



Celebrating 50 years

Politics & International Relations

1963-2013

**FIFTY YEARS AND MORE:
THE DEPARTMENT OF
POLITICS AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH**

Charles D. Raab

Professor of Government

Copyright © 2012 Charles Raab, Malcolm Anderson, Mark Aspinwall, Alice Brown,
Mary Buckley, Mary Chamberlain, Russell Keat, Richard McAllister, Jeremy
Mitchell, Sarah Nelson, Richard Parry, Sofia Widen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.....	iv
Introduction: Prehistoric remains.....	1
The 1960s to the 1990s and beyond.....	3
<i>Departmental colleagues</i>	3
<i>Undergraduate life</i>	11
<i>Postgraduates</i>	13
<i>Other departments and the wider university</i>	15
Meetings, and visits to ‘The Burn’.....	18
The curriculum, teaching, and marking: 1960s – 1990s.....	22
Directing studies.....	29
Premises, facilities and libraries.....	31
Expansion and repositioning in the 2000s.....	34
Annex 1: About David Playfair Heatley (1920-1944, first as Reader in Political Science, then as Reader Emeritus) (written by Charles Raab).....	37
Annex 2: Jeremy Mitchell (1964-68; student).....	41
Annex 3: Mary Chamberlain (1965-1969; student).....	44
Annex 4: Sarah Nelson (1967-1971; student).....	47
Annex 5: Richard Parry (1970-1974; student).....	50
Annex 6: Richard McAllister (1966-present; Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Honorary Fellow).....	52
Annex 7: Malcolm Anderson (1979-1998; Professor of Politics; 1998-present as Professor Emeritus).....	55
Annex 8: Mary Buckley (1983-2000; Lecturer to Reader).....	57
Annex 9: Alice Brown (1979-2002; student to Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Professor; 2008-present as Professor Emeritus and Honorary Fellow).....	59
Annex 10: Russell Keat (1994-2006; Professor of Political Theory, 2006-present as Professor Emeritus and Honorary Fellow).....	65
Annex 11: Mark Aspinwall (2004-present; Senior Lecturer to Professor of Politics and International Relations).....	73
Annex 12: <i>Student</i> in the mid-1960s (compiled by Sofia Widen).....	77
Annex 13: <i>Student</i> in the mid-1970s (compiled by Sofia Widen).....	79
Annex 14: <i>Student</i> in the mid-1980s (compiled by Sofia Widen).....	82
Annex 15: <i>Student</i> in the mid-1990s (compiled by Sofia Widen).....	84

Foreword

This is less a history than a recollection of the Department of Politics – now the subject area of Politics and International Relations – from the early/mid-1960s through to the present time: some fifty years, but with antecedents that are not well known, and with a future that others will in time be able to record. This history, or recollection, is full of gaps where time has not permitted a fuller and better-researched treatment of many aspects of the Department's life and work, and there are many stones that have had to be left entirely unturned. There are many places at which information should be checked with other sources for accuracy, and in many cases this has been done. Especially where it has not, it is open to others to improve this account, challenge it, and expand upon it, and I hope some will do this and fill in the holes, give alternative views, and provide more information.

There are many persons whose information and comments could provide a more accurate and fuller picture overall than I have done, or who could cast light on parts of the story and at different times. I have called upon several of them to provide supplements to this account, not only for the sake of accuracy and more completeness, but to bring alive and enrich our memory of the Department. These are placed in Annexes but are integral to the whole, and are cross-referenced with my own text. Historical accounts are constructed and negotiated, and so too are the 'factual' accounts contained in records, or the memories of others against which one's story is triangulated. Yet some factual sources, such as records held by the University or published in its Calendars, should be taken as accurate, or indeed as the only records remaining, but these have by no means been systematically researched for this history. Little of other written material – once contained in individuals' papers or institutional records at several levels in the University – that would be essential to a proper historical understanding appears to have survived the processes of retirement, departure, change of location, digitisation, weeding, shredding, and the like. Electronic communication, overtaking paper-based means, will exacerbate this in future. In such ways, we all conspire in collective amnesia.

This story is not about me, nor so much about the contributors of Annexes: former students and former and present members of staff, but about the Department and wider circles of the University and Edinburgh as they are illuminated by, or perhaps refracted through, personal experience. I have entered the picture at various points in the account solely in order to talk about these matters and to make clear how I happen to have been privy to them in terms of vantage points or participation. I fear I may not always have adhered to this self-denying ordinance, but at times have consigned personal comments to footnotes. Other things purely about me, outside these contexts, have not been included. Many of the more personal accounts are found in the contributed Annexes. In addition, I have thought it prudent not to discuss certain things, as I have been mindful of confidentiality and good manners. Yet there are dangers in both candour and prudence.

Thanks are due to the current and former colleagues, and former students, who indulged me in this *jeu d'esprit*; some read early drafts, contributed their brief memoirs to it, and helped with its incorporation into a celebratory occasion in 2012. Special thanks must be given to Sofia Widen, who laboriously combed the microfilmed pages of the newspaper *Student* at several points in each of four decades to identify and extract relevant articles and other matter that give a flavour of the life

and experiences of students, staff, and the wider world, and to write these up for use in this history. Only lightly edited, these are to be found in four Annexes, and they enhance our understanding of the recent half-century through snapshots of student journalism that dealt with a variety of local, national and international issues. I am also very grateful for the assistance given by Arnott Wilson, Head of Special Collections and University Archivist, and by his staff, in acquainting me with relevant archival resources in the Special Collections of the University Library and in making these available to me.

Charles Raab
Edinburgh
August 2012

[Note: I have been a member of the Department of Politics and its successor since 1964, as Lecturer (to 1979), Senior Lecturer (to 1994), Reader (to 1999), Professor of Government (to 2007), and Professor Emeritus and Honorary Professorial Fellow (to 2012). As from 2012, I have resumed my Personal Chair as Professor of Government.]

Introduction: Prehistoric remains

We mark the fiftieth anniversary of the Department of Politics¹ since its inception in 1963 when Harold John ('Harry') Hanham took up the new Chair. This dating, however, is a matter of convenience and in fact the University formally created the Chair in 1961. The establishment of a Chair and of a Department – with its own curriculum, degree structure, academic staff, students, and eventually graduates, is highly significant in the life of a University, and perhaps especially an ancient one in which new creations have to fight for a place in the sun under an existing canopy of interests, rivalries and jealousies.² We justly celebrate and commemorate the creation of the Department. But we should not suppose that it sprang fully formed, or even partly formed, from the head of some Minerva without enquiring into its background, elements of which moved forward into the new era and shaped the kind of Department it came to be.

In fact, the teaching of Politics – under some variation of that label – at the University of Edinburgh began long before the modern creation of a Department of Politics. Some would look to the 18th century Enlightenment for early roots, perhaps citing the philosopher Adam Ferguson's writings (including *Principles of Moral and Political Science* in 1792, and *Essay on the History of Civil Society* in 1767). If the study of Politics later, and conventionally, came to embrace the study of political theory and political institutions, the seeds at Edinburgh were already sown at the beginning of the 20th century, when an Honours optional course in Political Science was established within the History Department in 1900, taught by David Playfair Heatley, and then when an Elementary Politics course was instituted in 1914. Annex 1 gives further details of the fascinating history of Heatley's contribution at Edinburgh, which has been long forgotten.

In view of Edinburgh Politics' transformation in the 2000s into Politics and International Relations, with a new narrative about reflecting an up-to-date conception of its educational mission in a globalising world, it is interesting to note that the teaching of international relations in some form – albeit in the History Department – had begun nearly a century earlier. In addition, from 1948 the University had a Visiting Montague Burton Chair of International Relations, to which distinguished outsiders were appointed to give a series of public lectures, a practice that continues in a different and reduced form. Therefore, in the new Millennium the Department (or 'subject area') was picking up a thread that would have entitled it, instead, to point proudly to earlier origins that began with Heatley, and in the 1960s and later, continued with Honours courses on international politics as well, taught by Richard McAllister and others. Amnesia about the very distant past is forgivable, but what is puzzling is the University's own unawareness of its then-current offerings, when in 1945 it told Sir Hector Hetherington – in his role as a member of the committee that had been established under the chairmanship of Sir John Clapham to look at the state

¹ Although 'Department' and 'Politics' are used throughout this history, the name 'Department' ceased to exist with the recent establishment of Schools within Colleges, replaced by 'Subject Areas'. In addition, 'Politics' became 'Politics and International Relations'. 'Department' and 'Politics' are used throughout this history.

² At least one not-disinterested voice was raised in the higher reaches of the University when the establishment of the Politics Chair was being considered, arguing that the money could be better spent reinforcing other and recent new departures when the New Faculty of Social Sciences was being created.

of economic and social research in the UK – that ‘it had no lecturer in either political science or political philosophy’.³ This was not strictly true in terms of the titles of appointed academic staff, and it was somewhat misleading and uninformative in terms of the actual teaching of these subjects to generations of Edinburgh students.

³ Grant, W., *The Development of a Discipline – The History of the Political Studies Association*, Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell 2010, p. 14.

The 1960s to the 1990s and beyond

Let us leave the very distant past, change the style, and speak in a different voice about the past fifty years, including personal reflections.

Departmental colleagues

I was appointed Lecturer in Politics in 1964, and arrived in Edinburgh in August of that year. The University was much smaller then than now: probably about 8000 students. There was no full or long tradition of the social sciences as such, under that self-aware label, although of course economics, political history, anthropology and other social subjects did exist as taught subjects at Edinburgh. The Department began working in 1963, with a Professor in post, although without taught courses until the following year. The first holder of the Chair, Harry Hanham, was an ebullient New Zealander and in post in 1963-64.⁴ At that time, the Department consisted of Hanham and Douglas Nobbs, a historian of politics and political thought. He transferred from the History Department as Reader, having been a Senior Lecturer from 1954.⁵ As we see in Annex 1, Nobbs had inherited Heatley's teaching from 1935 and taught Political Science ('the Mackay Lectures') in the History Department, for a number of years alongside Bernice Hamilton, up to the creation of the Faculty of Social Sciences in 1963 and its Politics Department. In 1963-64, he was teaching these courses by himself within the History and Economic Science Honours curricula.⁶ This teaching, and Nobbs, then moved across to Politics, and the Department grew from then.

Hanham, a nineteenth-century political historian, realised the need to develop a modern department that could cover a wider range of teaching and research.⁷ It should

⁴ Hanham had done his PhD at Selwyn College, Cambridge in the field of Victorian British political history. He also developed an interest in Scottish Nationalism as it then was, and is likely to have become concerned with Scottish history partly through Nicholas Phillipson, then a Lecturer in History (later Reader and now Honorary Fellow) and a seminal figure in the study of the Scottish Enlightenment; and partly through Douglas Nobbs. In 1952, Nobbs had published a historical work on Anglo-Scottish relations, *England and Scotland 1560-1707*, London: Hutchinson's University Library. Hanham and his then wife Alison, a mediaeval historian, lived in Cramond with their *dachshund*. Harry was given to wearing a bowler hat (which gave a certain resemblance to Oddjob in the James Bond film, *Goldfinger*; he was not amused when I pointed this out). He was on good terms with another New Zealander, Professor Edward Stamp, who was in Accountancy and who became a major force in the criticism and revision of accountancy conventions and standards; see his University of Saskatchewan honorary degree laureation, available at: <http://www.usask.ca/archives/history/hondegrees.php?id=396&view=detail&keyword=&campuses=>, accessed 29 December 2011. Stamp left Edinburgh after the 1960s for the University of Lancaster; perhaps Hanham's later Vice-Chancellorship at Lancaster owes something to Stamp's championing, but this is only speculation.

⁵ In the same year, John P. Mackintosh was appointed Lecturer in History; some 20 years later, as a Member of Parliament, he became the third Professor of Politics at Edinburgh.

⁶ University Calendar, 1963-64, pp. 374, 381.

⁷ In 1963-64, he also had the services of Ian Budge, who was still completing his PhD. Budge (now Professor Emeritus at Essex) had been a PhD student at Yale in the USA from 1959, along with me. He was a native of Edinburgh and had done an MA (Hons) (First Class) in History here before going to Yale. I believe he had been taught by Nobbs for his Honours degree in History, in which achieved outstanding results. Budge acknowledges comments from Nobbs in Budge, I., 'Jeremy Bentham: A Re-Evaluation in the Context of Empirical Social Science', *Political Studies*, 19, 1, 1971, pp. 18-36. Budge had come back to Scotland and had taught at Strathclyde (then still the Royal College of Science and Technology, which became the University of Strathclyde in 1964) and also, I think, at Edinburgh in 1963-4. When Hanham sought to fill two posts for 1964, Budge is likely to have advised him to look to

be borne in mind that Politics had only been established as a degree subject in the UK since about 1950 (*Political Studies* was founded then as the institutional journal)⁸ and was only taught in a few places outside Oxford (where it was part of PPE) and Cambridge (where it was notably political theory) and the London School of Economics and Political Science. The University of Manchester became the leading engine-room for the next generation of Chairs round the UK, including Hanham as part of the Manchester ‘diaspora’. It was WJM (‘Bill’) Mackenzie, later Professor at Glasgow, who was the Manchester father figure, and his ‘sons’ fanned out to other universities.

I was recruited from Yale to my first academic post. The other appointee to a Lectureship was the late James Cornford, then a political historian with very wide political and sociological interests. We shared some knowledge of the literature that was then at the forefront of the renovated, more sociological and behavioural, discipline of political science or political sociology as it was developing in the USA and in some places in Europe. He had been a Fellow at Trinity College, Cambridge and had spent time in the USA under a Harkness Fellowship. In later years, he was the second holder of the Edinburgh Chair.⁹ In 1964-65, the Department thus consisted of Hanham, Nobbs, Cornford and me. We could all fit into Hanham’s grey Morris Oxford, as we did in travelling to Dundee to attend the first meeting of the then Scottish Political Studies Association. Jean Rosie,¹⁰ whom Hanham usually called ‘Miss Rosie’, looked after us as the Department’s first secretarial appointment.

