, according to Tony Wright, and as with Jean Seaton's point, he thought this might be a thoroughly bad thing, and that it has been caused by the increased focus on mechanisms of accountability and trust in the first place. Simply sticking to rules doesn't breed trust or legitimize actions, as the MP's expenses scandal shows.

Conversely, perhaps all that is needed is some tweaking of general rules. For Stoddart Martin, the question of a democratic deficit at the level of the EU is one thing, but what about truly 'global' institutions; what is the fate of the UN for example? While the world has moved from a G7 to a G20, the UN remains stuck, so what hope is there for that? In response Runciman replied to critics that his was simply an optimistic 'spin' on a generally pessimistic story, and thought that an EU election might wake people up. The current fate of party was embodied in the general weirdness that is the current GOP in America, which has become hysterical, distant, and lacking anything resembling coherent leadership. There are structural problems, partisanship is needed as well as idealism, and the role of the internet is equally problematic (witness the Republicans in the US again).



Left to right: Matthew Taylor, Professor Michael Banner, John Wilkins, Dr Véronique Mottier

Moreover, questions of causality are (much like questions of judgement) always going to be visible in retrospect only. O'Neill also replied that our focus on contractualist/formalist methods only heightens the question of when and where we are to 'trust' institutions. Where increased accountability measures have been imposed, less trust seems to have resulted - clearly the model is not working.

As Richard Wilson summed up, the relationship of government, civil service and 'trust' over the past sixty years of peace has been increasingly examined by a well-educated citizenry, at the same time as the power of Parliament has decreased, whether from the loss of empire, devolution, the EU and so forth. Ultimately this has resulted in central government using local government as its whipping boy, and in turn when local government was cut and became simply an arm of the centre, there was nobody to stand up for it because people were already distant from it given the more general failures of politics. He also thought, however, that it was striking that the levels of trust there were, were so high in this context, and relatedly that mistrust and suspicion towards institutions was generally the right attitude to take. Perhaps some remedial action could be taken by constraining power through limited terms, or such like.

Session 3 Democracy in a Non-Western Context

Speakers Peter Nolan, Ali Ansari

Moderator John Dunn

Next came the third session, on 'Democracy in a Non-Western Context', where Peter Nolan and Ali Ansari reflected on recent developments in China and Iran respectively. Peter Nolan offered a provocative warning to complacent Western 'liberal' responses to China, with a polemical recording of, in particular, the ambivalent colonial past of Britain and France, and the current imperialism of US foreign policy. All this was likely to be thrown back in the face of the West without a more sensitive approach, and the sort of perilous headlining/posturing of recent books on China simply amplified a dangerous vision of the future as necessarily perilous. China is, as Susan Shirk has suggested, a 'fragile superpower', but the policy challenge facing the West really must be to avoid war. Indeed, putting the point in terms of a large-scale historical sociology, Nolan claimed that the world was lucky in fact that it was China who was an industrial late-comer in the context of modern economic development. Because of its traditions and concerns, perhaps its modern advance would be less querulous than the comparable industrialization of major Western states, though this of course was a point not without problems, some of which were raised in discussion.



Left to right: Professors Peter Nolan, John Dunn and Ali Ansari

Looking at Iran, particularly in light of the recent election campaigns and results, Ansari reprised some of the paradoxical outlines of contemporary Iran and, especially, of US policy towards it. Noting that the constitution of the contemporary Iranian Reform Front is underpinned by the thought of Max Weber, whilst the relationship between democracy and religion and its future is, as Tocqueville suggested, grounded in an Anglo-Saxon model, the apparently 'western' character of Islamic political thinking about democracy can be traced. One reason why, is that the intellectual concerns of the movement (made famous by Weber) of a move from charismatic to traditional/patrimonial to rational leadership is of particular concern in Iran. (One might note, here, that such connections are perhaps important possible instances where recent moves towards a 'comparative political theory' could bear some fruit). Moreover, there is an appetite for sophisticated Western/European thinking on the relationship between politics, state and society, as evidenced in the widespread Iranian interest in the relatively recent visits of Ricoeur and Habermas. Thus, although recent reforms have tried to dismantle some of these intellectual foundations, it is impossible to do so, and it is only a reactionary old-guard who resist democratization. This is shown in the clear failure of Ahmadinejad to 'walk-away' with the recent election, while an unintended consequence of repression and US policy has been to create a workable opposition, whose resistance through the internet as well as traditional forms of protest is clear. Contemporary Iran is nothing like the Iran of 1953 when Mossadegh was removed. And when it is presented as such, it becomes the victim of a particularly odd revisioning of the national past as *mythenschau*.

In reply to Western-centric views of China, Christopher Catherwood supported Nolan's claims by suggesting that we should 'see things from their perspective'. The Chinese response to the Opium-Wars, for example, as presented in national museums, is significantly different to the English. Yet, it is important to distinguish between past hypocrisies and current demands, for citizens' rights for example. Conversely, when thinking about the Middle East one might wonder, as did John Wilkins, why the obviously ideological rationale for war in Iraq has not worked out the way the neo-cons had supposed, if it really is the 'vocation' of this global hegemon to 'spread democracy'. John Jenkins replied directly to this, suggesting the reasons for failure were simply ignorance and incompetence in the region that went back at least to the 1920s. Iran might be exceptional in the region, but it's also still patrimonial, exclusive, and so forth.

Montu Saxena also suggested we look at the internal dynamics of 'democratization' quite carefully, claiming that the Indian example proved that watching votes alone doesn't equate with a democratic sentiment; equally, many rights (movement, trade, labour, and so forth) can still be checked, while in Iran, might we not look to the bazaar as an important filter for reformist ideas? Overall,

it was the symbiosis of democracy and development that mattered. John Keane concurred, but we should, he suggested strongly against Peter Nolan, be very suspicious of China. In pursuing the theme of democracy and development, he also suggested we look at the roots of Indian democratization historically, in 19th century constitutional traditions; the way in which past reforms were capable of being used to justify future developments, and that although there were groups and emerging problems we should always be aware of hubris that is likely to lead to unintended consequences, and also take seriously the old Burkean problem as to whether democracy is best placed to deal with complexity. Correlatively, Ed Husain asked the counter-question to the democracy-development couplet, by focusing on the ways in which the ideological promotion of democracy can also aid a transition to, or at least support for, far-right politics and possibly even support for dictatorship.



