The Bienniel Football Match

Nuffield Old Boys
vs
Nuffield Lions

Saturday 20 March 2010
11am, Central Oxford location

If you want to play or spectate, please contact: nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Nuffield Gaudy

This year’s Gaudy will be held on
Friday 2 July 2010

Invitations will be sent out to all Alumni who were at Nuffield between 1995 and 2004, as well as those who started before 1960.

Dinner will be served in the Hall at 7pm. Dress Code will be black tie.

Limited (first come, first served) overnight accommodation will be available (standard single: free of charge, subject to availability; ensuite double £53 per night. Breakfast included).

To reserve a place at the Gaudy, please contact the Events Officer by Friday 18 June.

E-mail: nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk
Tel: (01865) 278527

Cover Photograph: Taken by Nuffield student Kadambari Prasad during a recent trip to the Maasai Mara. The young girl pictured lives in a small village, and is wearing the traditional cropped hair and handmade beads of clay, ivory, charcoal and seeds. This image won, the Photograph Competition held in Michaelmas Term 2009.

The Chapel Committee (see page 7) invited College members to submit photographs and then vote for a winner. The quality of all 62 submissions was very high. A competition was held last year too – it looks like this could be an annual event in the College’s calendar!
Nuffield College Society at Varsity match, Twickenham

The first expedition of the Society beyond the Oxford ring road was to the archetypically English event which is the Varsity Rugby Match at Twickenham. This event allows for the co-mingling of violence, young people, alcohol and terrible food without any apparent adverse effects.

We got the St Cross (two Blues on the day) coach to pick us up from College after we had assembled in the Buttery for bucks fizz and croissants. The Nuffield Society members were joined on this occasion by a few of the College’s professional advisors from the legal, property and investment fields which made for interesting conversation. And, in case you were wondering, four females were among the numbers.

The novelty for 2009 was that the match sponsors, Nomura, had also sponsored alumni hospitality in the new South Stand at Twickenham so, for the first time, colleges could arrange something slightly more appealing than a picnic in the West Stand car park. The bar was open by the time the coach arrived in West London and the indigenous Oxford members were joined by a few foreigners including our intrepid Chair, Paul (I can find my own way) Jowett. Altogether 23 of us filled two tables which allowed us to dominate physically as well as morally the likes of Linacre (one Blue, half a table) and St Catz (one Blue, one table). The pre-match buffet lunch was rather good even if the overall ambience was more like a conference centre in Slough than the home of Rugby.

Although the seating plan ensured that we were nicely mixed, Table A, realising that it had the monopoly of actuaries, insurers and bankers, chose to bet Table B (law, property and healthcare) that, out of the 23 of us, at least two would share the same birthday. So for those of you who have not heard the result of the Varsity Match, I can now reveal that Table A won and was suitably gloating about how most of us intuitively fail to understand probabilities. A Nuffield education clearly equips one well to ‘hustle’.

After the match, a refreshing tea was laid out, although some of us (c.f. last sentence of the second paragraph) took the opportunity to visit the shop, which has a surprisingly broad minded range of rugby merchandise. It was a bit of a rush to get back to the coach without keeping the Master of St Cross waiting too long (note to self: Nuffield must consider buying a coach), but it was an easy run back to Oxford where most disembarked, tired but happy, outside Green Templeton (four Blues – what some colleges will do to get on the team sheet).

I am sure I reflect the general view that this was a great day out, even if you didn’t particularly like rugby. I am sure we will try to repeat the event next year and I hope lots more Nuffield College Society members will be able to join us.

Gwilym Hughes, Bursar
After the success of the Society’s second AGM held on 25th September 2009, the Committee, began work on new initiatives at its meeting of 30th November 2009, invigorated by the addition of three new members (Alberto Behar, Peter Kowalczewski, and David Levy).

An important agenda item for the Committee remains when and where future events should be organised. To date, the College has been the focus of the Society’s activities, which has resulted in high attendance from both current and former members living in and around Oxford, but patchy participation from those further afield. At the AGM, it was suggested by some former members that at least one event per year be held in London. One option discussed was to hold a seminar and dinner event at the Oxford & Cambridge Club on Pall Mall. Further options were to have events where the location itself is stimulus to attend. The Varsity Match at Twickenham made for an excellent outing, and in future years this too might be publicised and made into a Society event.

Other issues addressed by the Committee included the frequency of the Nuffield Newsletter, and a possible survey of former members. The College is discussing the possibility of adding an electronic newsletter (provisionally entitled “E-Nuff Already”) which would increase the frequency to three times a year. There was also debate both within the Committee, and between the Committee and the College, over themes to be addressed in a former members survey. Unfortunately, the differences which emerged over the scope of this initiative proved to be unbridgeable, and the idea of a survey has been laid to rest for this year.

The Committee also played an active role in organising the Politics Reunion Dinner scheduled for 19th March 2010. Iain McLean and Nicholas Bamforth having kindly agreed to lead a debate before the dinner on the subject: “Should Britain Have a Written Constitution?” Former members are greatly encouraged to stay overnight to witness or participate in the Nuffield Old Boys vs Nuffield Lions Football Match to be held on Saturday 20th March 2010.