An important point of connection for some Politics staff with those elsewhere was provided under the auspices of John (JDB) Mitchell, Professor of Constitutional Law and first holder of the Salvesen Chair of European Institutions in 1968.¹¹ Mitchell engineered a significant and renowned series of invited lectures on the Common Market, as it was then called. Britain had declined to join ‘Europe’, but many felt – academics as well as business and public affairs persons – that the flame should be kept alive and that a good deal of learning was necessary among the political class to

the USA and to Yale, which was then at the forefront of the ‘modern’ academic study of political science, and was likely to have mentioned my name to Hanham.

⁸ See Grant, W. *op. cit.*

⁹ Cornford left academic life in 1976 to become, at various times and *inter alia*, founder of the Outer Circle Policy Unit in London (a think-tank at a time when these were few and far-between in the UK, making the connection between research and policy-makers); Director of the Institute for Public Policy Research (where he drafted a Constitution for the UK in 1991); Director of the Nuffield Foundation; Director of the Paul Hamlyn Foundation; Literary Editor and then Chairman of *The Political Quarterly*; founder and Chairman of the Freedom of Information Campaign; a broker of the Labour-Liberal pact in the turbulent politics of the 1970s; and the adviser on Freedom of Information to David Clark, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in the first Blair Government. Clark brought out a White Paper on FOI in 1998, leading to legislation, but was dismissed (along with Cornford, as a consequence) after resisting its watering-down. Before his death in 2011, Cornford was also prominently involved in the Social Entrepreneurs movement. He had had an affinity with the work and career of Michael Young (later Lord Young of Dartington), the sociologist and high-minded social reformer whom Cornford, I think, admired and in many ways emulated. See Cornford’s obituary in *The Guardian*, available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/oct/05/james-cornford-obituary>, accessed 29 December 2011.

¹⁰ She later became Jean Pryde and served as Faculty administrator/Dean’s Secretary).

¹¹ The main donors to Mitchell’s Centre of European Governmental Studies (CEGS) were the Volkswagen and Calouste Gulbenkian Foundations, and the Leith-based shipping and transport company, Christian Salvesen. CEGS was the forerunner of the Europa Institute; for some history as well as references to Politics, see <http://www.law.ac.uk/europa/theinstitute.aspx>; accessed 29 December 2011.

keep up the pressure. The seminars were held underneath the great portraits in the Old College's Raeburn Room, then used for meetings of the Senate; the University's most prestigious and elegant meeting room. Over several years, a stream of European movers and shakers from that first generation trooped through to give talks on various Common Market topics. Among the typically large audience were bankers, lawyers (academic and practicing), pro-European politicians, and many others. This was preaching to the converted, convincing the waverers, and also a means of elite networking.¹²

All this was at the beginning of the Department's strong academic interest in Europe, which developed subsequently with Martin Clark, Richard McAllister and others on the staff. Politics Second Ordinary concerned comparative European politics, albeit taught in a country-by-country way with an emphasis on historical traditions and current institutions. I gave many of the lectures and attempted to introduce comparative analytical elements and methods, as well as socio-cultural perspectives, into the teaching, as I had been taught in my own graduate school training. However, such comparativism, which bordered on political sociology, was grossly underdeveloped and there was, as yet, little literature to sustain it; moreover, students – perhaps especially those doing History courses or a joint degree – usually could not see the point, so it was like pushing a stone up a hill. Idiographics, 1; Nomothetics, nil, in the Kantian League. In retrospect, I think Heatley would have been better able to get the comparative point across.

The Department added roughly one new member of staff per year over several years.¹³ As mentioned, Martin Clark joined in 1965, and then Richard McAllister. Ronnie Irving (now an Honorary Fellow), who specialised in the politics of Western European countries and particularly France, joined subsequently, as did the late Henry Drucker in 1967, a political theorist and specialist in British politics, who had come from the USA via LSE.¹⁴ Henry was the second American to join. He introduced me to Indian cuisine (of sorts) at a hole-in-the-wall one-man Indian restaurant in Potterrow, and I recall our lunching there and wondering what our roles were supposed to be as members of the Department. Henry became our most popular lecturer: gregarious, imaginative and enterprising in involving students in field trips to by-elections such as Darlington in 1983, and in collaborative authorship with them, and so on.¹⁵ Gordon Brown tutored while doing his PhD in History, and the person in the Department to whom he was probably closest was Drucker, who was a Labour activist and stalwart.¹⁶

¹² These events were, in the 1960s, chaired by the late Lord Cameron, then a very senior High Court judge who sat on the University Court (as did his son, Lord Cameron of Lochbroom, years later). Occasionally, I attended the post-lecture small private dinner given in a tiny room somewhere else in Old College, where elevated dialogue on the topic of the moment was conducted across the silverware.

¹³ See Sarah Nelson's pen portraits of many of them in Annex 4.

¹⁴ He left in 1987 to become Oxford University's chief fund-raiser and subsequently ran his own consultancy, Oxford Philanthropic, until he died suddenly in 2002. He is remembered in the Dictionary of National Biography (DNB). See his obituary at:

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/2002/nov/07/guardianobituaries.highereducation>; accessed 29 December 2011.

¹⁵ See the Annexes by Richard Parry and Alice Brown.

¹⁶ Drucker and Brown later edited *The Politics of Nationalism and Devolution*, London: Longman, 1980.

With his wife Nancy, a Lecturer in Social Policy (then called Social Administration), Drucker was a founder of the Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland (later called Scottish Government Unit), which published the annual *Scottish Government Yearbook* from 1976-77 on. I also served on this, along with other founders including Richard Parry (Social Policy), the late Allan Macartney (who tutored for the Department but was mainly a tutor at the Open University in Scotland, and later SNP Deputy Leader and an MEP), David Miller (former European civil servant and Liberal candidate); Helen Ramm, one of the Departmental secretaries, handled its business. In those pre-devolution, lost-referendum years, Drucker's many publications on Scottish politics, and his contacts with leading Scottish political figures, added an important dimension to the Department, not least for students. In addition, Nancy and he, along with me as very much a third wheel on the chariot, went to see the University Principal, Sir John Burnett, some time in the 1980s to get the University to establish a fund-raising campaign on the American model, which happened in a modest way before Drucker left.¹⁷ He had hopes of eventually holding the Departmental Chair, but was very unfortunately blocked by others in the 1980s and then decided to move on. This was not a happy episode.

The late John Erickson had been appointed by Hanham to an interim Readership before he then quickly became Professor, and was the Department's specialist on the Soviet Union and Defence Studies. He established a formidable and renowned Centre in – but detached from – the Department, with Kathie Brown (who had succeeded Jean Rosie as Department secretary) as his secretary/administrator. Erickson had a great hoard of material from Soviet archives, and was better appreciated as an expert on the Soviet military in the USA than in Britain, where the Foreign Office and Ministry of Defence appeared to have kept him at arm's length. He received financing from Texas A&M University and (I think) the Air Force Academy in Colorado, and there was a steady stream of postgraduates who came to do Master's or PhD degrees under him. These were serving officers in the US military, and there was an Israeli as well (Amnon Sella).¹⁸ They worked on materials from the Erickson archive. Erickson's work on the Soviet military in World War II was acclaimed as the definitive scholarly work.¹⁹

¹⁷ Edwin Feulner, President of the Heritage Foundation in Washington and a PhD of the Department, whose work I had supervised, was instrumental in establishing the American Friends of Edinburgh University.

¹⁸ Sella received his PhD in 1973, and has been an academic at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and at the Interdisciplinary Center in Herzliya since then. See:

<http://portal.idc.ac.il/en/faculty/asella/Pages/Bio.aspx>; accessed 29 December 2011.

¹⁹ Erickson's writing was apparently greatly appreciated in the USSR because it told the story of Soviet military involvement that had been decisive in the defeat of Nazi Germany, at a time during the ensuing Cold War when it was convenient for the West to forget about the role of the Soviet Union, its people and its armed forces. He knew the top military brass, their roles in the War, and reputedly could identify their campaign medals and ribbons at 20 paces at cocktail parties, which impressed them. Erickson was one-of-a kind, an extremely funny story-teller about military and political life, and a seminal figure in the darkest Brezhnev years. He got the University and Burnett to launch the 'Edinburgh Conversations', whereby a link was maintained between East and West through meetings in Edinburgh and Moscow between people who respected and trusted each other outside the frame of belligerent rhetoric between the West and the Soviet Union. Erickson's memorial service, after he died in 2002, was held at St Mary's Cathedral in Edinburgh: a packed occasion, with eulogies by Tam Dalyell MP and others, with many highly-placed figures in attendance, including the former Foreign Secretary, Lord Owen.

In the late 1960s, the Department also appointed the first African member of the academic staff, the late Jabez Ayodele Langley from The Gambia, who went on to have a very distinguished academic and public service career before his death in 2007. He had recently completed a PhD in African History under Professor George ('Sam') Shepperson, and was then appointed a Lecturer before leaving Edinburgh a few years later.²⁰ Through these colleagues, and me for a time, the Department had strong links to the Centre of African Studies, and Chris Allen maintained this for many years through a stream of postgraduates whom he supervised.

Harry Hanham left in 1968,²¹ and James Cornford took the Chair, presiding over the growth of the Department in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Michael Clarke, with a particular interest in political organisations and public policy, came in 1969 and stayed for several years; he co-edited the *Scottish Government Yearbook* with Drucker in 1978.²² The late Chris Allen arrived in 1972 as a specialist in African Politics, sharing the teaching with me for his first few years, and was a distinguished Africanist. He later became Head of Department, and took early retirement to France before dying long before his time a few years ago.²³ John Wilson came into the Department in the early 1970s: a philosopher and Plato specialist, who left after a number of years because he did not find teaching congenial, but he maintained his interest in Plato and over the years since then has published a number of learned papers in philosophical journals.²⁴

²⁰ Up to the time of his death, he was still academically very productive in the field of African political history, having taught at Howard University in the USA. Earlier, he had been Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Economic Planning and Industrial Development for The Gambia (1974-1982), Secretary General of the Government of The Gambia, Chief of Staff to the President, and Head of the Civil Service (1982-1988). At various times, he had served as Executive Director at the World Bank; The Gambia's Acting High Commissioner (Chargé d'Affaires) to Nigeria; Short-term Expert at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa; Senior Associate, New Transcentury Foundation, (Development Management Consultant in Zambia and Ghana; and Senior Research Fellow, The Ralph Bunche International Affairs Center, Howard University. See one of many tributes and obituaries at: <http://nigeriavillagesquare.com/articles/sabella-o-abidde/obituary-professor-jabez-ayodele-langley.html>; accessed 29 December 2011.

²¹ Hanham went to Harvard first, then to MIT as Dean of Humanities and Social Science, before returning to the UK as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Lancaster, his last appointment before retiring. Russell Keat knew him at Lancaster, and there were some controversial aspects to Harry's Vice-Chancellorship connected to the expansion of that University.

²² He later became Deputy Director of Policy Planning in Lothian Region following local government re-organisation, then Director of the Local Government Training Board (later re-styled as Local Government Management Board), then Professor of Policy Studies, Head of the School of Public Policy and Vice-Principal of Birmingham University, CBE, DL, retiring in 2008 and now Chairman of the Birmingham Royal Ballet Board, and member of the Church of England Synod. The biographical details in the *Birmingham Post* are possibly slightly inaccurate; see www.birminghampost.net/tm_headline=no-27-professor-michael-clarke&method=full&objectid=19470051&siteid=50002-name_page.html; accessed 29 December 2011.

²³ Chris was a Marxist and, I think, at some stage a Communist Party member; in the nicest possible way, I think it can be said that he also enjoyed his claret and New Town residence. He was one of the greatest bibliographers I have ever met and was immensely good with students, taking great pains with them and sharing his vast knowledge of the literature.

²⁴ He moved to London, worked for an NGO and a charity, became researcher for Brynmor John MP (Labour spokesman on Social Security, then Agriculture), then re-trained in computing, working briefly in the City before returning north to the old Edinburgh District Council in 1988. When local government was reorganized in 1996, he became an adviser to Gordon Brown before undertaking work for the Smith Institute. From 2001 until his recent retirement he was involved in various Scottish

Among these other new arrivals, David Holloway joined Politics as a Soviet specialist; he left many years later for a post at Stanford University in the US, where he continued his distinguished work on Soviet nuclear arms development, Soviet science and technology, etc.²⁵ Holloway and Erickson were temperamentally very different persons, and did not get on very well, Erickson perhaps seeing him as something of a young rival. David Holloway's brother John also joined the Department soon after, bringing a significant and popular Marxist element to the curriculum, which was also pursued prominently by Richard Gunn, (now retired) who was also appointed in the 1970s. For a time, both John Holloway and Gunn supervised – together and separately – a very large number of postgraduates who worked on many Marxist and neo-Marxist topics in political theory. Holloway was a central contributor to debates within Marxist theory, which was carried on in the Conference of Socialist Economics and in publications.²⁶ He left the Department at the beginning of the 1990s to continue his career in Mexico, where I think he also engaged in activist work in relation to the Zapatistas. Gunn subsequently devoted much of his attention to researching historical aspects of Scottish political theory, but the contribution to the work of the Department continued with him and with others who were appointed in the 1980s and 1990s, including Werner Bonefeld and Hans Kastendiek.

When Cornford vacated the Edinburgh Chair of Politics in 1976, there was then a 'search' for his successor, under the aegis of a very timid Deanery which considered – as was probably traditional but becoming unsustainable – that members of staff should play no part in the appointment, not even expressing their views (which could be ignored) on candidates or knowing who the candidates were. We would only be able to give a general view on what sort of person we would prefer.²⁷ However, John Mackintosh MP was appointed, and it was said that it would be 'part-time', which meant that his time would be divided between his Parliamentary duties and Departmental duties. This seemed at first to short-change the Department, and would have done so had the new Professor been anyone less devoted to furthering the study of Politics and less committed to putting his prodigious energy into teaching famously well, revising part of the curriculum, and spending more than part-time in the Department before succumbing to cancer in 1978.²⁸

Executive / Government programmes, mainly concerned with sharing personal information between public sector organisations. Wilson was for a time an Honorary Fellow in the Department.