Right to left: Ed Husain, Director, Quilliam Foundation, Lucy James, Research Fellow, Quilliam Foundation, Nick Ray, Fellow, Jesus College, Cambridge

In response, Ali Ansari pressed for increased familiarity and knowledge, rather than ideology, using as an historical analogy the different ways in which Lord Curzon and Gordon Brown deal(t) with the problem of putting the national interest first. Internally in Iran, he also suggested, reformers were jettisoning the 'Islamic' component of Islamic democracy, while specifically the bazari had become 'emasculated'. For his part, Peter Nolan repeated the warnings about misunderstanding China. With major problems and transformations over the

past thirty years, he argued, the reality of growth and peace against all expectations said something profoundly important about the CCP. Moreover, its impact on everyday life was phenomenal, and there had been a major 'democratization of everyday life' in China. He maintained, however, that the idea that the West has a 'right' to intervene was a dangerous one, and recapitulated the warning about seeing China as something like a new Sparta, against whom an old Greece had to worry. Nicholas Boyle concurred, and further claimed that it was vital to take this seriously, for if there was going to be a war with China, it would certainly be started in the West. The particularism of such cases, however, illustrates the different valences of the democracy-state form relation, according to John Dunn. For although it is certainly the case that Iran now is wholly unlike Iran under Mossaddegh, what is the appropriate response both internally and externally to this? Even if it were true that democracy was an unqualified good (which it is not), it would certainly not follow from that that there was a justification to 'push hard' to enforce it elsewhere. Neither follows in fact. For the acceptance of democracy is the acceptance of popular tastes, and it is necessarily specific, so that whatever the future of democracy in Iran might be, it is certain that if there is a 'democratic' state form in Iran, it will nevertheless look very different to the 'democratic' state forms of Western representative democracies.



Left to right: Dr Montu Saxena, Ambassador Jose Turpin, Dr James Dodd, Lord Wilson of Dinton

Session 4 Britain

Speakers Peter Kellner, Matthew Taylor

Moderator Andrew Gamble

Respondent Tony Wright

The conference then turned its attention back to Britain, with Peter Kellner and Matthew Taylor offering contrasting visions of the development of democracy. Kellner suggested, in a variation of a classically 18th century argument, that democracy cannot be planned, and in fact Britain is a pertinent example of unplanned democracy. His illustration was of John Bright's speech about England as the 'mother of Parliaments', which was reported in *The Times* as a speech made on his 'annual visit' to his constituency. Clearly, times had changed, but how? The media was one obvious issue, but Kellner focused first on the decline of the party. This he attributed to the muddying of the waters over ideological division. When distance and difference is clear, party and partisanship is strong. Complexity (whether in fact or as imagined) has fostered a decrease in turnout, and a decline in partisanship. Equally, though, something central about politics remained constant – namely that it is, was, and shall continue to be, an 'elite' enterprise. If most people don't want to be involved in politics as process, but are interested in particular issues and services, the question is how to combine this elitism with more open access to the membership of or insertion into this elite, in which questions of technology might help. Blogging, for example, keeps Peter 'honest' he says, and perhaps that instantaneous response can be brought to bear on politics more generally?

Matthew Taylor, a regular blogger now, thought a little differently. He cited the generally well-known advances in human psychology about the so-called 'wisdom of crowds', about the weaknesses of self-interest, about the difficulties of discounting and so forth. From this has followed the cultivation and language, post FDR, of politics as a language of consumers, not producers, but this contains its own paradoxes. Consumerism implies a demand that can be met, and met perfectly in and through time (like the jars of pesto one buys in the supermarket, they must be standard, 'perfect' each time). But politics can't and doesn't work like that. Politicians have fallen into this trap, however, going beyond earlier claims about standard adversarial politics, to now wanting to have their cake and eat it, and also to have it for free. Temporality is therefore central. Who, just three years ago, could have said no to the rise of now obviously 'toxic' mortgages, thereby 'denying' many urban poor the opportunity to buy into a housing market. Yet now it is clear that this is a major site of blame and opprobrium. Politics works in short-term windows with brief sound bites and simple explanations being presented, and no single theory encapsulates all of the elements of power in political life. Yet politics is required to resolve these

conflicts of interest, so that democracy must not mean giving people what they want, but rather getting them to accept what they can't have in a peaceful or bearable manner. How could it be different though? Here, Taylor offered some concrete (tentative) recommendations. First, devolve power locally, not least for its educative role. Second, have citizen's juries every 2-3 years. Third, publish all policy advice given and taken, with reasons. Fourth, pursue transparency, and re-engage with a beleaguered media. Fifth, a large proportion of the upper house to be randomly elected citizens, again to change perceptions about possibilities of (a) outcome and (b) representation.

Clearly there were likely to be many responses to such direct presentations, and Stoddart Martin started the ball rolling, by questioning whether devolution was workable in tandem with democracy, by offering the example of California, while Ed Husain recalled the problem of the rise of right-wing parties, particularly in the north of the UK, which suggested quite clearly something of a democratic deficit once more. Equally, could the British political system remain viable, asked John Naughton, while an 'elective dictatorship' remained with the first past the post voting structure? Replying more directly to Kellner, Michael Banner highlighted the problem of self-interest on the part of particular groups that were themselves supposed to have some kind of scrutiny function (such as the Human Tissue Authority). He called for increased deliberation. In similar fashion, O'Neill returned to the problem of consumerist ideology in modern politics, asking what the extra added value of democracy might be, such that it could answer questions about why particular decisions were better or worse, and so forth.

Looking at Taylor's proposals, both John Dunn and David Runciman tried to bring out the paradoxical quality of the discussion items. Could it not be, they suggested, that accepting such claims about human psychology, then this sort of reform becomes both conceptually incoherent and practically impossible? In fact, would not these proposals simply reinforce the self-seeking, blame-avoiding, imperfect behaviour they are designed to reduce? It was at this point, to return to my earlier allusion to it, that Tony Wright brought to bear his own experiences in the transformation of British democracy with reference to his own constituency. Although significantly 'gentrified', his own thoughts were that his constituency, like the rest of the UK, might be richer in many ways, but that something malign had in fact occurred. A civic crisis in fact, manifest in the decline of everything from public manners to self-respect requires a new politics to meet these challenges. In fact, although it was a major short-term risk to parties who changed, there were likely to be large political gains for those that changed first.