The Committee would like to thank Laurence Whitehead and Stephen Howe for taking the time to be interviewed for this edition’s article on “When is regime-change justified?” In the next edition, the Nuffield Newsletter’s spotlight will turn upon the Sociologists’ corner, to debate the question “Should Sociology become an undergraduate degree component at Oxford?” Any Newsletter readers who would like to contribute ideas for future interviews in upcoming editions should contact the Committee, preferably by e-mail at nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk.

Paul Jowett, Chair, Nuffield Society

From left to right: Paul Jowett, Anthony Teasdale, Chris Patten, and David Levy at the 2009 Oxford Annual Reunion
NEWS FROM FORMER MEMBERS

Anderson, Gregory (NCF 1993)
During my term as Norman Chester Research Fellow, I gathered research materials on Fidelity Insurance in 19th and 20th century Britain. This has resulted in a number of conference papers and published articles. I have recently co-edited a book (The Appeal of Insurance) for University of Toronto Press – to be published in 2010. Although I am now semi-retired from my position as Associate Head, Salford University School of Business, I continue to be research-active and will continue to research and publish during my retirement.

Byatt, Ian (S 1955-57)
Ian Byatt has had a new post (since December 2008) as Chairman of the Trustees, David Hume Institute, Edinburgh.

Ederer, Florian (S 2002-04)
After graduation from Nuffield I studied for a PhD in Economics at MIT which I obtained in June 2009. I am currently an Assistant Professor at the University of California at Los Angeles at the Anderson School of Management.

Gallop, Geoff (S 1979-81)
Geoff Gallop’s essay ‘A Radical Legacy’ was chosen for inclusion in The Best Australian Political Writing, edited by Eric Beecher (Melbourne University Press, 2009).

Gazeley, Ian (PPRF 1983-85)
Andrew Newell (Sussex) and I have been awarded a £1.1m ESRC grant on “The Living Standards of Working Households in Britain, 1904-60”. The project will digitalise and analyse the results of the 1953-4 Household Expenditure Survey and make the extracted data available on-line via a virtual centre, which will be part of the Poverty Research Unit at the University of Sussex. All of the 12,900 expenditure records collected for 1953-4 survey are extant at The National Archives, Kew. The data extracted from the extant returns of two earlier national surveys of household expenditure, carried out in 1904 and 1937/8 will also be made available via the virtual (Living Standards in Britain) centre.

Hartley, Owen A. (S 1965-68)
I formally retired in July 2009, having spent just short of 41 years teaching in different departments of the University of Leeds. I published some slight but provocative pieces, did the usual run of administrative tasks, but mainly enjoyed teaching – over 8000 students (including over 60 postgraduate researchers) for the University and other institutions. In retirement, I will do some part-time teaching for the School of History of Leeds and catch up on so many things I never found time for in a busy but contented life.

Pawson, Eric (S 1973-75)
I am Professor of Geography at the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, working on colonial environmental histories. I was awarded the Distinguished New Zealand Geographer medal in 2007 and a national tertiary teaching award in 2009.

Rose, Richard (S 1958-60)
In November Richard Rose received the Sir Isaiah Berlin Prize for Lifetime Contribution to Political Studies for lifetime achievement in European Political Sociology from the European Consortium for Political Research at its biennial conference in Potsdam.

Sandell, Adam (S 1995-96)
After ten years working for the NHS as a doctor, mainly as an inner-city GP in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, I have retrained as a lawyer. I am now a barrister at Matrix Chambers in London, specialising in public and human rights law.

Two books published in 2009: Corporate Governance – principles, policies and practices, Oxford University Press, and Directors – an A-Z Guide, Economist/Profile Books. Both of these works can be traced back to my research at Nuffield in the early 80s, which led to the first book to use the title Corporate Governance (1984). Today, of course, it has become of major interest, unfortunately more due to corporate collapses around the world than to academic research.

Abbreviations: AM Associate Member GF Guardian Fellow GGF Gwilym Gibbon Fellow HF Honorary Fellow OF Official Fellow PF Professorial Fellow NCF Norman Chester Fellow S Student VF Visiting Fellow
College Pantomimes from Yester-Year

During a recent ‘spring-clean’ (it took place in the autumn), Sybil Iley and Sarah Brough discovered some historic material in the form of a script and sketches from the 1986 JCR pantomime. The material is too good not to share with those who weren’t involved, and hopefully bring back entertaining memories for those who were present at the event. We would like to thank Ian Preston, not only for making the sketches (which were transformed into the pantomime’s programme), but for giving us permission to reproduce them and then (with Sara Connolly’s input) being able to put names to pictures!

The ‘plot’ was inspired by the appointment of Helen Cunliffe as chaplain and the students at Nuffield were depicted as dysfunctional versions of the Von-Trapp children. Unfortunately there are no audio recordings: lyrics to the Sound of Music were re-worked and included a duet (featuring Sara Connolly and Cathal Guiomard) of “How do you solve a problem like Helen?”!
2007: *Horse-junior in action*

We also understand the JCR pantomime committee decided that the looming retirement of the Warden (Michael Brock retired in 1988) was creating a power vacuum within Nuffield, resulting in the sociologists (John Goldthorpe and Chelly Halsey) rather meanly (a 1986 cast member’s word!) represented as attempting a coup. Nuffield was ‘saved’ from this terrible fate by ‘Vic’ Sylvester, the College caretaker at the time.