²⁵ See biographical details at: http://www.stanford.edu/dept/history/people/holloway_david.html; accessed 29 December 2011.

²⁶ See [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Holloway_\(sociologist\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_Holloway_(sociologist)); accessed 30 December 2011.

²⁷ It was either in that or in a subsequent 'search' episode two years later, when there was a search for a successor to the late John Mackintosh, who held the Chair during 1976-78, the Deanery descended to the ludicrous and bathetic game of playing a 'Deep Throat' game of the following kind: 'If such-and-such a person [giving an outline description of someone who had applied] were to apply – *and I'm not saying he or she has applied* – what would your view be?' To which I replied, knowing who the person in question was, 'well, I would be favourably disposed to [name of that person]'; which answer disconcerted said Dean. The University has no Official Secrets Act, but you could have fooled me.

²⁸ Mackintosh's experience as Professor at Strathclyde, as a maverick MP whom Harold Wilson PM would never appoint to the Cabinet, and as a champion of devolution, were admirable assets. His premature death in his late forties deprived the referendum campaign on Scottish devolution of his contribution and leadership talents, and was a blow to the Department and to both the practical and academic sides of Scottish and UK politics. Many thought that his campaigning might have ended in a referendum victory rather than in the defeat that set the cause back for another generation. It cannot be certain whether this would have been so. More on Mackintosh's career is available widely in many

Later that year, things were put in motion to appoint a new Professor: eventually, and for a very long period, the Chair was held by Malcolm Anderson,²⁹ Anderson arrived at a Department that harboured a number of tensions and awkward relationships that required careful handling; see his Annex for comments. I did not envy him his Headship, during which time the Headship and incumbency in the Departmental Chair eventually became separated, so that we could elect a non-professorial Head every few years. This seemed, and seems, a very sensible idea in a growing Department of middling size (as it was) and larger (as it is now), especially in an age where pressures to carry out research have intensified enormously.

There was considerable flux in the Department's staffing in the years following. Along with a few who had been appointed earlier on, many came and went in the 1980s and 1990s after a shorter or longer period of years in the Department, testifying to the Department's inability to hold on to people with fast-rising reputations in the discipline. Among these were Richard Bellamy, Nigel Bowles, Desmond King, Pippa Norris, Robert Singh, and Jeremy Waldron. The rising number of undergraduates, the establishment of labour-intensive taught Master's degrees within and across Departments, and a deficiency in its research and research-income dimension, meant that the Department – and for some, the university, Edinburgh and Scotland as well – was not seen as a congenial place to establish a longer career on the pattern of many of those who arrived in its first twenty years or so. Although for some, Edinburgh Politics became a stepping-stone to better posts elsewhere, they made a great contribution to the intellectual life of the Department while they were part of it. It may be observed that some of those who departed also did not stay long in each of their subsequent posts.

Later on and into the 2000s, there were further colleagues who remained a relatively short time, including Cas Mudde, an ebullient Dutch comparativist who worked on right-wing political movements and who contributed to the Methods courses that several of us taught as a compulsory part of the Honours curriculum; it had been

sources; for a start, see <http://www.jpmackintosh.ed.ac.uk/aboutjp/>; accessed 30 December 2011. I heard of his untimely death in the summer of 1978 on the radio while enjoying a holiday in our house at Blairmore, in the extremely remote Northwest of Scotland not far from Cape Wrath, without (then) a telephone. I walked, late at night, down the road to the last red telephone box on the northwest mainland and put in a very long call to Henry Drucker in Edinburgh, all the while trying to protect myself from the thousands of midges with whom I was trapped inside the box on that warm and windless night. Perhaps it was presumptuous of us to think that we were the only, or the best custodians of the Department's interests, but Drucker and I discussed how certain practical Departmental matters could be handled during the rest of that summer before the Faculty itself got its administrative oar into the water. Mackintosh's memory and work are kept renewed through the JP Mackintosh Memorial Committee that hosts an annual Memorial Lecture given by a prominent political person; there has been a stream of distinguished Lecturers over the years. Drucker was instrumental in establishing the Mackintosh Lectures, as Alice Brown recalls in Annex 9. Mackintosh's widow and daughters have maintained the family interest in this series. The Committee was jointly established by the University and the East Lothian Labour Party; Mackintosh's former parliamentary constituency was Berwick and East Lothian. See <http://www.jpmackintosh.ed.ac.uk/>; accessed 9 August 2012.

²⁹ Anderson and I got on very well and I absorbed much from him in an avenue of research and interest – international policing and a host of institutional, constitutional, and operational matters connected to it – that intersected with my own research on privacy and personal data. I joined his ESRC-funded research project that resulted in the co-authored book, *Policing the European Union* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995). For other sidelights on Anderson's activities and achievements while at Edinburgh, see Annex 9 by Alice Brown and Annex 10 by Russell Keat. Anderson retired in 1998 and has lived in France since then, remaining active in research and academic life.

introduced under the aegis of Richard Freeman as a School course. Others, however, including Malcolm Anderson, Mark Aspinwall, Elizabeth Bomberg, Alice Brown, Mary Buckley, Roland Dannreuther, Lynn Dobson, Richard Freeman, Tim Hayward, Jonathan Hearn (who moved to Sociology), Kimberly Hutchings, Russell Keat, Fiona Mackay, Nicola McEwen, Luke March, and Andrew Thompson remained rather longer and carved out formidable careers; some of them eventually moving on into other academic posts or, in Alice Brown's case, into important positions in public life.

The only woman appointed to a post in the early years was Joanne Watson (née McConnell, (an American PhD student), who was hired as a Temporary Lecturer in the 1970s. In truth, Politics in British universities was still an overwhelmingly male discipline and we had few, if any, female applicants for posts. Apart from the women mentioned earlier, the appointments of colleagues including (among several others) Christina Boswell, Sally Cummings, Lynn Dobson, Sara Dorman, Ailsa Henderson, and Pippa Norris, working in a wide variety of specialisms, has happily overcome the gross imbalance in more recent decades, as Malcolm Anderson's contributed Annex points out. They have also made internationally recognised contributions to the discipline; while some have departed for posts elsewhere, the recruitment of women to the Department has remained very buoyant up to the present time. In addition, and not before time, gender as an essential dimension of the study of Politics gradually became more prominent in the curriculum, in research, and in postgraduate work from the 1980s on, most recently under Fiona Mackay's leadership, and including a Scottish political dimension.

It would be both invidious and far too lengthy to mention each colleague's contribution to the research, teaching, and life of the Department, including as well the many colleagues who have been appointed from roughly the mid-2000s to the present time, and who are not mentioned here. Suffice it to say that, from the 1980s to the 2000s – to which we will return later – we had a great and diverse enrichment of knowledge and resources on international relations and political economy; EU politics; Scottish politics and society; territorial politics; political theory of several kinds; public policy in various fields; gender politics; the politics of the Middle East; the Soviet Union and its successors; the politics of migration; North American politics; the politics of information; security studies; human rights in several fields; biological approaches to politics and conflict; and much else. Nomothetics, 1; Idiographics, nil.

Undergraduate life

In the 1960s, as a new subject, Politics and its Department became very popular for students wanting to do Honours, or to add a Politics course to their programme in other fields; several students came over as refugees from oppressive or dull regimes in Arts, sometimes from the Leavisite and anti-Leavisite battlefield of English Literature. Politics had not yet been a subject taught in schools, and it had a novelty value as well as an attractive aura of rebelliousness – whether deserved or not – that did us no harm. More on students a bit later; but there were many lively, independent-

mindful and maverick students in those early years, and they were a joy to teach and to get to know. Insights into student life are given by several students from the early years, and in extracts from *Student*. These are located in Annexes, and are important accounts of what things looked like from the other side of the lectern or the tutorial armchair.

In the early years, students from across the University in the central area tended to take lunch in the Refectory in Old College, a large Georgian room with fluted columns and dreary lighting that overlooked the short street that runs between South College and Chambers Streets, and that was subsequently refurbished to serve as the Senate Room. The Refectory rose to the culinary heights of pie/fish and chips/beans, mugs of tea, etc., which was standard fare for students (and many others) then. It was always crowded, but – as with the Staff Club – it provided a centralised facility, and in the politically awakened years of the 1960s, was commandeered for the occasional impromptu student protest statements and meetings. Students tended to live in ‘digs’ with landladies, very commonly in Marchmont with its large Victorian/Edwardian flats where widows with grown-up and absent children let out their large rooms, or in University-controlled student houses, or – for some – in the embryonic Pollock Halls, which first consisted only of Holland House and Fraser House; today it is a large student ‘village’.

In many countries, the later 1960s and beyond included years of student protests and sit-ins, and Edinburgh had its own, possibly copy-cat, versions of this, in which Politics students were prominently involved; many of them becoming establishment pillars, distinguished academics, media entrepreneurs and the like in later years. There were also some others who were active in political parties, especially Labour. Although the teaching of international relations in the new Department was only in its infancy in the 1960s, there was no shortage of international political issues to interest students: South African *apartheid*, white rule in Southern Rhodesia, nuclear disarmament among them; see Sofia Widen’s Annex 12 for reports in *Student*. The fashion for ‘teach-ins’ had come across from the USA, and Edinburgh had a number of them. A teach-in is, or was, an event lasting at least a full day, held in a large lecture theatre (for example, the then brand-new George Square Theatre), with people coming and going, lots of informative as well as campaigning talks and slide shows (this was the pre-PowerPoint era), handouts, debate, and so on. There was one on Rhodesia, in which the young and kilted Lord James Douglas-Hamilton took part on the platform. At one point in the 1960s, the University established a committee for teach-ins; research would be able to determine whether this was to keep an apprehensive supervisory eye on what students were getting up to, or to maintain an orderly allocation of spatial and temporal resources. But there were plenty of lively, engaged, and radical or at least unruly students about, a number of them doing Politics, and they helped to set the tone of the Department and the Social Science and Arts Faculties and give them a flavour of involvement in the wider and international world. It should be mentioned that the subject of one teach-in was drugs, and the pages of *Student* – which several of our students filled as writers and editors – were full of the ‘drugs question’ in the Edinburgh version of those heady days; pun intended. At least one Politics lecturer contributed to the journalistic effort.

Mary Chamberlain’s and Richard Parry’s Annexes mention the Politics Society briefly. It seems to have begun in the late 1960s, and over many years its presence in the Department fluctuated, owing in part to the level of students’ enthusiasm and

individuals' leadership to run a society that invited speakers to come and also held other events. At its best – as it seems to have been in the late 1990s and into the 2000s – it made a major contribution to the life of the Department, and no doubt was also a useful CV-building mechanism for those who took charge of it. It is difficult to reconstruct an account of its leadership and activities over the decades without access to such archival material as may exist, and to the memories of those who were intimately concerned with its affairs.

An increasing presence in the Department over the years were Junior Year Abroad (JYA) students, primarily from the USA. A number of overseas students, coming from a wide variety of countries, now choose Edinburgh for their full undergraduate degree. JYA students of very varying quality came from a variety of American institutions, and often added a lively element to tutorials, but sometimes also an intrusive one. Some did not understand the difference between our marking scale and the one they had been accustomed to back home, so what looked like pretty good numbers on essays looked to them, at first, like disastrous failures; grade-translation schemes had to be operated. Occasionally, JYA students saw the year as an opportunity to 'do Europe' even if this meant absence from tutorials and the late handing-in of essays.³⁰ But on the whole the inward trickle, and then flow, of students was a good idea, and some JYA students became active participants in the life of the department as a whole. There was reverse traffic as well: not only to North America – we had exchange schemes with the University of Pennsylvania and with Carleton University in Canada, for example; and other places like Georgetown proved popular – but also to European universities, including Grenoble, as Richard McAllister relates in Annex 6. In time, other European universities sought arrangements with us. In the 2000s, an exchange scheme with City University of Hong Kong, for a handful of Politics as well as Social Policy students, was instituted during my period of Headship. Running schemes such as these involved selecting our students to go abroad, vetting overseas students applying to come to Edinburgh, finding suitably comparable courses at both ends, translating marks, and liaising with counterpart staff members abroad. This could be a heavy and awkward administrative load that members of staff were reluctant to take on. Regrettably, the Hong Kong exchange lapsed in 2008, in part a casualty of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE; of which more later) pressures that saw the Department grimly keeping its head down to concentrate on the 'core business' rather than the 'frills' that did not seem to pass the cost/benefit test, unlike the more lucrative and older visiting and exchange schemes.

It would not be prudent or possible to offer comments on all or most of the students who passed through our lecture rooms, tutorial and seminar rooms; or whom one otherwise knew (but did not teach) as students in and around the Department. Many from the early years, as well as more recent graduates and staff members, remain in individual and collective memories for one reason or another,³¹ and in some cases

³⁰ One student from a leading American college, who received a low mark on an essay and who had frequently been absent from class, seriously offered to 'negotiate' a higher mark with me. I showed him the door.

³¹ In the policy world of information privacy protection in which I carry out research, the 'right to be forgotten' is a concept in good currency (although not a 'right' and probably impossible to implement in practice). The recent play given to the concept owes much to reactions to social media such as Facebook, which thrives on self-exposure and the failure to understand the consequences of its permanence and permeation into myriad contexts of recollection that may be unanticipated,

have kept up contact with some staff members in various ways until the present time. Without at all forgetting memorable students who have since been lost from view, many have achieved particular prominence in a variety of walks of life. Some were doing Politics degrees as single or joint Honours; others attended Politics courses as part of other kinds of degree taken in other Departments, so that they are not Politics graduates but are have done some study in the Department. Those who read this historical sketch or who played a part in the history of the Department are invited to recollect their contemporaries – on either side of the lectern – and to come up with their own list as well as their own stories to tell with as much (in)discretion as seems appropriate.