Replying to the questions, Peter Kellner suggested that the rise of the BNP was simple to explain – and involved a failure to deal with the real or imagined fears of regular people in communities under threat, but that it was equally important

to maintain a sense of proportion. Each country has its fair share of nasty right wing bigots, but there are less in the UK than many other places he said. Replying directly to O'Neill, he asked what are the 'ideals' that democracy could uphold today, in a context where nobody has to actively fight for it? And to Matthew Taylor, he suggested that nobody wants local decisions and citizens' juries, but at the same time, the crisis that Tony Wright talked up was overstated; there are problems, but it's not a crisis. Taylor, for his part, suggested that if these were not the best solutions, then what else was there on the table? Appropriately suggesting that there must be a creative boundary in between the extremes of UK versus California style devolution, perhaps we could think about it some more? Equally, the centrality of transparency was something he wanted to hold on to, and making things explicit could only help. He recognized the paradoxes of institutional agency and human psychology (citing Cass Sunstein here as evidence), but thought that it was important to recognize what it is that people disagree about, so as to construct institutional forms that could reconcile these differences peacefully.



Professor John Keane, University of Westminster

Session 5 The Media and Democracy

Speakers James Curran, John Naughton, Peter Horrocks,

Moderator Jean Seaton

The fifth and final session turned to the role of the media, whose scrutiny function was vital, said Chair Jean Seaton, but whose power seemed to have diminished. What was the relationship between media and democracy today then? First, John Naughton argued that we could rethink the term ‘media’ as more like a biological metaphor, for the nutrients in which a range of organisms grow. He also noted the general overhyping of the internet – TV media interaction was still the predominant source of information and entertainment in most households, but the general environment had changed from an industrialized provision of information to a network information economy. Old freedoms required access to major capital while new ‘internet’-based ‘freedoms’ do not. Blogging, Twitter, user network groups etc., were perhaps changing this forever, and had certainly made the modern ‘eco-system’ immeasurably more complex. In order to highlight the uncertainty surrounding this new future, he offered us a thought experiment. Going back to sixteen years after Gutenberg, imagine someone polling you then, asking what you thought the printing press might affect – revolution, reformation, freedom, and so forth. Then, it was impossible to predict the future impact of print. Today, sixteen years after the WWW went mainstream, it remains equally impossible to predict its impact, but there are reasons for thinking that the transformations are likely to be comparable in certain respects. However, even though traditional media required capital in a way that new media might not, it is still important to note that it’s the ‘usual suspects’ who seem to be in charge. We should be wary, and we should certainly keep things under a suspicious surveillance.

James Curran was second, and he took up Naughton’s thought experiment, claiming that the competition to such early-modern printing came in the form of manuscripts produced in various scriptoria, and that such literatures were artefacts in their own right. His point, though, was that the alternatives today are incomparable with that opposition between mass-print and private manuscripts. In 1995, only 14% of the UK had access to the internet, now it’s much greater, and with blogs, rapidly increasing access and so forth, critique and resistance is possible in a whole variety of new ways, and it can be a powerful tool in reconstructing politics (witness Obama’s use of it as a fundraising aid in the Primaries). In totality, the net is qualitatively different beast, and national governments cannot deal with it in the same way as they dealt with earlier transformations. Readjustments are needed, but he agreed that overall the net is still eclipsed by television, and that television remained irrevocably biased towards its own national filters. The idea of a pan-European media seems to have

failed, and indeed any sense of a shared European identity is weakened by the power of a national media bias. Moreover, although we've never had more information about political matters, we don't use it. For most, the deregulated internet is simply a portal for quick fix personal entertainment. What it has done is challenge traditional print journalism, and some 108 newspapers have closed since 2008. But this major change carries dangers too, with the rise of an 'administrative' or safe journalism that becomes less able to challenge power. This is, in part, one explanation for the continued focus on 'scandal' – it sells, but is also safe, in its attempts to frighten, anger or amuse us.



Professor Andrew Gamble

Finally Peter Horrocks offered a perspective from the BBC World Service (of which he is the Director), noting the centrality of a 'media driven populism' alongside the radical potential of new media. This made it hard to generalize, but there were causes for real hope. Thus, one example of a successful blog that had changed informational engagement was Robert Peston's analysis of the financial crisis. Here, people were given easy access to sophisticated yet understandable problems in a way that was unthinkable previously. Also responses/checking/criticisms are now instant, so that poor reporting can be held to account quickly and easily. There is a question of honesty here, but the impact clearly shows a desire to engage and to be engaged, and there are ways of using technology to raise awareness. One example: the BBC World Service was taking

advantage of the large number of mobile phones in Nigeria, to get people to text/phone in instances of corruption wherever they found it, which could then be examined/checked/developed, and be subject to some editorial control (which remains central). In Vietnam, too, a managed and controlled government internet had journalists giving out the party line in public, but then often the same journalists would write different versions of their own stories, with different slants, for new blogs or critical sites against the government. There were paradoxes of access and engagement here. Moreover, some technological developments clearly have revolutionary potential – direct translation software that was becoming increasingly accurate and usable has massive scope, but he was adamant again that some filtering/editorial control had to remain in place. As Jean Seaton rounded off, the role of the media as a challenge to power, as a place where free speech and argument could flourish, had to remain.

David Marquand asked about reader responses on the net, citing his own experience in writing for *The Guardian*, and receiving a torrent of abuse about his articles for example. Was this really of any use to anyone? Also, he asked, what are the uses of the internet now, what difference has it/will it make to those who have never had a world without Google? John Cornwell suggested that one obvious response was that of Susan Greenfield, who had suggested that constant internet use by the young could lead to early form of Alzheimer's, but more seriously, many studies of the use of the internet had been and were being undertaken, but there were no conclusive results at all, as the main panellists intimated in reply.