In the re-discovered script, Steve Nickell sings a song including the lines ‘If I were the Warden, I’d never have a Governing Body …’. To current College Authorities’ knowledge (and relief), the Warden has performed a U-turn on his wayward youth.

A sub-plot portrayed the attempts of Nicol Von Rae to escape from Nuffield to America (the land of primaries, caucuses and mid-terms) being thwarted by Fellows. People portrayed in the 1986 production who didn’t make an escape include David Butler, David Hendry, John Muellbauer, Duncan Gallie, John Goldthorpe, Chelly Halsey. John Vickers and Steve Nickell *did* effect an escape, but only to return as Wardens of All Souls and Nuffield, respectively.

Ironically, the 2009 panto was (very) loosely based on the Truman Show in which the main character finally decides that he *doesn’t* want to escape from the ESRC-sponsored College.

The pantomime horse has been a stalwart of Nuffield’s pantomimes, making an appearance in all shows within living memory – there may have been one or two absences due to injury, but a stirling record none-the-less. Unfortunately, the horse had to retire and his four large shoes are now being filled by horse-junior who has a very glossy coat. Horse-junior made his (or possibly her) debut in 2007 during the pantomime ‘Indian Jones and the Quest for the Holy Data Set’. The audience were sitting on the edges of their seats as the tension rose – who would find the Data Set, sociologists, politicians, economists, or the deadly MBAs?

You will be relieved to know that once the data set was retrieved and mined, the answer to everything was, indeed, found to be 42. But could the intrepid Nuffieldians prevent the Data Set falling into the hands of the Saïd Business School? Needless to say, horse-junior played his/her crucial role to perfection.

2006: ‘*The World is not Enuffield*’

In 2006, we learned that the JCR is actually run by the CIA. Ultimately, Bond saved Nuffield from a fate consisting of mind control and *homo oeconomicus*, but only after running the gauntlet of Librarians and Dr Evil (aka The Warden).

The pantomime horse has been a stalwart of Nuffield’s pantomimes, making an appearance in all shows within living memory – there may have been one or two absences due to injury, but a stirling record none-the-less. Unfortunately, the horse had to retire and his four large shoes are now being filled by horse-junior who has a very glossy coat. Horse-junior made his (or possibly her) debut in 2007 during the pantomime ‘Indian Jones and the Quest for the Holy Data Set’. The audience were sitting on the edges of their seats as the tension rose – who would find the Data Set, sociologists, politicians, economists, or the deadly MBAs?

You will be relieved to know that once the data set was retrieved and mined, the answer to everything was, indeed, found to be 42. But could the intrepid Nuffieldians prevent the Data Set falling into the hands of the Saïd Business School? Needless to say, horse-junior played his/her crucial role to perfection.

2009: Nuffield’s current students take a bow – until next year!
JIM SHARPE

Jim Sharpe came to Nuffield in 1966. He was persuaded to do so by the Warden, Norman Chester because of a well-known interest in local government and its relations to central government. Jim was a lecturer in politics at the London School of Economics and came to Oxford as lecturer in the University and faculty fellow of the College.

Throughout his long stint in college he maintained the stance of an outsider, a maverick from the outside world of the London School, apparently bemused by the elitism and conservative worldliness of Oxford. This was endearing trope, but in fact, of course, he was thoroughly at home with us and delighted in provoking all and sundry. He had no motto, but “épater les bourgeois” would have served him very well.

He was always on hand to challenge received opinion. His interests were wide. He rarely produced a systematic argument, but could be relied upon to generate an excitement and an atmosphere of curiosity which might transform technical knowledge into a composite view of the nature of politics. He was expected eventually to produce a big general book on political theory and practice. This never came, but he did write a large number of articles on a wide range of social science topics ranging from the limitations of academic politics study in application to public policy to the intricacies of politics in North America as well as the UK.

Out of his wide range of contributions to the life of the college some students and fellows would single out the remarkable success of graduate classes he organised through most of the 1980s, on the topic of Canadian politics. Most students imagined the topic to be rather dull. Quite the contrary, he taught his listeners that the politics of Canada was just as challenging and significant as the much more extensively studied politics of the USA. He attracted a remarkable collection of the very bright Canadians (not all of them political scientists – on the contrary many were on Canada Council Scholarships working in quite different disciplines but they all valued the chance to reconnect with their home affairs.)

He retired in 1988 much to the regret of his colleagues and student, and not, least, his own. At the funeral service (21st January 2010) many vivid tributes were paid to Jim by his numerous family and friends. What a lovely man he had been as Jim the father, Jim the gardener, Jim the sprinter, in his varied activities as academic, lover of music, critic of drama, commentator on life. Yes, a lovely man, and we shall all miss him.

Chelly Halsey & Laurence Whitehead

THE CHAPEL COMMITTEE

For the last couple of years, a Chapel Committee has been organising events (both secular and religious) based around Nuffield's Chapel. Being at the top of a staircase, the Chapel can be an over-looked part of College life, but we hope, it has been more used by an increased number of College members through the variety of recent events. These have included an art exhibition, a Japanese tea ceremony, a poetry reading, concerts, summer madrigals, the annual Carol Service (followed by compulsory mince pies) and two photo competitions. As you can see from the front cover of this Newsletter, we have some rather talented photographers with us at the moment.