Postgraduates

The Department had, from the start, just about as many postgraduate students in the Department as there were members of staff; only a few can be mentioned here: those from the first years of the Department's life.³² Among postgraduates in the 1960s, Charles Bloomberg will be referred to at a later point. There were several men from the Middle (or further) East whom Hanham had attracted in his Lawrence-of-Arabia mood.³³ 'Harry's Arabs' were an asset to the Department in terms of their breadth of interest, scholarship, and conversation. Walid Kazziha came from Lebanon and did an MSc, which was then the name for an MPhil or Master's by Research.³⁴ Another student was Mohammed Abu Sag from Sudan,³⁵ and there was an Iraqi scholar, Ghassan Atiyah.³⁶ The Department in the 1960s/70s had no real organised postgraduate life –possibly not untypically in the Social Sciences Faculty – although Hanham instituted small seminars in which students presented their work to each other and to us, but these were not very successful and students did not seem interested in each other's research. The current pattern of Research Groups in Politics and International Relations seems a much better, and more professional, way of promoting cross-fertilisation.

Another postgraduate at the end of the 1960s was Malcolm Rifkind,³⁷ who had done an LL.B before going to the then Southern Rhodesia and teaching Politics at its

unwelcome, and uncontrollable. It would be improper and impolite to ignore this concept with regard to the pre-Internet days with which this history largely deals.

³² Many from more recent years made a mark on the Department as students and some as tutors, and distinguished themselves thereafter, but their praises cannot be sung here.

³³ Harry occasionally would fiddle with a string of worry beads (let us call them) when in conversation.

³⁴ He is Professor of Political Science at the American University in Cairo. See biographical details at: <http://www.aucegypt.edu/fac/Profiles/Pages/walidkazziha.aspx>; accessed 29 December 2011.

³⁵ He later became an academic and then a politician and Sudanese Government Minister. See biographical details at:

http://www.minic.gov.sd/english/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=217:mr-mohammed-osman-abu-sag&catid=79:curriculum-vitae&Itemid=142, accessed 29 December 2011.

These details say he received his PhD from 'Adunburg'.

³⁶ He was later a dissident, publisher of Iraqi File, and Founder and Executive Director (2003 on) of the Baghdad-based Iraq Foundation for Development and Democracy. He became Professor of Political Science at the University of Baghdad and Visiting Professor of Political Science and International Relations at Stanford, and lives in London. See biographical details at: <http://www.ijtihadreason.org/voices/ghassan-atiyah.php>; accessed 29 December 2011.

³⁷ He went on to become a local Conservative Town Councillor, then MP in 1974, and Cabinet Minister (Secretary of State for Scotland; for Transport; for Defence; Foreign Secretary, etc.; receiving

University. He then returned to Edinburgh to take up a legal and political career. He did a research MSc under my supervision, on the politics of land apportionment in the then Southern Rhodesia, which was then under the control of the white settler elite, including Ian Smith. He gave an account of the unfair apportionment of land between whites and blacks, and was such a fluent and clear writer, with a good deal of research material gathered from his time in Southern Rhodesia, that my ‘supervision’ was really superfluous and very light; almost unnecessary.³⁸ In the 1960s, there was also the Africanist Roger Tangri,³⁹ and somewhat later, Jagdish Gundara became a postgraduate as well.⁴⁰ Geoffrey Reeves, who specialised in East African literature and politics, did a PhD before returning to hold a series of academic positions in several Australian universities. Many other postgraduate students could be enumerated, although I recall no women as PhD students until considerably later. Russell Keats Annex mention a few students, as well as describing the weaknesses of the Department in terms of postgraduate study.

It is sufficient to say that the postgraduate side of the Department remained difficult for many years, at least into the 1980s, with small numbers, few areas of research and resources to attract them, apart from a spate of PhD students – some of them formerly undergraduates of the Department – who for a few years were doing theses in the Marxist tradition under the supervision of John Holloway and Richard Gunn, as mentioned earlier. Others worked in different areas of political theory, or on aspects of Scottish or women’s politics. Some of the Marxist students abandoned their studies before completing their theses, but so did others who worked in other avenues of Politics, whether full-time or part-time. The Department’s fairly small intake of research postgraduates was worrying for a Department that wished to be taken seriously as a research-oriented one, and the very uneven distribution of students across supervisors was also not very healthy. These became serious issue as we entered the years of external appraisal and assessment of the Department’s quality and strength.

At a lower level, the Department developed taught Master’s degrees from the very early 1990s on. The first one – in Social and Public Policy – was shared with the Department of Social Policy and was organised by Richard Parry and me. It was taken largely by some part-time students who worked in local authorities. The teaching for this degree was difficult to find on the Politics Department side, for the study of public policy was very underdeveloped in the Department, and the degree later migrated to Social Policy. Next was the degree in European and International Politics, which I also originated around 1990 and ran with the help of Lisa Dominguez, and which – as we will see – played a significant part in the changes of the 2000s. It attracted small numbers at first but then enjoyed a greatly increased enrolment,

a Knighthood in 1997). In the late 1960s/early 1970s, he was associated with the devolutionist Thistle Group of rising Conservative politicians in Scotland that included Michael Ancram and aimed to rejuvenate the party.

³⁸ It was an excellent piece of work, and I urged him to publish it. But Rifkind did not and, it seems, could not, with at least one publisher procrastinating before rejecting it; he has apparently not publicly referred to this work in the years since, as far as I know, although it is available in the Main Library.

³⁹ He has had an academic career, teaching at many universities. See, with due Wikipedic caution, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Roger_Tangri; accessed 29 December 2011.

⁴⁰ He has subsequently been very prominent in the field of inter-cultural education, and is now Emeritus Professor at the University of London Institute of Education. See biographical details at: http://www.ioe.ac.uk/staff/LCCN_34.html; accessed 29 December 2011.

particularly overseas students, and therefore became a lucrative growth-point for the Department (and the new School of Social and Political Studies, as it was first called) past the year 2000.

In the 1990s and after, other and smaller, less prominent, taught Master's degrees, part-time and full-time, were mounted as well as Research Master's degrees. One significant problem with the taught degrees concerned the staff resources for teaching the courses and especially for supervising and examining the dissertations. Some members of staff contributed teaching and supervision with great reluctance, wondering what the rewards were for them in terms of teaching-load and other recognition as well as intellectual stimulation, and resenting the incursion on their vacation/research time in the Summer and early Autumn months. In addition, the quality of the students was sometimes very uneven, detracting further from the attractiveness to members of staff. Not surprisingly, counter-arguments made in terms of the overall benefit to the Department fell on deaf ears. As Mark Aspinwall's Annex shows, there is now a variety of taught Master's degrees, some emphasising International Relations as well the EU in one or more ways.

Other departments and the wider university

In the very early years, when we were in physical proximity to Sociology in 18 Buccleuch Place and shared many academic interests as well as comparable marginalisation as fledgling subjects in an ancient university, in the first decade or more we (Cornford and I, at least) became close to the sociologists: Professor Tom Burns, the distinguished organisational sociologist; Gianfranco Poggi, the eminent social theorist,⁴¹ and Frank Bechhofer, whose noted works were in social stratification and later on, as Professor and Director of the Research Centre for Social Sciences, in Scottish social structure and much else. Brian Elliott, who worked on class structure and urban sociology, and who later went to the University of British Columbia in Canada, was another early member of the Sociology staff who was part of this network.⁴²

Contacts with Sociology were, for me and I expect for Cornford as well, not only matters of camaraderie but also of cross-disciplinary interest. My own political science training at Yale had been heavily political-sociological, and Cornford was

⁴¹ He later moved to the University of Virginia, and is now Professor Emeritus at the University of Trento in Italy.

⁴² Rosemary Johnson, who sadly died in early middle-age of cancer, was a further member of the Sociology Department and shared many interests with me, including the question of the social responsibility of science; Bechhofer also shared this interest. We made some headway by bringing the social responsibility of *social* science into the picture. With Brian Wynne in Science Studies – later, and since then, very prominent as a critical environmental science-and-technology Professor at Lancaster – we founded ESSRS, the Edinburgh counterpart of BSSRS (British Society for the Social Responsibility of Science) and somewhat later, in the 1970s and early '80s, this became the Scottish Branch of the SRA (Social Research Association). Both successive organisations held meetings. ESSRS included biological and physical scientists in its meetings (I do not think there was a concept of membership as such), such as Martin Pollock, Aubrey Manning and Ulrich Loening. The idea of the role of social science in relation to natural and physical science was discussed on at least one occasion, as it was quite topical, and the 'social responsibility' of science fed in part off the anti-nuclear movement and CND.

also very much at home with the work of political sociologists such as Erik Allardt, Juan Linz and Stein Rokkan, whom I had also met when he visited Yale.

It was evident that one could function across Departmental boundaries fairly easily if one wanted to make the connections. Certainly, it was easy to meet people from other Departments, greatly facilitated by the presence of the University Staff Club in Chambers Street (now the Charles Stewart Building, named after the Secretary to the University in those early years and later).⁴³ It seemed as though the whole University downed tools each midday to take lunch there,⁴⁴ and since some of the scientists were still in the Central Area, they lunched there as well as the social scientists, the arts and legal people, the medics, architects and planners, divines, and the University administrators. Thus it was that one could dine in the cafeteria (if dining is the word) and then take coffee in the lounge with historians, economic and social historians, sociologists, anthropologists, physicists, chemists, artificial intelligence specialists, science studies people, doctors, academic lawyers, practicing lawyers (who tutored) in black court dress, linguists, and administrators. One could recognise them, pick up and retail gossip, sometimes converse on a more elevated plane, and get to know some of them better, as well as hear about their research. Although it is easy to romanticise collegiality, for me it worked well in terms of meeting people and sharing academic as well as public-life interests.⁴⁵

Open networking was assisted by the great dearth of other places to have lunch in the vicinity: there were a few pubs, of course, dispensing curly sandwiches; and then one of the first and very tiny Indian restaurants opened in Potterrow, in a building now replaced by the tunnel, as well as a Chinese place of dubious repute on the site of the modern extension to the National Museum of Scotland in Chambers Street. Therefore, the Staff Club cafeteria was the place to go. The Staff Club had its bar-flies (lawyers, often), but it also had a squash court, showers, a table-service restaurant, many lounges (some used by elderly snoozers, mainly), a television set, and a billiard room. It had an off-licence for the sale of University-bottled wines. The Club was the daily

⁴³ In the USA, I had made the acquaintance of Jo Grimond, MP for Orkney and Shetland (Zetland, as it was written), and later Leader of the Liberal Party whose visit to Yale for a week in 1962-63 I had arranged. When he learnt subsequently that I had been recruited by Edinburgh, he thought I would appreciate its wonderful and unusual (for its time) facility, the Staff Club, which he knew as the former Rector of the University. This proved to be so.

⁴⁴ Christopher Smout, of Economic History, later of St. Andrews and Historiographer Royal in Scotland, once aptly referred to it as 'the works canteen'.

⁴⁵ One acquaintance that I made in those days – one that is indicative of what was happening in the University in the 1960s and beyond – was with the late David Edge, a radio astronomer who was appointed to get things going with a Science Studies Unit and bridge the gap between the science and social science/arts Faculties. Donald Mackenzie, David Bloor, Barry Barnes, Steve Shapin (now in the USA for many years) and Brian Wynne, (these names testify to the great distinction to which Edinburgh rose in the field of Science Studies and then Science and Technology Studies) as well as others, could be more authoritative than can I about the attitude of the Science Faculty, and the role of the eminent CH Waddington in arbitrating the fortunes and role of that fledgling subject that had no natural institutional home. David Edge used to spend much early-evening time in the Staff Club worrying and wondering about what his role ought to be, how to move things along, how to raise the profile of science studies, and he shared a lot of this with me in long conversations that could be called flagrantly cross-disciplinary. In later years, the Centre for Human Ecology also kept some of these new cross-fertilisations alive, or so it seemed, with some of the same people as I had encountered in the ESSRS and early Science Studies days. David Edge died in 2003; see the obituary by Professor David Bloor in *Social Studies of Science*, 33 (2003), pp. 171-176; available at: <http://www.ssu.sps.ed.ac.uk/davidedge.html>, accessed 2 August 2012. The University never saw fit to confer a Professorship on Edge.

hangout of senior University administrators from Old College, who commandeered the green-baize billiard tables after lunch, bringing their pints from the bar, removing their suit jackets (revealing braces; all that was missing were green eye-shades). Cornford and I sometimes played there too, and often had to wait for a free table. Incidentally, in those years there was no real pressure to be seen conspicuously at lunchtime to be having sandwiches in one's room while staring at a computer screen. There was little guilt involved in sloping back – on rare occasions – to Buccleuch Place for 4 pm tea; or playing squash on the premises, as some lawyers and sociologists used to do; or cultivating various personal and extramural hinterlands. And in the afternoons, in one or another of the Staff Club lounges, the lawyers and perhaps the historians would regularly but separately foregather over pots of tea and not always scholarly conversation. Also, as television was then not so common, the Staff Club TV was the place for some to watch cricket and Wimbledon⁴⁶ late into the afternoon.

Eventually, the Staff Club entered serious financial difficulties. I am not sure what the Club's subsidy arrangement might have been with the University, or how it was coming under scrutiny. It faced competition as a lunch place, and a decline in membership (for example, the remnants of Science Departments moved out to King's Buildings); also, staff members increasingly lunched at their desks. The Club opened membership eligibility to secretarial and other staff, and to members of the then centrally-located Heriot-Watt University. It also hired itself out as a venue for the Jazz Festival for a few weeks in the summer. A committee was formed to look into the Club's affairs, under the wise chairmanship of the late Professor Neil MacCormick. But the days of the Staff Club were numbered, and it was dissolved in 1997; I do not remember anything more than whimpers at its passing.⁴⁷ The building was refurbished and is now Charles Stewart House, which houses the University's Finance Department. The jazz, all-year-round, has migrated to a cellar location a few metres further east along Chambers Street.