George Brock asked about the relationship between mistrust and disinterest, which he found intriguing in the light of nearly fifty years of peace in this country at least. One effect of this is that people have acquired some legitimation for making choices from numerous and diverse sources. We can't, like Tony Wright, declare a culture war on affluence, but we can think of ways in which new media outlets are developing. Hyperlocal publishing, for example, from San Diego to the Czech Republic, is one thing, but citizens need to be given power, not simply put upon in juries and so forth. Geoff Harcourt recalled the tenor of JK Galbraith's classic work *The New Industrial State*, to show how issues of ownership and control still matter in these things. Pier Luigi Porta clearly agreed. Peter Kellner thought that despite the agglomeration of information, the good argument will drive out the bad even on the internet, while John Keane asked us to try and put this in perspective. A transition from assembly to representative to perhaps a new post-representative politics with this new media, led him to ask whether a (new) form of monitory democracy was a necessity in fact, which could be reconciled with new forms of information, like Propublica or Google books? In response, John Naughton simply reminded us that with all new forms of media change there have been moral panics, and this was unlikely to be any

different. James Curran reiterated the entertainment side of the net, but recognized that the question as to its democratizing potential was an open one. Peter Horrocks thought that as the net was an active media, and that interaction was the essence of democracy, there was considerable hope, while Jean Seaton thought that the net could continue to advance the rise of single-issue politics, whereas global issues required 'political' (i.e. interconnected) responses, and this went just as much for the internet as everything else.

Session 6 Final Words and Comments

Speaker Andrew Gamble

Offering some concluding thoughts, Andrew Gamble claimed that the fact that we lack data about all the transformations being discussed was unsurprising, for there were no obvious or unilinear trends, nor obvious or uniform political responses to them. For although there may be issues of globalization to discuss, politics remains 'stubbornly local', which means that national state forms are likely to remain the key site of interest for the time being. The question then becomes, as Dunn had suggested, what favours/disfavours that form in a globalized world? Also, there is the question of how this 'local' politics deals with disengagement; over Iraq, there were protests and anger, over expenses, continued anger, but no protests for example. How then are we to think about such issues? Recession and a civic crisis prompted questions of trust, whilst a more hollowed out democracy seemed to promote a managerial and consumerist approach to politics. Equally, there are real problems with thinking that one form of 'democracy' could easily be transported and implemented elsewhere. So perhaps the issue is one of generating real global agreements between nation-states that will have binding force, and which might have a chance of dealing with real global problems. For that, we might need to revive the tradition of thinking about democracy as a cultural form, never a finished product, to allow us to conceptualize these issues adequately. Could such international agreements be based on the kind of 'regulatory regimes' of nation-states, which would then mean that the quality of their legitimacy would depend on the quality of national democracies in context?

Duncan Kelly
Jesus College
Cambridge



Dr Christopher Catherwood and Professor Jean Seaton



The Master's Lodge and gardens, Jesus College

Appendix

Conference Participant Profiles

Professor Robert Mair FREng, FRS - Rustat Conferences Chair

Robert Mair is the Master of Jesus College, Cambridge and is Professor of Geotechnical Engineering at Cambridge University. He is Head of Civil and Environmental Engineering at Cambridge. He was a Fellow of St John's College from 1998 to 2001. He is co-founder of the Geotechnical Consulting Group, an international consulting firm in London, started in 1983. He is a Fellow of the Institution of Civil Engineers, a Fellow of the Royal Academy of Engineering and its Senior Vice-President, and a Fellow of the Royal Society.

John Cornwell - Rustat Conferences Director

John Cornwell is Director of the Rustat Conference and a Fellow Commoner of Jesus College, Cambridge, where he also directs the Science and Human Dimension Project, a public understanding of science and ethics programme. He is an author, journalist, and was a senior manager at The Observer.

Professor Ali Ansari

Ali M. Ansari is Director of the Institute for Iranian Studies and Professor of Iranian History at St Andrews University. He is also an Associate Fellow at Chatham House and sits on the Governing Council of the British Institute of Persian Studies (BIPS). He is a regular speaker at conferences on Iran, including "Iran's New Parliament" at the New American Foundation. He is author of *Modern Iran since 1921* (Longman 2003, 2007 2nd ed); *Iran, Islam and Democracy: the politics of Managing Change* (RIIA 2000, 2006, 2nd Ed); *Iran Under Ahmadinejad (Adelphi Papers)*, (Routledge, 2008), and *Confronting Iran: The Failure of American Foreign Policy and the Roots of Mistrust*, (C Hurst and co, 2006). He obtained his BA and PhD from SOAS, University of London. Currently he working on a book for CUP on the Politics of Nationalism in Modern Iran, and has just been commissioned as Editor of the *Cambridge History of Iran Vol 8, the Islamic Republic*.

Rev Dr Michael Banner

Michael Banner is Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge. From 2004-06 he was Director of the UK Economic and Social Research Council's Genomics Research Forum and Professor of Public Policy and Ethics in the Life Sciences at the University of Edinburgh. Previous appointments include Fellow, St Peter's College, Oxford; Dean, Chaplain, Fellow and Director of Studies in Philosophy and Theology, Peterhouse, Cambridge; and FD Maurice Professor of Moral and Social Theology, King's College, London. He has been chairman of HM Government Committee of Enquiry on the Ethics of Emerging Technologies in Breeding Farm Animals and the CJD Incidents Panel, Department of Health. He has also been a member of the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution, the Agriculture and Environment Biotechnology Commission and the Human Tissue Authority. He read Philosophy and Theology at Balliol College, Oxford.

Professor Nicholas Boyle

Nicholas Boyle was elected to the Schröder Professorship of German in 2006. Before that he was Professor of German Literary and Intellectual History. He has a particular interest in German literature and thought of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and especially in Goethe, and in the relation between religion and literature. He has published two volumes of his prizewinning biography, *Goethe: the Poet and the Age* and is currently working on the third. In 2000 Professor Boyle was awarded the Goethe Medal of the Goethe-Institut. In 2001 he was elected to the British Academy. He is President of Magdalene College, Cambridge.