Plays for this year include a folk group (12 February) and, by popular demand, a return visit at the end of the Trinity Term by soprano Penny Grant and friends, who so delighted everyone on their previous visit in 2008. We also hope that the Nuffield Choir, led by the indomitable Jeffrey Howard, will add to the variety of offerings.

On Friday 19 March, we are very excited to be hosting a talk on John Piper by Frances Spalding, surrounded, of course, by his designs and artwork. Frances will be speaking to us ahead of her appearance at the Oxford Literary Festival: this will be rather a special event.

If you would like to receive e-mail notification of Chapel events, please contact the Chapel Committee at: events@nuffield.ox.ac.uk. You should also feel free to suggest ideas for events you would like to see organised by the Chapel Committee. We aim to provide a diverse selection of themes and topics – most things will be considered!

We would be delighted to welcome old members to any or all of the concerts (or other events) that are put on in the Chapel. Many of these events include light refreshments and the opportunity to speak to other members of College as well as the performers. Occasionally we break the mould, and hold the event (or refreshments) elsewhere in the College, so please do check on the location prior to arriving!


Norman Robertson (VF 1947-49, S 1951-52) died on 17 July 2009 aged 84.

Jim Sharpe A memorial service will be held in College later this year. If you would like to attend, please contact Catherine McNeill at: catherine.mcneill@nuffield.ox.ac.uk.
**When is Regime Change Justified?**

Paul Jowett interviews Laurence Whitehead and Stephen Howe.

Paul: Perhaps some of the thorniest questions in international politics today include: (a) can regime change instigated by a foreign power ever be justified, and if so under which auspices; and secondly (b) can regime change ever work, and why has recent performance been so poor? Laurence, I know that you have written extensively on the subject, and Stephen that as an historian of imperialism, you’ve covered your fair share of regime changes, so both of you are well placed to comment. Laurence, perhaps you could start by giving us your views on the justification for foreign intervention in a nation state’s internal affairs.

Laurence: The term “regime change” has recently become associated with Afghanistan, Iraq and what I have called “coercive democratisation”. This can only be justified under highly restrictive conditions, although I am not prepared to say it can never be justified. The 1983 Grenada “rescue mission” came close to being legitimate, at least retrospectively, because the voters of the island judged it to be so. Arguably, however, Grenada was less a “regime change” than the restoration of a strong constitutional status quo ante. But the Bush/Blair assault on Bagdad was based on a false prospectus, it was disproportionate, not fully authorised by the Security Council, and undertaken without responsible planning for the post-invasion chaos. It was a prototypically unjustified coercive democratisation, and arguably a war crime.

Paul: In a sense, the lack of legitimacy over the Iraq regime-change is precisely the stimulus behind the question of whether “coercive democratisation” can be justified, and in what circumstances. You mention Grenada possibly being at one extreme, and Iraq at the other, how should we judge what comes in between?

Laurence: Clearly between Grenada and Iraq there lies a series of intermediate cases of coercive democratization – Timor, Haiti, Afghanistan, Kosovo – each with differing rationales and debatable justifications. Although the most prevalent western assessment of Kosovo is that it was justified by the responsibility to protect the majority of Albanian Kosovos from genocide, it is notable that only 64 out of the UN’s 192 member states have recognised the de facto entity created by NATO’s action, and that according to a significant current of critical opinion the risk of genocide was exaggerated to justify an operation that has resulted in a significant degree of “ethnic cleansing” of the Serbian minority.

Paul: At least in the case of Kosovo, I suppose, the majority, being of Albanian ethnicity, would consider the intervention to have been justified, certainly after the event. How would you judge the situation in Afghanistan?

Laurence: The Afghan intervention is hard to evaluate in isolation from a 30 year trajectory of great power proxy conflicts, and from a democratization perspective western endorsement of the 2009 re-election of President Karzai confirms the international community’s lack of commitment to democratic principle in this case.

Paul: It sounds as if Afghanistan is closer to the Iraq end of the spectrum. You also mentioned Haiti and Timor. Where would you position them?

Laurence: I think the record of the UN-supervised political intervention in Haiti is probably only a little better that the Afghan mission, even before the current overwhelming tragedy occurred. Timor initially seemed a somewhat more justifiable example, except that the ensuing regime has proved both fragile and incapable of maintaining its own internal security. If I consider all six cases I’ve mentioned, I think my general view would be that most coercive democratisations are of questionable legitimacy and dubious efficacy. The only plausible case for them is that the counterfactual alternative of non-intervention might have been even worse, but this is often hard to establish with confidence, and it glosses over the possibility that the forces of intervention may share culpability for the background conditions leading to the regime failure.

Paul: Do you think there any other instances where regime-change could be more justified than in the examples you’ve mentioned so far?