⁴⁶ I recall there seeing the extraordinary two-day 1969 Wimbledon match that Pancho Gonzales won against Charlie Pasarell, 22-24, 1-6, 16-14, 6-3, 11-9.

⁴⁷ For one such whimper, see Guild, R., 'Café society drives ideas off the menu', *Times Higher Education*, 18 July 1997, available at: <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=103528§ioncode=26>, accessed 6 August 2012.

Meetings, and visits to ‘The Burn’

In the normal life of the Department, the academic staff had their own institutionalised occasions for meeting. There were frequent Departmental meetings that gradually became formalised with agendas, minutes, and the discussion of important matters of the curriculum, individual course approval, teaching and administrative loads, research activities, resource allocation, and other collectively significant issues. Although at times these meetings could be a cockpit for factionalism and displays of bad temper, there was also a sense that we had to get on together and carry on the normal business in spite of all. At a later stage, student representatives of all four years were present at these meetings, as part of a movement of change across the University. Although the student representatives tended not to speak unless asked to do so, in the more recent years they were expected to report on their events and take part in organising them, such as visits to ‘The Burn’ or Politics Society seminars, and to give their views on matters that were also part of the consultation and water-testing that occasionally was carried out at ‘The Burn’. There were also meetings of the Board of Studies across Departments, which were used to scrutinise proposed Departmental curriculum changes and to look in detail at the outlines and indicative reading lists of new courses; not a very exciting but a necessary chore.

For many years in the 1960s and 70s, at least, it was *de rigueur* for all members of staff to down tools and attend the monthly Faculty of Social Sciences meetings, held in one of the David Hume Tower ground-floor rooms. As is typical, each Department habitually occupied the same rows and zones in the room, with the Deanery and Faculty Officers (notably the late Rev. John Ross as Faculty Secretary) arrayed at a facing front table. These meetings took up virtually a whole afternoon, but one had to go lest there be a vote on something, in which case the ‘payroll vote’ was the rule in each Department. The Faculty of Social Sciences had a succession of Deans and Vice-Deans, all eminently worthy but, in the early years, some consummately colourless, although there were also some with wit and an approachable bearing as well as intellectual curiosity.⁴⁸ But it was good irreverence-reinforcing theatre to see people arguing the issues, and to take their various measures as sensible persons, plain dealers, pious well-meaners, or alternatively as resource pickpockets, special pleaders, shroud wavers, or pompous windbags.

Much later, another form of gathering was the ‘Away Day’, mentioned by Alice Brown in her Annex. These came to be a regular fixture in the 1980s and after, as a way in which members of staff could discuss more privately, and at greater length, some of the most important matters confronting the Department, such as the curriculum, future appointments, and the stimulation of research. Decamping to a hotel or a meeting room away from George Square – in Dirleton or in Leith, for example – for the better part of a whole day helped to concentrate minds and avoid distraction, at least in the pre-laptop, pre-mobile phone, pre-iPad years. One of the

⁴⁸ The late Barrie Wilson (Architecture) stood out in the latter respect. I recall several late-night telephone calls with him, when we moved on from the practical Faculty-related matter that had instigated the call to a conversation on the nature of architectural creativity, the relationship between form, aesthetics and function, and the like. For me, with pretensions to familiarity with the world of art, architecture, and craft, these were stimulating and memorable telephonic moments. With my public-policy interest, I was at that time involved in co-supervising postgraduates in Architecture and in Urban Design.

biggest stimuli to these meetings was, of course, the advent of the RAE and to a lesser extent, the Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA). The RAE made many Departments wake up and sit bolt upright to face the reality of competition across Universities for ratings and rankings, which were fraught with consequences for finances, Departmental reputations, recruitment of postgraduates and undergraduates, and much else besides. Malcolm Anderson's Annex points up the manifest deficiencies of the Politics Department in this new climate, with its pressures to gather research funding, publish frequently and well, and provide a stimulating environment to attract and keep colleagues and postgraduates.⁴⁹ Away Days helped in planning our strategy, in constructing the kind of picture of the Department that we would wish to put forward for external evaluation, and in allocating responsibilities beyond the routine chores that the Department, like all Departments, had to perform day-in and day-out. Opinion was divided on the Damoclean sword that was now being held over us, like all others. Some would argue that Universities should have resisted these new requirements; others – and perhaps this is hindsight from the present position of relatively greater success – would say that we became a better Department as measured in terms of the external evaluative criteria and relevant indicators; but that is a debate for a place other than this history. In any event, the Away Days were not always preoccupied with the RAE or the TQA, and they contributed a good deal to the collegiality of the Department despite its fissures, and to gaining a perspective on where we were going, why, and how.

The interests of collegiality were also served on more pleasurable occasions. These included the annual Christmas dinner, held in a different restaurant each year, and starting probably in the 1980s or later. This included the secretarial staff as well as academics and their partners, spouses, or very close friends, and there were speeches as is customary on such ritual occasions. But colleagues, including students and others whether from the Department or not, often got together in smaller or larger gatherings in local pubs and restaurants: sometimes after a Departmental Seminar with a visiting speaker,⁵⁰ sometimes to drink a Champagne toast to a PhD student who had passed her or his *viva* successfully, sometimes to bid farewell to a departing colleague. Sometimes, too, to walk up the Campsies or other hills on a Sunday, as organised in recent years by Andy Thompson. There is nothing unusual in all this conviviality, but it is nevertheless worth recording, and it is ripe for further embellishment.

On the student side, the staff side, and across the divide, the Department developed patterns of socialisation and working routines that became important institutions. A prominent feature of student-staff life from the mid-1980s until the 2000s – now sadly a casualty of financial stringency as well as student and staff indifference – was the annual Reading Party at 'The Burn', the country-house estate near Edzell in Angus, comprising a Georgian house built in 1791 for General Lord Adam Gordon, the younger son of the 2nd Duke of Gordon, and about 200 acres of land on the North Esk given to the General by an undoubtedly grateful nation. Modernised with a new

⁴⁹ An earlier attempt to stimulate Departmental research production resulted in James Cornford's edited book, *The Failure of the State*, London: Croom Helm, 1975, to which Richard McAllister refers in his Annex.

⁵⁰ The Department held regular seminars, or series of seminars, of one kind or another over many years from the 1960s on. It would be informative to be able to construct a record of the topics and the speakers over such a long reach of time, but this would be difficult or impossible unless archival fragments and individual memories are pieced together. This is regrettable.

wing in the 1930s in the style of that period (and complete with enormous enamel bathtubs and Spartan bedrooms, contrasting with the splendid Georgian plasterwork and marble chimney-piece in the original house), it has been used by the Scottish Universities for 'retreats' by students, administrators and others for generations.⁵¹ Its visitors' books, housed in its library, contain the signatures of former students – many of them later to become political household names – who went there from various Universities over many years to enjoy weekends. The books were also signed by visiting South African dissidents during the anti-*Apartheid* struggle, and by the frequently meeting Scottish Universities' Secretaries and (at separate meetings) their Principals. No doubt they dined on the same wholesome fare as the student Reading Parties.

The Department organised Reading Parties of some twenty-five students and up to five members of staff, from Fridays to Sunday afternoons, to engage in some modest directed reading and discussion; debate on topical or ethical issues; simulations; political quizzes; billiards; croquet; walks along the river; drinking; smoking (until banned); eating boarding-house meals; taking afternoon tea with excellent scones, cream and jam; and personal bonding. Mary Chamberlain's Annex recalls a Reading Party in the later 1960s, but this was probably not an annual fixture then. The activities took place under the academic supervision of the staff members who attended, and under the domestic watchful eye of Colonel Ian Fraser and his sidekick, originally Mr. Darling ('as in sweetheart', he would introduce himself). The Colonel's introductory patter was unvarying from year to year: with students gathered near the main staircase, he would recite the rules of the house, the do's and don'ts, what parts were out of bounds, where the tub of salt was kept 'in case some academic claret spills on the carpet', and how to tend the open fire with the provided logs ('when they run out, you freeze', said Mr. Darling); then the rooms and beds were allocated.

The original idea was that a Reading Party held in the first part of an Honours student's third year would help to establish relationships among students who might not have known each other in the large classes of the first two years before Honours entry. I took part as a staff member for many years, developing my party piece as host of 'Question Time' à la *manière de* Robin Day (complete with bow tie and dinner jacket) and later David Dimbleby. We would all go up by hired coach on the Friday, and students would be required to give me three questions each before arrival so that I could prepare the evening after-dinner session and arrange the panel. Questions typically would range from topical political and social issues, to issues of student and University life, to the utterly frivolous. Students seemed to find this Friday evening a good ice-breaker, although the prodigious alcoholic consumption played its part before, and long after, staff members had retreated upstairs at midnight. Among other sessions during weekends, there was a Third World development simulation game run by Chris Allen; an ethical and human rights scenario debate led by Kimberly Hutchings; the collective dissection of stimulating journal articles; a video on transnational crime by Paddy (Patricia) Rawlinson;⁵² and another one offered by Pippa Norris. There was a navel-gazing-cum-consultation session on intramural Department matters concerning the curriculum, which became a frequent fixture led

⁵¹ It was gifted in 1948 to Goodenough College by Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Russell in memory of their son James, who was killed in action in 1944 aged 21. See http://www.goodenough.ac.uk/the_burn0.html; accessed 27 July 2012.

⁵² See <http://statecrime.org/person/paddy-rawlinson/>; accessed 29 July 2012.

by Richard Freeman, who was heavily involved in the structural and curricular changes in the Social Sciences that were in train in the 1990s, as Russell Keat's Annex describes. In one of the early years of visits, snow permitted a rousing snowball fight, and normally it was a Saturday afternoon tradition that everyone would straggle out for a long riverside walk past rapids and through wonderful forestland. One of the late-1980s visits coincided with Guy Fawkes' Day, when Paul Smart,⁵³ then a Lecturer in political theory and very popular with students, organised a splendid bonfire in the grounds opposite the house: a quaint English custom enacted in the Scottish countryside.

Students had to pay something for their weekend, not to mention their alcohol, and while the bill for room and board was quite modest in the earlier years and the Department subsidised the bus hire, it gradually became prohibitive. This had an effect on students' desire or ability to attend. In order to keep the numbers up, the original idea was abandoned and the Reading Party was made available to fourth-year students as well, to Junior Year Abroad visitors, and to others, thus eroding much of the common ground of the group and blurring the rationale. For some years, there was another kind of Reading Party organised for postgraduates. One observation on the very early years of these retreats, into the 1990s, was that there was a combination of gender and social difference, in terms of who talked or dined with whom, and who drank what (not how much). For some, the grandeur of the house, its furnishings and ambience (an Alfred de Bréanski Highland mountain evocation on one wall, a Samuel Bough boating scene on another) and its deep-countryside, green-Wellie, 4X4, *l'Ecosse profonde* surroundings was perhaps intimidating; for others, it might have been just a home-away-from-home. Another observation was that some staff members never attended, while others were regular participants. A further observation is that perhaps this sort of event – 'things to do'; games-rooms and hearty walks; log fires and an old-fashioned steam radio ('This is London calling...'); a bar dispensing the local Fettercairn whisky, and reasonable wine and beer, but closing at 10 pm; and nourishing but bland food – had had its day when visits ceased in the mid-2000s, after so many years. It was not so much the Colonel and his style (which were admirable in their way; but which in any case had changed when Andy Middlemiss succeeded Colonel Fraser), but the whole formula, based on shipboard-like seclusion and isolation promoting concentration and focus probably seemed antiquated for students in the age of the Internet, the mobile phone, and other ways to pursue happiness. This, however, is speculation, and visits to 'The Burn' made a valuable contribution for many years.

⁵³ Paul Smart, author of *Mill and Marx: Individual Liberty and the Roads to Freedom* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991) later left academic life for a career in the public and civil service, first in the housing field.

The curriculum, teaching, and marking: 1960s – 1990s

In my first year (1964-65), I taught four History of Political Thought tutorials per week, and two Politics II (Second Ordinary) tutorials, as well as giving all the second-term lectures (about 27) in Politics II. There was a great deal of marking to be done, for although the requirements varied over the years – it was fairly typical for students to write four essays in first- and second-year courses as well as in third-year ‘Ordinary’ courses (‘Politics III’, so-called). They would sit a Class Exam after the second term, and then the Degree Exam; casting an eye forward to a much later period in 1993-4, Politics I students only wrote three essays. In the ‘60s and even the early ‘90s, this was rather more formal, written assessment than students are required to do in the current curriculum, where there is greater scope for a variety of assessed performances and a somewhat broader curriculum in the pre-Honours years, but it is perilous to argue that one system is ‘better’ than the other. Honours courses generally had two essays and a Degree Exam. Students were awarded Second Class or First Class Merit Certificates in their first- and second-year courses, rewarding very good or excellent achievement. It is not clear what function the ‘Merit’ designation performed, with or without an actual piece of paper to hang on a wall and show the folks at home – and that physical manifestation of ‘Merit’ seems to have lapsed after several decades – but they related in some way to Honours entry.⁵⁴

There were three terms per year, rather than the semesters of the most recent years, but the third (Summer) term was quite short. The academic year began in October (now September) and finished at the end of May before exams in June. Lectures in the big courses of the first and second years were given three times per week, and students also attended one tutorial per week in tutorial sizes of (ideally) about eight. Students expected full 45-minute lectures, with maybe a few questions thereafter, and no handouts or elaborate course guides or collections of potted readings, or other hand-holding devices. Some members of staff would wear academic robes for lectures. I recall the historians wearing them and in Politics Hanham did too; he said it was a practical garment for keeping chalk-dust off one’s clothing. Yes, I suppose so, and, oh, of absolutely no symbolic status-value.