Professor George Brock

George Brock became Professor and Head of Journalism at City University in September 2009. He began his reporting career at the *Yorkshire Evening Press* and *The Observer*, joining *The Times* in 1981. In a 28-year career at *The Times* he held a number of key roles including foreign editor, Managing Editor, Saturday Editor and International Editor. He was closely involved in the creation of TimesOnline, and the paper's first compact print edition. He is a board member of the World Editors Forum, is a member of the British committee of the International Press Institute, a trustee of the National Academy of Writing and a governor of the Ditchley Foundation. He broadcasts and lectures frequently and reviews for the TLS.

Dr Christopher Catherwood

Christopher Catherwood is a historian and author, based in Cambridge, UK and at the University of Richmond, Virginia, USA. He has been a visiting scholar at St Edmund's College, Cambridge and the Cambridge University Centre of International Studies, and is a supervisor on the Homerton College JYA program. He was a consultant to the Strategic Futures Team of the Cabinet Office Performance and Innovation Unit. He is author a number of books including *Winston's Folly: Winston Churchill and the Creation of Iraq* (Constable and Robinson, 2006); *A Brief History of the Middle East* (2006); *Whose Side is God On? Christianity and Nationalism* (2003); *Christians, Muslims and Islamic Rage: What is Going On and Why It Happened* (2003); and *The Balkans in World War Two: Britain's Balkan Dilemma 1939-1941* (2003). He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and holds a PhD from the University of East Anglia.

Jonathan S. Cornwell

Jonathan Cornwell is a publisher. He has worked for Routledge, Chapman & Hall, O'Reilly and divisions of the Thomson Corporation. He was international division head of e-learning business ThirdForce plc, working on UNESCO and government projects in the Middle East, China and Latin America; and was a director of digital publisher Yudu Media. He studied at UCL, Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and Imperial College. He is on the advisory board of the Rustat Conferences.

Professor James Curran

James Curran is Director of the Goldsmiths Leverhulme Media Research Centre. He has held a personal chair at Goldsmiths since 1989. He has also held endowed visiting chairs at Penn, Stanford, Stockholm and Oslo Universities. He is engaged in a five-nation media and public knowledge investigation, centred at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology, and supported by the Norwegian Research Council. He has written or edited eighteen books about the mass media, some in conjunction with others. His work is in four main areas - media political economy, media influence, media history and media theory.

Brandon Davies

Brandon Davies is head of the Global Association of Risk Professionals Risk Academy and GARP's operations in Europe. He was Head of Retail Market Risk and Deputy Group Treasurer at Barclays Bank, Managing Director of Financial Engineering and later of Structured Products at

BZW. He is the senior non-executive director of Gatehouse Capital plc and a member of the Financial Markets Group at the LSE. He holds a degree in economics from UCL.

Professor Arnoud de Meyer

Professor Arnoud de Meyer is the Director of Judge Business School, Cambridge University, and a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. Prior to this he was associated for 23 years with INSEAD as a professor and as Dean for the MBA programme, Executive Education and the Euro Asia Centre. His research interests include manufacturing and technology strategy; management of R&D and innovation; project management under conditions of high uncertainty; the globalisation of Asian firms; and e-readiness in Europe.

Dr James Dodd

Dr James Dodd is Managing Director of Anthem Corporate Finance and has over 20 years experience in public and private equity markets. From 1989 to 1999 he was Head of Telecoms research at Dresdner Kleinwort where he was instrumental in the funding and operation of the Syntech IT Fund, one of London's first technology venture funds. From 1998 to 2004 he was Chairman of ETT, a data networking company acquired by Global Telecom & Technology Inc.

Professor John Dunn

John Dunn is Professor Emeritus of Political Theory at Cambridge University, a Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. He has taught at universities in Ghana, India, Japan, Canada, and the United States. His research interests include: rethinking modern political theory; the historical formation and intellectual weakness of liberal and socialist conceptions of political value and political possibility; explaining the political trajectories of the varieties of modern states; political thought of Locke; the historical development and current significance of democracy in different parts of the world. He is the author of 'Setting the People Free: The Story of Democracy' (2005), 'The Cunning of Unreason: Making Sense of Politics' (2000), 'The History of Political Theory and Other Essays' (1995), 'Western Political Theory in the Face of the Future' (1993), 'Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon' (1989), 'The Politics of Socialism: An Essay in Political Theory' (1984) and 'The Political Thought of John Locke' (1969). He is a Fellow of the British Academy, Foreign Honorary Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and winner of the Sir Isaiah Berlin Prize for Lifetime Contribution to Political Studies (2007).

Dr Shailaja Fennell

Dr Shailaja Fennell is Lecturer in Development Studies at Cambridge University and a Fellow of Jesus College. Her research interests include institutional economics, agricultural reform, gender and household dynamics, kinship and ethnicity, comparative economic development, educational provision and partnerships. She has a BA, MA and MPhil from Delhi University and an MPhil and PhD from Cambridge.

Professor Andrew Gamble

Andrew Gamble is Professor of Politics and Head of Department at Cambridge University. Previously he was Professor and Chairman of the Department of Politics and Pro-Vice Chancellor of the University of Sheffield. In 2005 he was awarded the Sir Isiah Berlin Award for Lifetime Contribution to Political Studies by the PSA. He is co-editor with Tony Wright MP of the journal *The Political Quarterly*. His latest book, *The Spectre at the Feast* (2009), is an analysis of recession and capitalist crises. He is author of a number of books, including *Between Europe and America* (2005), *Politics and Fate* (2000), *The Constitutional Revolution in the UK* (2006); *Hayek: The Iron Cage of Liberty* (1996).

Professor Geoff Harcourt AO Litt.D FASSA AcSS

Geoff Harcourt is Emeritus Reader in the History of Economic Theory, University of Cambridge; Emeritus Fellow, Jesus College, Cambridge; and Professor Emeritus, University of Adelaide. His research interests include history of economic theory, Post-Keynesian theory and policy, and intellectual biography. He studied at the University of Melbourne and King's College, Cambridge, where he took a PhD in 1960. He has taught at the University of Adelaide and the University of Cambridge where he was Fellow and College Lecturer in Economics, Jesus College 1982-98 and twice Jesus College President.

Professor Stephen Heath Litt.D

Stephen Heath is Professor of English and French Literature and Culture at Cambridge University and a Fellow of Jesus College. He is the author of several books on English and French literature, culture and cinema. His research interests include nineteenth and twentieth century, literary theory, and comparative literature.