Laurence: I think we shouldn’t overlook the fact that “regime change” can be a domestically driven, rather than an externally imposed transformation. We should also bear in mind that it isn’t only authoritarian and dictatorial regimes that are replaced; sometimes democratic regimes can be displaced too. A substantial proportion of the Chilean electorate still seem to believe that General Pinochet was justified in overthrowing Chile’s foundering constitutional democracy in 1973, for example. Views about that case remain divided, in part because of disagreements about the nature and source of the crisis that had developed by the time his coup took place, and in part because of the problem of the counter-factual. If the Chilean armed forces had not united to oust the elected President what else would have happened? Those who believe a pre-revolutionary situation was in the making either praise or lament the coup for thwarting a different kind of regime change. My
assessment of that case, at the time, was that between these two polar alternatives there still remained space for an avoidance of the worst. If you follow that line of reasoning, then regime change was not justified and responsibility for this brutal outcome rests with those – on both sides of the political spectrum, and in Washington – who worked so hard to block any resolution based on regime continuity. Then there are cases when un-democratic regimes are overthrown from within, but not by supporters of liberal democracy. Was the 1979 Iranian Revolution justified, even though it ushered in Khomeini’s theocracy? Can we isolate the justification of one episode in a complex and linked historical sequence?

Paul: Considering the complex modern history of Iraq, not to mention Afghanistan, do you think Bush, Blair, and their advisors considered the context within which their regime-change plans were laid?

Laurence: Few of the British politicians who justified coercive regime change in Iraq could recall any of the earlier history relevant to the question. My grandfather was a Tommy charged by London with suppressing the Shia rising in Basra in 1920. My uncle was one of the RAF officers thrown out of Bagdad by the 1958 anti British Revolution in which Saddam took part. If you are oblivious to all that then justification requires less effort.

Paul: Are there any instances where the justification for regime-change, even if only after the event, could be considered stronger?

Laurence: It is easier to deal with the many recent cases where regime change was brought about from within and resulted in a more democratic outcome. The peaceful restoration of democracy in Spain and Portugal in the 1970s, or in Korea and the Philippines in the 1980s, or the dismantling of apartheid in South Africa in the 1990s, or of the Suharto dictatorship after 1990s, constitute clear regime changes that are all pretty easy to justify, both on grounds of democratic principle and in the light of the results. But even here it is as well to recognise that not all peaceful democratisations are so straightforward. On the whole most former Soviet citizens would probably accept that the USSR needed a radical overhaul and replacement by a series of other regimes. But the actual course of that transformation was so disruptive, indeed destructive, that it is understandable if a significant proportion of those involved refuse to approve of how it happened (even though, as Yugoslaiva subsequently demonstrated, much worse possibilities were avoided). A generation later the outcome may seem positive to many, but certainly not to all. Consequently a substantial bloc of opinion within the Russian Federation prefers Putin’s “sovereign democracy” to Yeltsin’s free-for-all, and few share Gorbachev’s self-assessment that everything he did was fully justified. In China, most now firmly believe that the Tiananmen students were misguided (or worse) and that regime change against Deng would not have been justified. My main comment here is not that one view is correct, and the other is false, but rather that differences in view arise from the deployment of rival counter-factuals, each of which is possible but unprovable.

Paul: I would tend to agree with the thesis put forward by Philip Bobbit that the main justification for the international community to precipitate a regime-change is when human rights under the existing regime are being abused. But there are plenty of instances where we don’t interfere when human rights are abused. Stephen, I think many of us in the UK would long have considered Zimbabwe to be a candidate for regime-change. Why do you think this has never become a tangible initiative?

Stephen: I think you have the burden of the imperial past to take into consideration. Very few countries in Africa would sanction a regime-change exercise led by Britain. It would smack of neo-imperialism. Mugabe used exactly this sort of rhetoric to help shore up support for his regime within the region, and in this respect he was very successful. South Africa remained strikingly supportive to his regime – though Zuma is clearly less inclined to continue that stance than was Mbeki. The only source of legitimacy for regime-change would have been within the Southern African Development Community or the African Union. An attempt to initiate regime-change from outside Africa would be completely doomed to failure.

Paul: This implies that the sources of legitimacy can devolve to regional blocs, and don’t always depend solely upon a global consensus.

Stephen: I think to a degree that is probably true. The Kosovo intervention, for example, was precipitated by the European powers without provoking a major global melt-down. Their success was in gaining Russian acquiescence. If Russia hadn’t been at least a passive bystander, the Kosovo intervention would not have been possible. Even in this case there were dangerous mistakes. The bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade almost made the intervention a global issue. But overall, the Kosovo intervention was successfully contained as a regional initiative – and neither it nor Bosnia, of course, was an intervention directed at regime change as such. In Africa, too, those military intercessions which have had a degree of regional and international legitimacy and a measure, however qualified, of success – Sierra Leone, Liberia or (with yet more qualifications and question-marks) Sudan and Darfur – have had more modest, essentially peace-keeping or –making, aims
Paul: In the immediate post cold-war period, the US gained something of the status of a global policeman. Do you think it still retains that status?

Stephen: Not since the George W. Bush administration. There can be no question that the US lost much of the moral high ground in global perceptions over Iraq. But I think one could exaggerate the degree of global consensus behind a perception of the US as a policeman even before the George W. Bush administration. I think its freedom of manoeuvre was always very limited in the Middle East. The first Gulf War was a fluke, brought about by one Middle East power invading another, something that was clearly unacceptable even within the region.

Paul: Perhaps we can move on to the second part of the question. Even if an external regime change is legitimate, can it be achieved successfully and in a way that doesn’t increase rather than reduce the overall level of human suffering. I’ve often felt that because the legitimacy of the regime changes was so universally accepted after the defeat of the Nazi and Japanese Imperial governments that the suffering caused afterwards was overlooked.