Tutorials were given in one’s own room, with about eight students in each group. The idea was that students need not attend lectures, but that they were required to attend tutorials unless excused from one for good reason, or ill (a medical note was needed subsequently). We were issued small attendance books (registers) in which to record tutorial attendance, marks, and other comments. If more than two tutorials were missed consecutively, this was reported to the student’s Director of Studies, and the student’s DP (‘Duly Performed’) status (see later for explanation) could be in danger. Hanham told me, a completely inexperienced teacher, that the ideal tutorial was achieved when the students sustained the conversation so that the lecturer could leave the room in the knowledge that the discourse would still be going on when, or if, he returned at the end.⁵⁵ This was good advice but the experiment rarely took place. The level of reticence or unpreparedness among some students, to say nothing of the verbosity of others (often urban English) being intimidating to others (often rural

⁵⁴ The antiquity of the Merit Certificate system is manifested in the archival preservation of DP Heatley’s own certificates from his student days in the mid-1880s; see GB 237 Coll-243, Gen. 825/1.

⁵⁵ See extract from *Student* in Annex 12.

Scots) whose lips were sealed, meant that the group could not normally be left to its own devices.

Postgraduates seldom taught tutorials early on, but Politics was understaffed in those years or even decades and casual tutors were hired from outside the Department.⁵⁶ Full members of staff therefore taught most tutorials and gave all the lectures in a course. This meant that we tended to get to know our students well, much as Heatley is reputed to have done. The students had no reason to suppose that their learning consisted of lectures and handouts rather than tutorial participation, independent inquiry and written essays prior to the examination.⁵⁷ Tutorials and frequent contact contributed to a certain sense of collegiality between staff and students; but one must be careful not to wrap this in rosy nostalgia. Yet – as some former students' Annexes show – we were relatively young and thought to be approachable: the sort of people students would invite to their sometimes raucous parties and vice-versa.

In the Department's first full year of operation with its own courses, 1964-65, it offered two courses at the pre-Honours level, then called 'Ordinary' (before the onset of political correctness). These were for students who were reading for other degrees but who wanted to do some Politics, or for students who would read for the three-year (non-Honours) Ordinary Degree that was taken by students who aimed at primary-school teaching, for example. An Honours course in Sociology of Politics was on the stocks in 1964-65, including in its book list the works of Easton, Truman, Dahl, Parsons, Bendix and Lipset, and others. Further Honours courses were to be added in 1965-66, when we could expect the first cohort to enter the Honours years, and this required an additional appointment or two as soon as possible. The arrival of Martin Clark, a political historian of modern Italy, as Assistant Lecturer in 1965 (soon to become Lecturer), and in 1966 of Richard McAllister, a European Politics specialist who had served in the Foreign Office in 1966, helped to meet these needs.⁵⁸

Honours courses included third-year courses and what were then called 'Special Subjects' following the Arts formula, which were taken in the fourth year and enabled members of staff to give courses in their specialities.⁵⁹ In those early years, and in one's first academic post, it was daunting to have to develop a large number of lectures as well as to keep abreast of the subject week by week if one was not teaching in one's own area; and to teach across a range of subjects. This required flexibility and versatility, an interest in or knowledge of a wide range of subjects (or at least a willingness to get them up sufficiently to teach team), and tolerance for sleeplessness. Of course, research suffered, but this was all long before RAEs and REFs, with their requirement to publish profusely. Recall, also, that this was all pre-

⁵⁶ Including the Faculty of Divinity's Rev. Duncan Forrester, who was a socially and politically-minded lecturer in Divinity; later Professor of Christian Ethics and Practical Theology. The Department also had contributory casual teaching from others, including the late Stephen Maxwell, whose career was in the voluntary sector of the social services.

⁵⁷ There are pros and cons about the older and newer pedagogic philosophies and their implementation. Having worked under both systems, on balance I think the less industrial or Fordist system was preferable, and certainly more enjoyable. This came at the cost, of course, of research time; so it is not a hands-down winner.

⁵⁸ Clark, with a string of books and other publications on Antonio Gramsci, Modern Italy, and the Italian *Risorgimento*, subsequently became Reader and then took early retirement in the 1990s. McAllister, who has written extensively on European and EU politics, became Senior Lecturer and retired early as well, becoming an Honorary Fellow. See his Annex 6.

⁵⁹ See Jeremy Mitchell's Annex 2.

PowerPoint, pre-overhead slides, pre-Internet WebCT, and pre-lecture hall microphones, so it was all unassisted lungpower to recite more or less prepared scripts, and chalk on blackboards. It was also of course pre-search engines, so that keeping abreast of the latest literature meant searching publishers' catalogues, scouring bookshops, and intensively browsing the (cumbersome) library. Honours courses involved fewer lectures, if any (none in the fourth year), and were taught largely on a two-hour seminar basis, or especially in later years, a two-hour seminar and one-hour lecture per week. From the start, History of Political Thought (finishing more or less with the nineteenth century) was a third-year Honours course in which I held tutorials, and we very soon added Modern Political Theory, which Cornford and I taught with some contributory seminars from several others, including John Moffat, a Law lecturer. That course included works by Crick, Laslett and Runciman, Wolin, Popper, Oakshott, Laslett, Weldon, and Arendt, among others mentioned by Jeremy Mitchell in his Annex.

Another third-year course, inaugurated in 1966 under my direction, was Politics of Developing Areas. As with other third-year courses, this could be taken by Honours students as well as three-year-degree ('Ordinary' degree) students, who were otherwise not differentiated. I gave the African lectures, and Richard McAllister did the lectures on South Asia (mainly India); as mentioned, he also introduced a course on International Politics. Jabez Langley subsequently shared the African component with me, and then Chris Allen – hired as an Africanist – did the same from around 1972; but after about three years Allen took it over himself and it subsequently became African Politics. More specialised courses such as Soviet Politics, Italian Politics, Organisations and Politics, Public Order, and many others came later, when there were members of staff qualified to teach them at an advanced level in the fourth year and to supervise postgraduate theses. American Politics was taught in the first-year course along with British Politics, and later on Cornford, and then I after he left Edinburgh, taught American Urban Politics as an Honours option.⁶⁰

As mentioned, new undergraduate courses were added incrementally in the first few years, as students entered Politics Honours and as we gained more students reading for single Honours Politics or joint degrees, principally at first with Modern History but soon with a whole raft of other subjects within and across Faculties. Students' Honours exams were, for many years and traditionally, taken only at the end of the fourth year, so that they had none at the end of the third year. The theory was that, having qualified for Honours at the end of the second year, they would have one year to explore their subject free of exam pressures. They also had to write rather more, and longer, essays than in the more recent periods of the Department's history, and courses were one-year in length, rather than shoehorned or modularised into part of the year. Essay marks did not count as part of their final degree mark. All of this was aimed at allowing greater depth of teaching and learning, and time for exploration in and around the subject by those students who cared to do so. Reading lists could be fairly long, but students were also expected to find the material without necessarily

⁶⁰ Earlier than that, in 1967, I introduced an Honours course on Parties Elites, and in 1968 one on Political Systems (which focused on analytical models of political stability and change) and, from the early 1970s, a course on Social Science and Public Policy with a process-related as well as an ethical perspective on this relationship. This was the first Policy course taught in the Department, and I believe was also probably the first Policy course taught anywhere as part of a Politics degree in Britain.

being guided to certain chapters or pages. Nostalgia is a danger here: how far this was actually realised in practice should not be assumed.

In the 1960s and 1970s, very few students had typewriters (this was all in the pre-computer days), unlike students in the USA who had them since high-school days, if not in their cradles; and essays were therefore hand-written on lined foolscap paper (pre-A4). There were no anti-plagiarism affidavits to be signed, or other mass-production administrative requirements for registering submissions, etc. Essays were normally returned with marks and comments within a week if possible. In order to gain admission to an exam, students had to obtain a 'DP Certificate' ('Duly Performed'), meaning that their attendance was satisfactory in tutorials (we kept individual records) and that they had handed in the requisite number of essays in that course. Originally, these certificates were actual pieces of paper that had to be handed to the invigilator at the door of the exam room. At some point, they became virtual but still necessary – no more paper but the fact of 'due performance' recorded somewhere. I cannot remember whether DPs were only for Ordinary courses or for Honours as well; probably only the former.

End-of-year exams were held in large halls: Adam House, with its wonderful 1950s neo-Classical motifs; the McEwan Hall with its ethereal *fin-de-siècle* allegorical figures and inspissating gloom; and later the Pleasance gym (when built), with its smell of stale sweat and liniment. Members of staff were dragooned unwillingly to serve as invigilators, although for some years the University saw fit to hire external people for that task before reverting to the exploitation of staff members for invigilation, which is no longer the case. Double-marking only came about after a number of years, but the system of external examiners prevailed.⁶¹ For a very long time, and probably still, the system of Exam Boards meant that, for joint degrees (of which we came to have very many), one had to traipse in platoons to other Departments to settle the marks and sign the forms; sometimes a matter of only a few minutes, sometimes a longer ordeal. In the many years before Faculties became Colleges and Schools, this meant crossing Faculty boundaries with different conventions, and there was sometimes no end of argument and irritation about which Faculty's rules should prevail; but there were also discrepant conventions with Economics, with whom we established a joint degree rather later than we ought to have done – largely because of their resistance. The History Board was like a grand summit bilateral meeting with dozens of people comprising their side and rather fewer on ours, many History external examiners (we tended to have only one, and later on perhaps two when Political Theory acquired its own external examiner), and plenty of specious argument, special pleading, preciousness, and often-disingenuous baloney. This was arguably worse before the anonymity of using student numbers instead of names. What to do about special circumstances –whether illness, family bereavements, and other excuses far more dubious – was always an occasion for prolonged debate about compensation levels that occasionally resembled the tariffs in

⁶¹ We had a number of congenial ones who nonetheless could criticise our practices diplomatically, but seemed impressed by the standards of our students. Peter Campbell (Reading) was noteworthy because each year he would treat the staff to dinner during his visit, at places that included the Edinburgh Rendezvous in Queensferry Street, then the leading Chinese restaurant. Other externals in the first thirty years or so included Lewis Gunn (Glasgow), the late Paul Wilkinson (Aberdeen and later St. Andrews; a specialist on terrorism and international relations), Vincent Wright (Oxford), and Rod Hague (Newcastle).

a personal-injury insurance policy: so much for a loss of limb (grandparents), of an eye (parents), of a tooth (siblings), etc.⁶²

The marking scheme changed several times over the years, but was always rather absurd in that no-one ever was awarded anything much over (say) 70 for a First, or (say) below five marks under the pass/fail line, with (in the early years) an Upper Second (2-i) at 65-69, Lower Second (2-ii) as 60-64, and Third as 50-59. Given that most students would get some kind of Second, it was ridiculous to suppose that one could finely discriminate between (say) 62 and 63, or 64 and 65 for that matter. This mattered because the final mark would be an average over the (sometimes four) essays plus exam. And because a First was usually given a 70, and very rarely any number in the uncharted territory above that (for there be dragons and you might fall off the end of the earth if you wandered into the upper 70s, much less the 80s or 90s), the averaging process over several essays severely reduced the number of overall Firsts. Gaining a First on this system of calculation was a prodigious feat. During the year, essays were returned to students only with a classification (Lower Second or Upper Second or whatever) to retain flexibility at the end of the year, but one recorded a numerical essay mark in one's marking book. This seemed most unsatisfactory, opaque, and stupid as well. At an Examiners' Meeting, when there was a display of mean-spiritedness about some student's marks, one of our early external examiners, Professor Brian Chapman (Manchester) rhetorically and shrewdly asked a thrifty colleague, 'What do you do with the marks that you *don't* award?'

The University spent much time, on several occasions over many years, with what seemed casuistic arguments about how this should be changed or reformed, but it was creakingly slow and required consensus across the University. The marking scale did change dramatically and periodically over the years.⁶³ 'Grade inflation' arguably has much to do with the marking conventions that prevailed at different times, as the scale was modified to cope with yesterday's problems and perhaps, eventually, to make the University look more competitive with others where there was a higher proportion of Firsts. Exhortations were made to members of staff to use the whole scale, rather than to be miserly with the Firsts; probably a good thing. In the early decades, it was quite possible for students to leave with a Third, and the median mark was somewhere in

⁶² In Politics, Ronnie Irving once tried to invent a tariff system, although nothing quite so risible.
⁶³

1964-69 (or later)	1975-87	1987-96	1996-present
70+ = First	80+ = First	75+ = First	70-100 = First
65-69 = Upper Second	70-79 = Upper Second	65-74 = Upper Second	60-69 = Upper Second
60-64 = Lower Second	60-69 = Lower Second	55-64 = Lower Second	50-59 = Lower Second
50-59 = Third	50-59 = Third	50-59 = Third	40-49 = Third
<50 = Fail	<50 = Fail	<50 = Fail	35-39 = Marginal Fail
			25-34 = Clear Fail
			<25 = Bad Fail

the high Lower Seconds.⁶⁴ We can speculate – but not here – on the precise relationship between changes in marking scales and the burgeoning of First and 2-1 degrees, with the latter becoming more or less the default. It was possible eventually to detect some linguistic change: instead of ‘I got a 2-1’, students would often say, ‘I got *my* 2-1’, as if coming into their inheritance, entitlement, or rightful due, picking up an automatic £200 when passing ‘GO’ even if they only limped around the board.

The Politics Honours exam diet consisted of sitting seven or eight papers; one of them was a ‘General Paper’, but the nature of this was poorly thought out and poorly communicated. It was supposed to enable students to show some flair beyond what they had studied in individual courses, but the nature of the ‘generality’ meant that it too often resembled another political theory paper; this suited some students but by no means all. Moreover, there was no specific teaching towards the General Paper. Some students later thought that there should be, on the assumption that one should only be examined on things one had been taught, but this went against the idea of the General Paper.