Peter Horrocks

Peter Horrocks is Director of BBC World Service. He is also Deputy Director of the BBC Global News division which brings together BBC World Service, the BBC World Service, the BBC World News television channel, the BBC's international facing-online news services, BBC Monitoring, and BBC World Service Trust – the BBC's international development charity. He has worked for the BBC since 1981 and has held senior management and editorial posts in television, radio and online, all with a strong emphasis on the BBC's journalism. He won BAFTA awards in 1997 and 2005 for his editorship of Newsnight and for *The Power of Nightmares*. He was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge.

Ed Husain

Ed Husain is Co-Director and co-founder of the Quilliam Foundation, the counter-extremism think tank. Its founders are former leading ideologues of UK-based extremist Islamist organizations. He is author of *The Islamist* (Penguin, 2007) shortlisted for the George Orwell Prize for best political writing. Formerly an activist of Hizb ut-Tahrir (HT) and Jamat-e-Islam front organizations in the UK, he is now a strong critic of extremism and Islamism. He is an advocate of Muslim engagement in mainstream politics as citizens, and not as separatist, anti-western polemical ideologues with Islamist agendas. He worked for the British Council in Syria and Saudi Arabia (2003-05). He regularly contributes to media discussions on Islam, Muslims, identity, terrorism, and multiculturalism. Born and raised in London, he holds an MA in Middle East studies from SOAS, University of London, and is currently completing his PhD on Arab experiences of post-colonial secularism.

Lucy James

Lucy James is a Research Fellow at Quilliam and co-author of *Immigrant, Muslim, Female: Triple Paralysis?* (July 2009) and *In Defence of British Muslims: A response to BNP racist propaganda* (August 2009). She studied Religious Studies and Theology at the University of Manchester, where she specialized in Islam. Her MA, also taken in Manchester, was in South Asian Studies, where she specialized in the diverse expressions of Islam on the subcontinent, particularly Sufism.

Dr John Jenkins CMG, LVO

Dr John Jenkins is Her Majesty's Ambassador designate to the Republic of Iraq (2009), and formerly Director, Middle East and North Africa Directorate, FCO. He has held a number of roles at the FCO including HM Ambassador to the Syrian Arab Republic; Consul General, Jerusalem; HM Ambassador, Rangoon; Deputy Head of Mission, Kuwait; Head of Chancery and Head of

Political Section, Kuala Lumpur; and Head of East Africa Section, FCO. Dr Jenkins is an alumnus of Jesus College, Cambridge where he obtained his undergraduate degree and PhD.

Dr Tudor Jenkins

Dr Tudor Jenkins is Director of Wide Eyed Vision, a digital media company specialising in cultural heritage projects for organisations such as the National Trust, Historic Royal Palaces and NGOs. He studied at Imperial College and Sussex University, where he obtained a doctorate in Artificial Intelligence, and worked in the City of London for a number of years.

Professor John Keane

John Keane is Professor of Politics at the *University of Westminster* and at the *Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin*. In 1989 he founded the *Centre for the Study of Democracy*. Among his many books are *The Media and Democracy* (1991); *Democracy and Civil Society* (1988;1998); *Reflections on Violence* (1996); *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions* (1998); the prize-winning biography *Tom Paine: A Political Life* (1995); and a study of power in twentieth century Europe, *Václav Havel: A Political Tragedy in Six Acts* (1999). Among his most recent works are *Violence and Democracy* (2004), and *Global Civil Society?* (2003). In recent years, he has held the Karl Deutsch Professorship in Berlin and served as a Fellow of the influential London-based think-tank, the IPPR. A consultant to the United Nations and the Evolution of Global Values project at the University of Leiden and a recent member of the American-based Institutions of Democracy Commission, he has recently completed *The Life and Death of Democracy*, a full scale-scale history of democracy and the subject of a 3-part BBC Radio series to be transmitted in late 2010. John Keane is from Australia and was educated at the Universities of Adelaide, Toronto and Cambridge.

Peter Kellner

Peter Kellner is the President of YouGov, the research, opinion polling and consulting organisation. Formerly the political analyst of BBC Newsnight, he has also been a journalist with the *Sunday Times*, *the Independent*, *New Statesman* and *Evening Standard*. He was a visiting fellow at Nuffield College, Oxford and the Institute for Policy Studies. He was recently appointed as Chairman of The Royal Commonwealth Society. He studied economics at King's College, Cambridge.

Dr Duncan Kelly

Duncan Kelly is University Lecturer in Political Theory, University of Cambridge, and Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. Previously he was Senior Lecturer at the Department of Politics at Sheffield University where he was also a British Academy Postdoctoral Fellow. His principal research interests concern the intellectual history of modern political thought and various issues in political theory, including ideas of freedom, representation, and the connections between the passions, personhood, and political judgement. He is a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society. He is author of *The State of the Political: Conceptions of Politics and the State in the Thought of Max Weber, Carl Schmitt and Franz Neumann*, (OUP, 2003); and editor of *Lineages of Empire, The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought* (OUP/British Academy, 2009). He is a contributor to several works including *Politics as a Practical Science* (Palgrave, 2008); *Advances in Intellectual History* (Palgrave, 2006). He is the Future of Democracy - Rustat Conference rapporteur.

Dr Kwasi Kwarteng

Kwasi Kwarteng was the Conservative candidate in Brent East in 2005 and was chairman of the Bow Group in 2005-6. He read history at Trinity College, Cambridge and was a Kennedy Scholar at Harvard before returning to Trinity College to complete a PhD. Following this he worked in the City and as a journalist. He has also worked as an adviser to George Osborne's Shadow Treasury team. He recently completed *Ghosts of Empire*, to be published by Bloomsbury in 2010,

investigating the legacy of the last days of the British Empire in various parts of the world. He is seeking selection as a candidate for the Conservative Party at the next election.