Stephen: I think in the case of Europe in 1945, the massive infrastructural damage, famine, and the problem of millions of displaced people, was as much a consequence of the war as of the change in regime.

Paul: True, but a lot of attention has been given over the last ten years by Germans to the consequences of the allied conquest of their country. The removal of the Nazi regime and its replacement by a government of occupation was not seamless. On the contrary, the rule of law broke down. Indeed, the behaviour of many allied soldiers contributed to this lawlessness.

Stephen: There was a lot broken in Germany in 1945, and I think it was inevitable then that there would be a lot of suffering in fixing the situation. One shouldn’t underestimate the initial resentment between the victor and the vanquished. We have come to view this, with post-1945 Japan, as one of the text-book cases of a successful democracy being installed to replace a pariah regime. But even in these cases, many mistakes were made. Remember too that in Germany there were four occupation powers involved: America, Britain, France and Russia. Even the three western allies didn’t cooperate or coordinate their policies very effectively. Actually I think Britain’s record as occupying power was the least bad, without the extremes of corruption permeating parts of the US administration, or the frequent apparent arbitrariness of the French (whose treatment of German POWs was sometimes pretty shameful), let alone the despotism of the Soviet zone.

Paul: There are still a number of similarities between the fall of France in 1940, the fall of Germany in 1945, and the fall of the Sadam regime in 2003 which bear consideration. In all three cases, the legal vacuum which ensued the fall led to a massive upsurge in theft, murder, rape, and overall chaos. Weren’t these symptoms of regime change underestimated in the planning of the Iraq conflict?

Stephen: I think the Iraq conflict would hardly be described as best practice. There appears to have been very little preparation for maintaining law and order once the occupation had been achieved. We all recall the wide-scale looting that began in Baghdad once the Americans entered that city, and it was clear that the Sadam regime was dead. Many US army commentators considered this looting to be an understandable “letting off of steam”. The occupation government was ready to turn a blind eye to such lawlessness in the early days. But the intertribal warfare, ethnic cleansing, and wholesale fragmentation of society which came through the devolution of central authority to the tribal level, were developments neither expected nor prepared for. As the Chilcot hearings, among their many revelations, have been showing us, many British and other experts were horrified even in advance at the sheer lack of intelligent planning for the longer term.

Paul: The British never succeeded in subduing Afghanistan, nor did the Russians, are we doomed to being unsuccessful in influencing a regime change in that country?

Stephen: In a sense, it all reduces back to the question of legitimacy. British, Russian, and even current Allied invasions of Afghanistan have continuously lacked legitimacy among broad swathes of Afghan society, and in particular, their tribal and religious leaders. Legitimacy for a regime change outside a country is all well and good, but if an invasion aimed at regime change lacks legitimacy
within that country, it is doomed to failure.

Paul: Don’t we face the challenge however that the local regime will always retain some local legitimacy, even when precipitating the most blatant human rights abuses? There will always be factions of society that will defend that regime.

Stephen: Certainly, and some might be tempted to argue that we should only act if the supporters of the local regime are in a clear minority. But this would be a spurious argument even if we could reliably ascertain the true balance of local opinion. It could easily be the case that a majority is abusing the human rights of the minorities, and it is precisely in these cases that international intervention may be legitimate and necessary. Darfur was, I think, one of the clearest such cases in recent history. I’d place myself among those who simply do not consider ‘national sovereignty’ as something which should be accorded any great ethical weight, certainly not when set against human rights protection – or maybe even those who believe as Nye Bevan said long ago that it’s a phrase which history is rapidly emptying of meaning. But we have to recognise that ours is a minority view. Especially in formerly colonised societies, the call to ‘defend our hard-won independence’ and ‘resist imperialist aggression’ has, and will long continue to have, a huge popular emotional appeal.

Paul: So we should cultivate the support of those within the impacted country who oppose the inhuman behaviour of the regime?

Stephen: It would be a rare country indeed that didn’t contain people opposed to human rights abuses. But they rarely speak with a single voice, nor should we ever expect them to do so. Seeking to work with such people (let alone as surrogates for them, as ‘humanitarian intervention’ often effectively means doing) rarely provides clear and simple answers to the question ‘What to do’. In the wake of the Haitian tragedy, for instance, some urge that the best hope for rebuilding the country lies in returning former President Aristide to power. Others, though, respond that Aristide and his party, once repository of great hopes for Haiti’s future, had latterly become gross abusers of Haitians’ rights, corrupt and autocratic. Much of Haiti’s ‘human rights community’ would bitterly oppose his return.

Paul: Should we be using the term “regime-change”, a term I hadn’t heard used in a pro-active sense before the George W. Bush presidency?

Laurence: “Regime change” is a glib phrase. It refers to social upheavals and political power redistribution that hurt multitudes of bystanders, even if – perhaps – the benefits reaped by future generations may prove so great as to provide retrospective justification. The immediate pain and disruption is more certain, and more directly attributable than the hypothetical future rewards. Some would find this utilitarian or consequentialist calculus inadequate.

Paul: Even if we use some other term, you used “coercive democratisation”, which includes the notion that the goal is a functioning democracy, is it worth imposing the sorts of social upheaval you describe in the aim of installing a democracy?