Many years later, in the 1980s, Malcolm Anderson and I thought we would offer optional seminars on ‘political science’ as the ‘teaching’ for the General Paper, but this was not successful. Some students thought it added a burden of material to be studied, and those who thought of themselves as political theorists rather than as empirical political scientists (or students of politics – forget the ‘science’) thought it was alien. This was before the Department began, beneficially, to consider itself as involved with a discipline of Politics or Political Science that had a pedigree, lineage, and its own ‘great authors’. Sociology had Weber, Durkheim, Simmel, Marx (maybe), and more recent ‘greats’. Politics had the political-thought canon of Plato (but perversely not much, if any, of Aristotle, in Edinburgh), the mediaevals (who were in fact not taught), Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Mill and perhaps Marx. Politics could claim some of the sociologists as well (but then some students would complain that ‘that’s *Sociology*’) but also Bentley, the post-war ‘revolution’ of (e.g.) Truman, Dahl, Lindblom, Deutsch, Almond, Olson, Arrow, and others. Not all of these, of course, served in departments that flourished the brand of Politics or Political Science: it was a list with names that stretched over several cognate disciplines – Lipset, Rokkan and Mills were among the most relevant – but they all centred in some way on the concepts of power, influence, decision, organisation, process, and interest.

Some of these had, long before, figured in the Honours courses on Sociology of Politics and Modern Political Theory, but they had waned after a few years and the new disciplinary canon was lost from view, for the most part, unless they made limited appearances in other courses. In the 1980s, it became a matter of concern that our students were graduating without any systematic or required grounding in the mainstream Political Science literature and its seminal authors, to which the students in the 1960s and early 1970s had been introduced; see the Annexes by Anderson and Keat for further observations on this. How one defined ‘politics’ or the ‘political’ was rarely explicitly confronted or discussed, although broached in certain theory courses, in the General Paper, and in the offering that Anderson and I developed.⁶⁵ Anderson

⁶⁴ I have preserved my marking books from 1964 to 2001, with the exception of 1969-75, 1997-2000, and 2001-7 that I cannot now locate. I taught no courses when I was on research or sabbatical leave for some of the most recent years, especially 2004-7).

⁶⁵ Further afield, there were also insights to be gained into politics, conflicts, and the boundaries of political communities, and important conceptual debates as well, in the political and legal anthropology

took the lead in this attempted shift of orientation. He and I, at the time, were among the very few people in the Department who had had some kind of Political Science background. As mentioned, those who were recruited in the early years tended to be primarily historians, area specialists, philosophers and political theorists (Marxist or not): often sceptical or dismissive of claims to ‘science’ or of the application of social science methodology (although the translation of ‘Wissenschaft’ as ‘science’ became a red herring on all sides of the argument). It was not until much later, with the appointment of more disciplinary-minded and methodologically-minded colleagues, and with the move from Department to School, that things began to change.

literature. I had had some familiarity with this field from my Columbia and Yale days: the works of Gluckman, Mair, Leach, Barth, Boissevain, Balandier, Fortes, Evans-Pritchard, Radcliffe-Brown, Hoebel, Llewellyn, Nader, Bohannan, Pospisil, and Malinowski, to name only a few from older schools of those sub-disciplines. It would have been interesting to see how far courses or degrees could be developed across disciplines – with Law and Social Anthropology – in which these approaches could be studied alongside the Political Science canon, exploring differences and complementarities of empirical research methodology, conceptual affinities (e.g., legal pluralism; multi-level governance; states, acephalous societies, and international relations) and theoretical issues surrounding power and its exercise, and public order. But the opportunity for this was either lost or never broached in the first place.

Directing studies

One of the significant components in the life of many members of staff, and of all students, has been the system of Directors of Studies (DoS) in which, for the duration of their degree, each student is assigned to a member of staff as a personal tutor for the purposes of handling the administrative arrangements of registering for courses, settling into the University and to everyday life, sorting out or counselling on academic problems and sometimes delicate personal ones concerning relationships with friends or flatmates. This job description, however, subsumes a welter of separate tasks, including negotiating a good deal of registration bureaucracy connected with the choice of courses; the sheer paperwork and Calendar-searching; learning and bending the rules; receiving letters from other colleagues about tutorial absence; sending stern letters to directees; writing testimonials to employers, graduate schools, or landlords; supplying Kleenex to the weeping; handling the complex forensics and case-work surrounding a suspicion of plagiarism; referring students to the official counselling service and knowing when, and when not, to do so; handling parental phone calls in which the confidentiality of the student's information had to be preserved against the imprecations of irate or pushy mums and dads at the other end, who were concerned about their children's academic performance, sanity, living conditions, future careers, or friends; going to meetings of Directors; handling the different role requirements of sometimes being both a DoS and a course tutor to a specific student; and some that I have forgotten.

The academic, moral and legal responsibility involved in all this, not to mention the sheer time and effort spent, was sometimes onerous and always worrying for members of staff who felt they were insufficiently knowledgeable about the rules regarding curricula, about courses, colleagues or quotas in other Departments whose offerings were or were not available to Politics students (and this became more significant as more students enrolled for joint degrees with a host of other subjects); or insufficiently equipped with tact, wisdom, and skills for pastoral counselling and the difficult judgements required for this; or just too busy to learn the ropes of being a DoS or to do the job effectively and efficiently. Directors would hold office hours for directees at specific times of the week, but always lived in fear of a knock on the door in the middle of the day; or occasionally of a phone call at home in the middle of the night from a student experiencing acute personal difficulties; or of an urgent request for an instant letter of recommendation that was due the day before yesterday. Directors also feared the consequences of misdirection if mistakes or wrong judgements were made, and sometimes feared (or laughed at) a parent's threat to take up their son's or daughter's cause with the University Principal if satisfaction were not provided by the lowly DoS or even by the Head of Politics.

All these things were exacerbated, as the years rolled on, by the vast increase in student numbers that outstripped the expansion of the Department or of the availability of members of staff to take on the DoS role, given their sabbatical entitlement or their perceived competence at doing it. Directors found that they had forty, fifty, sixty or more students on their books, operating a creaking paper-based system of course-registration (until it became computerised in the late 1990s or perhaps even later than that) and a byzantine complexity of curricula, requirements, and demand. When the pressures of research and publication became all the more palpable, as they did with the advent of the RAE and its successor, it was understandable that members of staff would seek to avoid becoming a DoS, or to keep

the numbers of directees down, or to cut corners. As Head of Politics, I found it difficult at times to make Directorial assignments, to shuffle the numbers, and to listen to colleagues' justifiable complaints about the system, about their having to take on the DoS role, or of having many more directees than someone else. These problems were not easy to deal with without bruising good collegial relationships in a situation not of our own making and without much room for manoeuvre. This was aggravated because students would sometimes complain about their DoS experience, including their being reallocated to a different DoS each year because of sabbaticals, the completion of a DoS's term of office, or a change of degree course. Then, too, there were probably long-unvoiced systemic complaints on the grounds of gender, with female students locked into a system in which most Directors were male, and with whom some problems could not be discussed. This might be amenable to analysis following the lines of Steven Lukes' 'three faces of power',⁶⁶ either with some felt issues not being raised politically in anticipation of likely defeat, or not even being felt as issues because that is just how the world happens to be; an interesting hypothesis.

On the other hand, having been a DoS for many years, I knew that it was only a small minority of students who needed the service of a DoS beyond course-registration, so that the burden of the multifarious tasks was sometimes exaggerated, although no less worrying when one had to act in a difficult or delicate situation. Computerisation helped, particularly in terms of the mechanical tasks involved in registering for courses and the flow of information about courses to those who needed to know it, but the basic problem remained, of a well-intentioned system persisting into an under-resourced era with different legitimate expectations and in a different academic culture from the one in which DP Heatley had become the 'Official Adviser' in Arts more than a century ago. From 2012, DoSs are being replaced by a system of Personal Tutors: a specialised role, in the hands of about six colleagues who are better trained and more 'professional'. This is not an enormous change, but pastoral and social support is being taken away from academics, to be done by administrators. Personal Tutors will do more intensive academic advising, and talk about postgraduate degrees and the like.

⁶⁶ Lukes, S., *Power – A Radical View*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1974.

Premises, facilities and libraries

The Department was first housed in 18 Buccleuch Place, the building in which the famous *Edinburgh Review* had been founded in 1801-02 by Francis Jeffrey (see the plaque above the door), and which was a main literary and political organ of the Scottish Enlightenment. In this domestic Georgian (c. 1780s) but faded splendour, Politics had two upper flats in the building, and Sociology – also newly established – had a flat or two below ours. In the lower of the Politics flats, Harry Hanham had the large room to the rear, overlooking the Meadows, which still had allotments that dated back to the Second World War. The large room facing Buccleuch Place was the Departmental Library. There was a small room next to Hanham for the departmental secretary, a kitchen, and a smaller room overlooking Buccleuch Place, which was for Nobbs. At precisely 4 pm each day, ‘Miss Rosie’ made us all tea in the kitchen, in green-and-white, gold-decorated bone china cups with saucers, including digestive biscuits, thus providing a place and a space in which to meet and talk. In the upper flat were my room (facing the Meadows), a larger one with a rounded end which was James Cornford’s, and a room overlooking Buccleuch Place that was inhabited for a time by Charles Bloomberg, the postgraduate student and exiled South African journalist who was working on the history of the *Broederbond* and Christian Nationalism in South Africa.⁶⁷ The Department’s subsequent moves to other premises are discussed later.

As was still done in those days, Douglas Nobbs preferred to do his research in Old College, and specifically in what is now called the Playfair Library⁶⁸, where Nobbs and a few others inhabited the alcoves. He was immersed in writing about Scottish political thought in the 18th century and probably some of his archival sources were in the library in Old College.⁶⁹ There were then no busts of dead Professors in that grand room, which was a working part of the Library. Nobbs was therefore seen somewhat less at 18 Buccleuch Place, although he had a top-flat room there for tutorials.⁷⁰ A further room in Number 18, top flat, was literally a bathroom, complete with large enamel tub and hot water. It was occasionally used, possibly by Bloomberg. Lectures

⁶⁷ He lived in constant fear of the South African Secret Service, whom he imagined (perhaps correctly) were on his tail. He was an extraordinary character, full of stories that one had to take on faith because not easily verifiable, about his anti-apartheid activism in South Africa and his narrow escape in a dodgy Volkswagen, being chased by the Secret Police over the border into Rhodesian territory. I do not know how he ended up in Edinburgh, but according to him he was taken up (and possibly patronised as a quirky Jew) by the Douglas-Homes and by the Lyles (sugar dynasty); which, if true, might have offered some kind of high-level protection if the going got rough. Charlie was a fascinating figure; he always asked me to keep an eye on his room when he was not there and to tell him whether there were any strange visitors poking around during his absence. Whether this was paranoia or a realistic fear was hard to say: he had come to Edinburgh with *Broederbond* archival material squirreled away for use in his research.⁶⁷ He published *Christian Nationalism and the Rise of the Afrikaner Broederbond in South Africa, 1918-48*, probably in 1990. He was its author, but there was an ‘editor’ (Professor Saul Dubow, Sussex) and a Foreword was written by Jeremy Isaacs (cultural mogul; Royal Opera House, Covent Garden, etc.). Many years after Bloomberg left Edinburgh, he died at an early age from cancer, and perhaps the book appeared posthumously under editorship.

⁶⁸ The Playfair Library was then the Upper Library; the Main Library was at that time also in Old College.

⁶⁹ In 1965 he published ‘The Political Ideas of William Cleghorn, Hume’s Academic Rival’ in the *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 26, 4, pp. 575–86, in which the manuscripts of Cleghorn’s lectures as Professor of Moral Philosophy were a main source.

⁷⁰ Through his courtesy and helpfulness, Nobbs helped me to settle into academic life in Edinburgh. He retired in 1972 but sadly died not many years after.

were given in the ground-floor rooms of the David Hume Tower, the unfortunately still-standing black slab that affronted the elegance of George Square.⁷¹

About 1968, the Department moved from Number 18 to the new and aesthetically underwhelming William Robertson Building (WRB), twin to the equally dreary Adam Ferguson Building (AFB), to which it subsequently moved. The WRB could not accommodate everyone in the Department at that time, so a few of us were found other accommodation in the first-floor flat at 31 Buccleuch Place: Richard McAllister, Martin Clark, and me. This meant that one had to collect mail in the WRB and attend meetings there, and therefore one had deliberately to try to keep in the loop of Departmental gossip and discussion. We remained in 31 Buccleuch Place for many years, and eventually the whole Department decamped from the WRB to Number 31, where we had all the flats except, perhaps, part of the attic, and could accommodate postgraduates. Ronnie Irving, who ran the Department for a short time in the 1990s, inhabited a suite of two rooms in the attic, and – an accomplished piper – could be heard practicing stirring tunes on his chanter. Something of the all-under-one roof atmosphere of the early days at Number 18 was revived; no bathtub, but for a brief time the black Labrador of Guy Woodall, a PhD student.⁷²

Much later, the Department gave up Number 31 to inhabit the charmless AFB when the School of Social and Political Studies (as it was first called) was created. The rooms were small, and those facing Buccleuch Place intolerably hot in all seasons, owing to large windows (many of which it was no longer possible to open), and requiring electric cooling fans throughout. The soundproofing between rooms was virtually non-existent: the thin backs of one's book-niches were the walls of the adjacent rooms. It was said that when the AFB was first designed, the soundproofing was envisaged to be supplied by staff members' books. Where these were too few, obsolete volumes of *Gray's Anatomy* were, it is said, hauled over in quantity from the Medical School to fill the gaps on the shelves. A nice story, but to no avail. Trying to have a confidential phone call or a face-to-face conversation with a student was difficult. As a student of surveillance and privacy, I thought this was an eavesdropper's honey pot. As a Head of Politics subsequently, with many people to talk to about many confidential matters, I found it unacceptable. We took our leave from the AFB in the late 2000s and migrated with our other School colleagues to a newly rebuilt corner of the former Medical Faculty, now styled the Chrystal Macmillan Building.⁷³

⁷¹ George Square had long since been intact as a Georgian square, much of its north side having been replaced by the George Watson's Ladies' College at Number 7, now the Psychology Department.