Professor David Marquand FBA

David Marquand is an academic, author and former Labour MP. He was MP for Ashfield from 1966 to 1988 and was Chief Advisor to the President of the European Commission Roy Jenkins. As an academic he was a lecturer at the University of Sussex, Professor of Politics at Salford and Sheffield Universities, and was Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. He is a Visiting Fellow, department of politics, Oxford University and Honorary Professor of Politics. He has written extensively on the future of the European Union and the need for constitutional reform in the United Kingdom. He is author of a number of books including *Britain Since 1918: The Strange Career of British Democracy*; *The Decline of the Public: The Hollowing Out of Citizenship*; (with Anthony Seldon) *The Ideas That Shaped Post-war Britain*; and *The Progressive Dilemma: From Lloyd George to Kinnock*. He studied at Magdalen College, Oxford, St Antony's College, Oxford, and UC Berkeley.

Dr Stoddart Martin

Stoddart Martin has been a professor European culture in the UK and Eastern Europe. He owns the publishing house Starhaven which publishes literary novels, poetry, and cultural studies in the UK and in the USA.

Dr Thierry Morel

Thierry Morel is a research associate at the Faculty of History of Art at the University of Cambridge. He has written on von Pufendorf's *Two Books on The Duty of Man and Citizen according to the Natural Law*. He is completing *Mona Lisa Is Smiling*, about the looting, destruction and restitution of art during and after World War II. In this work he delves into the questions of how the Allied and Axis regimes approached great works of art—as commodities, trophies or tools of propaganda. A Rhodes Scholar, he was educated at the Universities of Paris and Oxford.

Professor Véronique Mottier

Véronique Mottier is Fellow and Director of Studies in Social and Political Sciences at Jesus College, Cambridge, and part time Professor in Sociology at the University of Lausanne. She was awarded the 'Prix Jubilé' of the Académie Suisse des Sciences Humaines et Sociales in 2001 for her research on eugenics in Switzerland. Her research and teaching interests are in the areas of social and political theory; historical and political sociology; gender, sexuality and 'race'; welfare states and social exclusion; and qualitative research methods, especially discourse and narrative analysis. Her books include *Sexuality* (OUP, 2008), and the co-edited volumes *Pflege, Stigmatisierung und Eugenik* (Seismo, 2007), *Genre et politique* (Gallimard, 2000), and *Politics of Sexuality: Identity, Gender, Citizenship* (Routledge, 1998). She received a BA in Political Science, a BA in Sociology and an MA in Political Science from the University of Geneva, and a PhD in Sociology from the University of Cambridge.

Professor John Naughton

John Naughton is Professor of the Public Understanding of Technology at the Open University. He is also a Fellow of Wolfson College, Cambridge where he directs the Press Fellowship Programme. He is a non-executive director of Ndiyo and Cambridge Visual Networks Ltd. He is Academic Advisor to the Arcadia Fellowship Project at Cambridge University Library and an Advisory Board Member at the Open Knowledge Foundation. He is author of *A Brief History of the Future: the origins of the internet* and writes The Networker column for The Observer.

Professor Peter Nolan

Peter Nolan is the Sinyi Professor of Chinese Management at Judge Business School, Chair of the University of Cambridge's Development Studies Committee and a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. He has been closely involved with China's policy discussions about the integration of China with the global economy and business system. He has testified before the US Congress' US-China Economic and Security Review Commission. He has contributed to the UK China Forum and served as an Advisor to the World Bank. He is also an advisor to Coca-Cola and Standard Chartered Bank. In a January 2000 report on the China Big Business Programme, *The Financial Times* commented: "Peter Nolan knows more about Chinese companies and their international competition than anyone else on earth, including in China."

Baroness O'Neill of Bengarve

Onora O'Neill writes on ethics and political philosophy, with particular interests in questions of international justice, in the philosophy of Immanuel Kant and in bioethics. Her books include *Faces of Hunger: An Essay on Poverty, Development and Justice* (1986), *Constructions of Reason: Exploration of Kant's Practical Philosophy* (1989), *Towards Justice and Virtue* (1996) and *Bounds of Justice* (2000), *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics* (2002) and *A Question of Trust* (the 2002 Reith Lectures) and *Rethinking Informed Consent in Bioethics* (jointly with Neil Manson, 2007). She currently works on practical judgement and normativity, on questions of trust and accountability in public life; and on the ethics of communication (including media ethics), while continuing to work on Kant's philosophy. She was Principal of Newnham from 1992 to 2006, and teaches in the Faculty Philosophy in Cambridge. She was President of the British Academy from 2005-9, chairs the Nuffield Foundation and is Professor Emeritus of Philosophy in Cambridge. She has been a member of and chaired the Nuffield Council on Bioethics and the Human Genetics Advisory Commission. She has worked on a number of reports on bio-medical issues, including recently the Kings Fund Inquiry into the Safety of Maternity Services. She was created a Life Peer in 1999, sits as a crossbencher, served on the House of Lords Select Committees on *Stem Cell Research*, *BBC Charter Review*, *Genomic Medicine* and currently *Nanoscience and Food*.

Professor Pier Luigi Porta

Pier Luigi Porta is Professor of economics and Chair of the Department of Political Economy at the University of Milano-Bicocca and an elected member of the university Senate. After studying Economics at Bocconi University in Milan, he was a research student at Cambridge University. He is a visiting Fellow of Wolfson College, Cambridge; a life member of the Istituto Lombardo-Accademia di Brera in Milan; and a founder member of the European Society for the History of Economic Thought. He is the editor of the *Handbook on the Economics of Happiness*.

Nicholas Ray

Nicholas Ray is Reader Emeritus in Architecture at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Jesus College. After qualification at Cambridge and University College, London he worked in London for the Shankland Cox Partnership and for Colin St John Wilson and Partners. On returning to Cambridge in 1973 he practised within Hughes and Bicknell Architects, where he became Partner, before founding Nicholas Ray Associates in 1989. His most prominent building in Cambridge is the Quayside Development, on the banks of the Cam. He has been responsible for new and refurbishment projects for numerous Colleges and universities. He is founder of the Cambridge Historic Buildings Group and author of numerous papers.

Dr David Runciman

David Runciman is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Politics and International Studies at Cambridge University, and a Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. His research interests include late-nineteenth and twentieth century political thought, theories of the state, various aspects of

contemporary political philosophy. He writes about politics for the *London Review of Books* and is author of a number of books including *Political Hypocrisy: The Mask of Power, from Hobbes to Orwell and Beyond* (Princeton, 2008) which explores the psychology of democracy from a historical perspective; and *The Politics of Good Intentions: History, Fear and Hypocrisy in the New World Order* (Princeton, 2006). He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge.