Laurence: I certainly see the value of democratic regimes. It may therefore be justified to make sacrifices for democracy, even when there is a certainty of bearing great costs. Nevertheless, for democratic regime change to be worth the price, it is crucial that the resulting regime really is durable and of high quality. So there is no escaping the question of the counter-factual. Many in China do not see a Russia-style democracy as worth paying the price of regime-change to obtain. If they believed some other more attractive option was on offer they might judge differently. Bush and Blair try to persuade us that the current Iraq “democracy” is categorically superior to the regime they so recklessly overthrew. But it is the people of Iraq who bore the pain, and they alone are therefore best placed to make the judgement. How many of them would say that the regime change we bestowed on them was well “justified”?

Stephen: I agree entirely, with both the hope and the caution of Laurence’s words. Seeking ‘coercive democratisation’ is not always and in principle illegitimate. But it is ever harder, either from recent history or in the prospective future, to see circumstances where it can both work, and be worth the price.

Paul: Laurence, Stephen, many thanks for your contributions to this debate for the Nuffield Newsletter. Let’s hope the Nuffield alumni, who are overwhelmingly composed of academics, play their part in making sure that our governments are better prepared to judge the pros and cons of regime-change interventions in the future.

Is there a topic you would like to see covered in future Nuffield Newsletters? Please send your suggestions to: nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk
A Gwilym Gibbon Fellow Takes Stock

One prerequisite of good public policy is independent analysis based on a robust evidence-base. A member of the UK diplomatic service, I joined Nuffield College as a Gwilym Gibbon fellow in 2006, attracted by the opportunity to associate with a leading international centre of social science research – and greedily glean new knowledge. Despite the obvious value of evidence-based research for policymakers, domestic government departments have been at the forefront of drawing on social science research to support policy formation. With major research budgets, clear hypotheses to test, and large sums of public money to spend, domestic government departments have improved their use of external research (as well as commissioning their own) to inform policy debates.

In foreign policy, however, some see the practice of diplomacy as an art rather than a science. Diplomacy, according to the scholar Martin Wight, consists of three primary functions – information gathering, negotiation and communication. Many diplomats view their craft as one built on apprenticeship and the application of conversation, charisma, and cunning. Traditional careers depended on quick minds and good judgement rather than literature reviews or quantitative modelling.

When I began at Nuffield I was working in the FCO Policy Planning Staff. Established in 1964, it was set-up to be a think-tank within the FCO. Policy Planning was designed to be a connecting rod between diplomacy and the world beyond in an age when diplomacy was largely detached from public scrutiny or debate. The FCO has since become much more open and it is no longer an exclusive function of policy planners or research analysts to connect with the wider world.

In 2007 I moved to Pakistan to take up a newly created position leading our political work on Afghanistan and Pakistan. The main focus of my team’s work was Pakistan’s Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA), the venue of much terrorist plotting against UK targets. The task was to reengage with the FATA and the wider Pashtun belt, understand it, formulate policy advice back to London, and get on and deliver the policy. The issue was important, yet the evidence-base was weak. I was based out of Pakistan’s capital, Islamabad, but spent much of my time in Peshawar, the provincial capital of the North West Frontier Province, meeting a wide range of people from the top to the bottom of Pashtun society. I also travelled to Quetta, the provincial capital of the southern province of Balochistan.

The weeks I spent at Nuffield each year became ever more useful. As we struggled to put together the first systematic opinion-poll in the FATA, beginning with a 1,050 strong sample base (now 4,000), advice from colleagues in the politics and sociology groups helped shape a better methodology. Meanwhile, the FCO was discussing how to improve the quality of policy training for FCO staff – and the sheer variety of experience from Nuffield fellows, visiting fellows and students provided a rich seam of potential advice. The Oxford Intelligence Group was a vehicle for discussions of ‘wicked’ problems past. And as someone with a qualitative background, I learned to appreciate quantitative data sets and the inferences that could be drawn from them. I also found time to pursue my interest in how the nature of government policy advice overall is changing and becoming more porous. A workshop at Nuffield in October 2007 explored this change, drawing on past government ministers, officials and special advisers to discuss what this might mean.

I left Pakistan in August 2009 for a fellowship at Yale, and have since taken up a new role as a senior advisor at the U.S. Department of State. The Nuffield experience has changed my approach to public policy. Nuffield is a special institution, and the continuing role of the Gwilym Gibbon endowment (and other fellowships) make sure that the College connects to the wider world beyond. Knowledge should shape policy – and Nuffield finds special ways to do just that.

Alexander Evans, Gwilym Gibbon Fellow (2006-10)
Back Row: Marloes Nicholls (S), Matthew Loveless (RF), Matthew Polisson (S), Thees Spreckelsen (S), Bob Allen (PF), Carlos Gonzalez Sancho (S), Martin Browning (PF).

Fifth Row: Mikhail Drugov (RF), Matthew Bennett (S), Malte Dummel (S), Gianluca Manzo (V), Anthony Harris (S), Ioannis Armakolas (RF), Dennis Tatarkov (S), Johannes Kemp (S), Daniel Marszalec (S), Klaus Broesamle (S).

Fourth Row: Aytek Erdil (RF), Steve Bond (SRF), Peter Neyroud (VF), Chris Huhne (VF), Gwilym Hughes (SF), Sarah Harper (SRF), Peyton Young (PF), David Miller (OF).

Third Row: Alan Morgan (VF), Robert Hahn (V), Vicky Pryce (VF), Sir Mike Aaronson (VF), Neil Record (VF), Alexander Evans (GRF), Lucy Carpenter (FF), Duncan Gallie (OF), Ola Onuch (S).

Second Row: Clive Gable (College Porter), Gilles Serra (RF), Nancy Bermeo (PF), Sarah von Billerbeck (S), Sundas Ali (S), Kadambari Prasad (S), Christel Kesler (RF), Gabriella Elgenius (RF), Elizabeth Baldwin (S), Chiara Binelli (RF), Kiril Kossev (S), Hande Inanc (S), Krista Gile (RF).

Front Row: John Muellbauer (OF), David Butler (EF), Uwe Kitzinger (EF), Daniel Lawson (College Butler), Gwendolyn Sasse (PF), Heidi Stöckl (S), Stephen Nickell (Warden), Dame Karen Dunnell (VF), Vince Cable (VF), Sir Nick Macpherson (VF), Paul Klemperer (PF), Elizabeth Martin (College Librarian), Justine Crump (Administrative Officer).

EF = Emeritus Fellow  PF = Professorial Fellow  SF = Supernumerary Fellow
F = Faculty Fellow  RF = Research Fellow  V = Visitor
GRF = Guardian Research Fellow  S = Student  VF = Visiting Fellow
OF = Official Fellow  SRF = Senior Research Fellow

Reproduced by kind permission of David Collins Photography
http://davidcollinsphotography.co.uk
**DIARY DATES**

**Politics’ Reunion Dinner**
**Friday 19 March 2010**

Invitations to those who studied Politics or have been affiliated with the Politics Group at Nuffield are enclosed with this Newsletter. For further information, please write to the Events Officer at nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk. The Politics’ Dinner (black tie) will take place on Friday evening, 7 for 7:30pm.

**Nuffield 2010 Gaudy**
**Friday 2 July**

for matriculation years 1995-2004 and pre-1960

To reserve your place, contact us at nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

The Gaudy Dinner (black tie) will take place on Friday evening, 7 for 7:30pm. Accommodation will be available in College on a first-come-first-served basis, so please book early to avoid disappointment.

**Nuffield Society AGM**
**Friday 24 September 2010**

The Nuffield College Society AGM and dinner will be held on **Friday 24 September 2010**. The meeting (6.30 p.m., SCR) will be followed by dinner in Hall.

If you wish to stand for a Committee position, please contact Nuffield Society at nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk or tel: (01865) 278527 by 1 September.

**Sociology Dinner**
**Friday 18 March 2011**

A Reunion Dinner for Nuffield’s Sociologists past and present. To reserve your place, please write to the Events Officer at: nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

**FORMER MEMBERS’ ENTITLEMENTS**

**Meals:** Former students and Fellows may dine at High Table (term time only) or Low Table from time to time, and up to three times an (academic) year free of charge* and will be welcome to do so (subject to space being available). They should give notice to the Butler by 10am on the morning of dining. Former students and Fellows may take lunch in College occasionally, at their own expense. Additional meals are to be paid for (e.g., for partner). Payment may be made either direct via the Finance Department or via invoice if details are left with the ‘cashier’ at lunch.

**Rooms:** When dining in College or attending an academic function in College, former students and Fellows living outside Oxford have the option of staying overnight in a single guest room (B&B) free of charge up to three times an academic year, with the option of upgrading to a double room on payment of the current room charge.** Arrangements should be made with the Bursar’s Secretary and payment made via the Finance Department.

**Library:** We are always pleased to see former members, and we are always happy to receive copies of your published work to add to library stock. **Oxford residents:** You are entitled to the following borrowing privileges, which continue as long as you a) are resident in Oxford, b) provide a contact address to the library and the Academic Administrator, and c) agree to respond promptly to all emails from the Library. You may use the Library during staffed hours (0930-1730) and you may borrow three books at a time. The loan period is 28 days; each loan may be renewed once by email or telephone unless the book is recalled by a member of College. To extend the loan further, you must bring the book in to the library. Fines will be charged for late returns; periodicals and government publications may not be borrowed. You are welcome to use all other services provided by the Library to College members except for book recalls and Inter-Library Loans. To enable access and borrowing, you should have a Bodleian card (to which you are also entitled, as a former member of the University). **Non-Oxford residents:** All former members of Nuffield are entitled to use the library for reference during staffed hours when visiting Oxford. You may not borrow from the Library unless you have a College guest room and register at the Circulation Desk. You must return all loans before leaving College. You are welcome to use all other services provided by the Library to College members except for book recalls and Inter-Library Loans.

---

* Includes dessert and wine at High Table or Dessert, but not guest’s wine.
** Subject to availability
CONTACT DETAILS

Porters’ Lodge
+44 (0)1865 278500
the.lodge@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Nuffield College Society
+44 (0)1865 278527
nuffsoc@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Bursar’s Secretary
+44 (0)1865 278525
bursars.secretary@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Library
+44(0)1865 278550
library-enquiries@nuffield.ox.ac.uk

Butler
+44(0)1865 278531
buttery@nuffield.ox.ac.uk