Dr Siddharth Saxena

Montu Saxena is Advanced Research Fellow at the Cavendish Laboratory, Cambridge and is a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. He is Chairperson of the Cambridge Central Asia Forum and Honorary Secretary of the Committee for Central and Inner Asia. In Physics he works on science of strongly correlated electrons, superconductivity and magnetism. In addition to Physics he has been involved in field based research in Central Asia since 1996 with particular focus on Bukhara in Uzbekistan and the Ferghana Valley. Since 2002 he has also been working in Almaty and Astana in Kazakhstan, Kashgar in China as well some areas of Afghanistan. In the past he has also spent extended periods in Iran and Egypt for field work. He studied at the University of New Orleans, Princeton University – where he completed a doctorate in Historical Anthropology of Islam in Khorassan - and Trinity College, Cambridge – where he completed a Ph.D. in Physics at the Cavendish Laboratory.

Professor Jean Seaton

Jean Seaton is Professor of Media History at the University of Westminster and the Official Historian of the BBC. She has written widely on the history and role of the media in politics, wars, atrocities, the Holocaust, revolutions, security issues and religion as well as news and journalism and is particularly interested in the impact of the media on children. She is author of a number of books and essays including (with co-author James Curran) the classic *Power without Responsibility: the Press and Broadcasting in Britain*. She is chair of the Orwell Prize and chair of the judges of the *Guardian/Faber Ben Pimlott* political history essay prize.

Professor Brendan Simms

Brendan Simms is Professor of the History of International Relations at the Centre of International Studies at the University of Cambridge, and a Fellow of Peterhouse. He lectures on international history since 1945, geopolitics and the primacy of foreign policy, and conducts the Themes and Sources seminar on "Revolutions in Foreign Policy". He is author of *Unfinest Hour: Britain and the Destruction of Bosnia* (2002) and *Three Victories and a Defeat: The Rise and Fall of the First British Empire, 1714-1783* (2007); and is co-president of The Henry Jackson Society which advocates the view that supporting and promoting liberal democracy should be an integral part of Western foreign policy.

Matthew Taylor

Matthew Taylor became Chief Executive of the RSA in November 2006. Prior to this appointment, he was Chief Adviser on Political Strategy to the Prime Minister. He was appointed to the Labour Party in 1994 to establish Labour's rebuttal operation. His activities before the Labour Party included being a county councillor, a parliamentary candidate, a university research fellow and the director of a unit monitoring policy in the health service. Until December 1998, he was Assistant General Secretary for the Labour Party. During the 1997 General Election he was Labour's Director of Policy and a member of the Party's central election strategy team. He was the Director of the Institute for Public Policy Research between 1999 and 2003, Britain's leading centre left think tank. He is a frequent media commentator on policy and political issues, and has written for publications including *The Guardian*, *The Observer*, *New Statesman* and *Prospect*.

Ambassador José Turpin Molina

José Turpin is Spain's Ambassador to Afghanistan and is a career diplomat. He has previously held diplomatic posts in the United Arab Emirates, Iran, Colombia, and India.

John Wilkins

John Wilkins is a journalist and former Editor of *The Tablet*, the leading Catholic weekly newspaper. He commentates regularly on religious affairs and the Catholic Church, and in 1996 won the John Harriott Memorial Prize for contributions to religious communication. He has been a writer and presenter for the BBC World Service, and was a visiting scholar at Clare College, Cambridge where as an undergraduate he read Classics.

Lord Wilson of Dinton GCB, MA, LL.M

Richard Wilson has been Master of Emmanuel College, Cambridge since 2002. He entered the Civil Service at the Board of Trade in 1966. He subsequently served in a number of departments including the Department of Energy where his responsibilities included nuclear power policy, the privatisation of Britoil, personnel and finance. He headed the Economic Secretariat in the Cabinet Office under Mrs Thatcher from 1987-90 and after two years in the Treasury was appointed Permanent Secretary of the Department of the Environment in 1992. He became Permanent Under Secretary of the Home Office in 1994 and Secretary of the Cabinet and Head of the Home Civil Service in January 1998. He was educated at Clare College, Cambridge.

Tony Wright MP

Tony Wright was first elected to the House of Commons in 1992 as Labour MP for Cannock and Burntwood, and since 1997 he has been the MP for Cannock Chase. From 1997 to 1998, he served as the Parliamentary Private Secretary to the former Lord Chancellor, Lord Irvine. He co-chairs the Constitution, Parliament and Citizenship Associate Parliamentary Group and is a Senior Fellow at the Centre for British Politics at Hull University. He has also chaired the Centre for Public Scrutiny and the Fabian Society, and co-chaired the Campaign for Freedom of Information. As well as co-editing *The Political Quarterly*, Dr Wright is the author of many books, articles and pamphlets. Recent publications include *British Politics: A Very Short Introduction* (2003), the Fabian pamphlet *A New Social Contract: From Targets to Rights in Public Services*, and *Restating the State?* (co-editor, 2004). Before entering Parliament, Dr Wright was Reader in Politics at the University of Birmingham, where he is now an Honorary Professor. He was educated at the London School of Economics and Balliol College, Oxford, and was a Kennedy Scholar at Harvard.

Sam Younger

Sam Younger is currently Interim Chief Executive of Shelter, having stepped down at the end of 2008 after 8 years as inaugural Chair of the Electoral Commission. Prior to that he spent 2 years as Director General of the British Red Cross following a career spanning 20 years at the BBC World Service, where he was Managing Director from 1994 to 1998. Sam has had a long association with higher education, as Chair of the Council of the University of Sussex (2001-07) and Chair of the Quality Assurance Agency (2004-09). Currently he is an independent member of the Greater London Authority Standards Committee, a Director of Electoral Reform International Services and a Director of English Touring Opera. He read PPE at New College, Oxford.



Dr John Jenkins, HM Ambassador designate to the Republic of Iraq



Sam Younger, interim CEO, Shelter, and former Chair, The Electoral Commission



Upper Hall, Jesus College, venue for Rustat Conferences - a round-table in session

**Rustat Conferences
Jesus College
Cambridge
CB5-8BL**

www.rustat.org