⁷² One foreign visitor to the Department in those years, who was with us for a number of weeks, was the Israeli Professor Yehezkel Dror. Dror, who wrote innovative books on policy-making and policy analysis, was campaigning to get the Government to establish a think-tank for public policy as an external resource, produced a very large manuscript (monopolising our secretary's roneo resources for a time) setting out the theory and practice of think-tanks to sell the idea to the UK Government; he had been a senior staff member at the RAND Corporation in the USA. The Central Policy Review Staff, set up in 1971 under Lord Rothschild and attracting the monicker 'think-tank', was a different kind of animal.

⁷³ As a retired member I never worked in those attractive and apparently well-appointed premises, but instead have enjoyed inhabiting a room in a quiet flat, dated 1776, in Buccleuch Place: the Elysian Fields for extinct volcanoes; or, as Russell Keat styles it in Annex 10, a 'building for grumpy old men'. But this is a threefold error, as in 'Holy Roman Empire'.

It was during the years at Number 31 that Politics, like other Departments, began to acquire computing facilities, moving slowly from primitive equipment (using floppy discs) eventually to desktop Macintoshes for all. Rooms were cabled through plastic conduits, snaking around still-elegant Georgian cornices and dadoes. There was a Faculty Computing Committee to decide Faculty policy and resource-distribution. This was frustrating, as one had to fight for more and better equipment against larger Departments who argued that they would be doomed without large dollops of kit, whereas, they implied, it would not matter if Politics (and Social Policy, which shared our complaint about under-resourcing) remained in the stone age with feeble Mac Classics. One newly-arrived Professor in the Faculty of Social Sciences said that he had been promised certain computing resources as an inducement, and that he had better get them. I suppose that, if Politics had had large research funding and a healthy number of postgraduates that were jeopardised by computing-equipment inadequacy, we would have been able to make a better argument; Anderson's Annex remarks are borne out by this. But we were aware that the recruitment of postgraduates, perhaps especially from abroad – who would expect good facilities – was in part dependent on securing these resources, and so it was a serious matter.

We had a Departmental Library from the start. Housed at first in Number 18 and subsequently in Number 31, it was reasonably well stocked with regard to the taught courses, and – as some contributors attest in their Annexes – was well used by undergraduates as a reading room as well as providing the venue for the occasional departmental seminars that were instituted in the late 1960s. David Steel MP, I recall, gave one, and took tea in the kitchen with us at Number 18. The Main Library was then still housed in Old College, and was woefully antiquated, dreary, and hard to use. I do not recall whether there were places to sit and read, because I used it largely to borrow books, albeit rarely, as it was in the early years poorly stocked with specialist research books or journals for a new academic subject like Politics.⁷⁴ The catalogue consisted of several very large, very heavy, bound grey books, with entries written in pen and continuously amended with new entries in gummed strips over the years in roughly alphabetical order. It was a palimpsest, and it was onerous to hump these tomes onto tables and thumb through their dog-eared and dirty pages. I think there was only one set of such books available to the large number of readers. It was not until later that the Georgian houses in George Square (south side of the Square) were pulled down, very controversially, to build the Main Library (designed by Sir Basil Spence) along with the George Square Theatre and the AFB. When this new library opened in the late 1960s, it was a great benefit as it was closer to where the Social Science Departments actually worked, and thus gave a central focus to the Departments ranged around George Square. It had more space, was better lit, and had the beginnings of a new catalogue, although it was too early to expect anything electronic. The new catalogue had many more volumes, smaller and lighter, bound in black, and with typed entries that had to be added to in scissors-and-paste fashion before whole pages were subsequently photocopied and inserted; all quaintly pre-digital from today's perspective. At least one no longer needed an Olympic weight-lifting medal to handle them. This catalogue was located in the foyer, to the left. But there were also now many places upstairs to sit down and read.

⁷⁴ This subsequently improved as budgets for library ordering became available at Departmental level.

Expansion and repositioning in the 2000s

When, in the early- and mid-2000s, changes were afoot for reorganising Departments, abolishing Faculties and creating Schools within Colleges, they coincided with a major change in Politics towards its eventual expansion and repositioning as Politics and International Relation (PIR); Russell Keat's Annex reveals much detail on the politics and planning of this transformation. Meanwhile, the European and International Politics MSc was seen as an avenue to, or 'cash-cow', for the financing of new posts. The School Administrator, Saladin Rospigliosi,⁷⁵ played a crucial role in translating the ambitions for Politics to play a large part in the new order, developing the case for financing staff growth in Politics from a planned-for increase in the number of E&IP (now with a reversed title: I&EP) students, especially full-fee overseas students. This took place during my Headship of Politics, 2003-2005, when I took over from Kimberly Hutchings, and later handed it over to Roland Dannreuther. The increased staffing that resulted largely from the I&EP degree helped to float new taught Master's offerings.

John Ravenhill, an International Relations specialist in the political economy of the Far East, had arrived in Edinburgh for what proved to be a short-lived and not terribly happy incumbency of the Chair of Politics before returning to the Australia National University. The study of International Relations had become more lustrous than that of Politics, which seemed to have suppressed its corporate identity overarching the parts that were very well taught and researched by many members of the Department. There were endless debates about the nature and relationship of these two disciplines, or perhaps branches of a single discipline. Many meetings of a steering group in the Department took place to thrash out the nature of the relationship as well as the position of European politics, to consider the nature of the undergraduate degree and its curriculum, and to ensure that Politics students – and the staff members who did not consider themselves to be 'IR' would not be overshadowed or marginalised under the new arrangements.

Undergraduates – whether Scottish or not – were becoming increasingly international-minded, as Sofia Widen observes in Annex 15, based on articles in *Student*, although internationalism was also well represented there in the 1960s. This was perhaps not so much a desire to push forward the frontiers of analysis and theory, but arguably in terms of how to engage practically, perhaps in career terms, with world problems and global (including Middle-Eastern) issues of war and peace, climate change, famine and underdevelopment, and 'globalisation', which had become a fashionable term and concept. There was thought to be an increasing pool of potential postgraduates wanting to come to Britain, and to Edinburgh, to augment the numbers who had already begun to enrol in our taught Master's degree as it had developed, with fluctuating numbers, from the 1990s into the new Millennium.

⁷⁵ He first appeared on the Politics scene in 31 Buccleuch Place as a temporary Departmental Secretary, bringing a unique style and splendid qualities. Dressed in ancient tweeds and waistcoat, he had all the bearing of a self-effacing, quietly efficient, supremely unflappable Jeeves as he managed the huge variety of Departmental chores and the diversity of the staff with great dedication and good humour. He later also worked in the central administration of the University, and as School Administrator in the School of Social and Political Studies (as it was first called), and served in the College of Humanities and Social Science as Head of Undergraduate Admissions. He left the University in 2012 to take up an administrative post in Heythrop College, University of London.

In the other direction, however, there was a new impetus towards the study of Scottish politics with the advent of the new Scottish Parliament and Government in 1999, and this absorbed much research attention in Politics, the Institute of Governance, and in other Social Science Departments. While Henry Drucker's research and publications in the 1980s had opened the Department's account in the 1980s, devolution created new avenues for policy-related engagements between academia and the new Parliament and Scottish Government (as it was later styled). It also contributed to the growing interest in cross-disciplinary comparative studies between Scotland and other nations within larger sovereign states; and, along with the Department's interest in the EU – greatly augmented by some new appointments – it helped to frame these studies in terms of territorial politics and multilevel governance.⁷⁶

In any event, the expansion in staff numbers was prodigious: from the mid-teens to the low twenties during my Headship, and pushing towards thirty during Dannreuther's. Some of this was described earlier. The appointment of many superlative new colleagues during my 'watch' (mid-2002 to early 2005) and after was gratifying, but the appointment process brought a significant administrative load not just for the Head, but for colleagues who took part in the tasks of deciding priorities; designing job descriptions; judging the many dozen applications for each post; arranging the selection procedure; holding the candidates' presentations and the interviews; making the decisions, and 'cooling out' the losing candidates. It pleased me greatly (as Head and as the Department's fossil) and the Department as a whole, when the Principal of the University astonishingly decided that we could have not one but two Chairs, so impressed was he and the Chair Committee with the leadership, innovative, and research qualities of Charlie Jeffery (who was appointed to the main Chair) and the EU specialist John Peterson, and so aware was he that Politics could be a major force for the future of the Social Sciences at Edinburgh. This success helped to make it worthwhile to have been Head of Politics during those beginning years of transformation.

I do not think expectations were in any way mistaken about the contributions to be made by these two senior appointees to the work and prestige of the Department – later styled Politics and International Relations – as well as to that of the University more widely. They – and the other newcomers to the academic staff in the new Millennium – helped to set a new, fresh stamp upon the Department for most of the 2000s to the present time, and to increase its visibility and reputation vastly in the eyes of students, prospective PhDs and job applicants, and the wider academic profession, and the world of public affairs. As Head, Mark Aspinwall inherited a going concern that gathered momentum in the early and mid-2000s, and helped to propel it further. His Annex 11 shows how the foundations were built upon during his tenure, with new initiatives and fresh departures across a fairly comprehensive spectrum of undergraduate and postgraduate teaching, institutional development, and research.

⁷⁶ Earlier on in the Department's history, Scottish politics had attracted the interest of some foreign scholars, most notably Luis Moreno Fernández, who wrote his 1986 Edinburgh PhD thesis – I think under Henry Drucker's supervision – on *Decentralisation in Britain and Spain: The cases of Scotland and Catalonia*. He returned to Spain to have a distinguished and productive academic career in sociology and political science. He remained in constant contact with the Department, playing frequent visits for conferences and the maintenance of friendships, and co-editing (with the Department's Nicola McEwen), *The Territorial Politics of Welfare* (London: Routledge, 2005). Jean-Pierre Drieux, a political scientist at the University of Rheims, had an interest in Scottish politics in the 1980s, and visited annually to collect information, speak to informants, and keep abreast of developments.

Aspinwall, in fact, shows how the Department has been utterly transformed in recent times: the past ten years or so have witnessed the largest change in the life and work of academic staff and students. If one goes back to consider the previous sections of this history, the contrast with the earliest, and even the fairly recent past, could not be greater. Yet this has not been a Whiggish interpretation of the Politics Department from its origins to 2012; nor, for that matter, has it reflected any Toryism in its sentiment. We may be 'on a roll' in recent times; long may it last, but there are drawbacks and ironies, as Aspinwall hints. Moreover, the luck or the talent could run out, and there are perennial challenges, problems to solve, relationships to manage, plans to implement, and goals to be achieved. How far the Department can shape its own future as it sets out on the next journey of fifty years or more cannot be certain, any more than it could have been at its origin. That journey depends, in part, on so many external and unpredictable factors, whether social, economic, political, or institutional; on local, national and international vagaries; on changing conceptions of the nature and organisation of knowledge, its production, and its transmission; and on so many more people: present, past, and still to come.

Annex 1: About David Playfair Heatley (1920-1944, first as Reader in Political Science, then as Reader Emeritus) (written by Charles Raab)

David Playfair Heatley (1868-1944) served the University for 35 years, and at his death on 20 September, 1944, was 'Reader Emeritus in Political Science and Mackay Lecturer in History', according to a brief death notice in *The Times* for 28 September, 1944. He had become Reader in Political Science in 1920, although that did not indicate that 'Political Science' had become a subject to which an appointment could be made, as well as describing a course of lectures.

Heatley was the Assistant to Professors Kirkpatrick and Prothero in the new Department of History. The optional 20-lecture course in Political Science that he taught (Tuesday and Thursday at 10 am) from 1900 was available to Honours students in History, in Economic Science, and – a few years later – in Constitutional Law and Constitutional History. It had the following syllabus:

- I. General. – Political Theory as (a) absolute, (b) relative. Conditions of Political Development. The Sphere of Government, politically and historically considered. Comparisons of the Ancient, the Mediaeval and the Modern State.
- II. History of Political Theory, with some reference to the historical conditions of each age.
- III. Modern Politics. – Liberty and Authority. Political Morality. Organisation of the State. Types of the Modern State. Mediate Democracy: Representation; Legislature and Executive; Checks on Democracy.⁷⁷

As approved by the University Court early in 1902, this course was altered to consist of two parts of 25 lectures each, on History of Political Thought Since the Reformation, and The Modern State.⁷⁸ It qualified for graduation in History and in Economic Science.⁷⁹ The fee for the full course was set at 3 guineas, and at 2 guineas for each half-course. The basic reading list of books was: Woodrow Wilson, 'The State'; Aristotle, 'Politics'; Hobbes, 'Leviathan', Part II (Of Commonwealth); Locke, 'Civil Government'; Mill, 'Representative Government'; 'The Federalist'; Gierke, 'Political Theories of the Middle Age'; Dicey, 'Law of the Constitution'; Janet, 'Histoire de la Science Politique'; Graham, 'English Political Philosophy from Hobbes to Maine'.⁸⁰

Further teaching of courses in the orbit of the study of Politics came about when, on 14 May, 1900, the University Court also approved the formation of a Moral Philosophy Honours half-course in Political Philosophy.⁸¹ That course, with a fee of 2 guineas, was taught in the Summer session of 1902, and consisted of the scope and method of political philosophy, its relation to ethics, economics and history, the general theory of political obligation, the nature and basis of the State, the particular

⁷⁷ University Calendar, 1900-1901, p. 100.

⁷⁸ University Calendar, 1902-1903, p. 560.

⁷⁹ When the Department of Politics was established, the Political Science course was already compulsory in the Honours curricula of Economic Science (University Calendar, 1962-1963, p. 373) and of History (University Calendar, 1963-1964, p. 386).

⁸⁰ University Calendar, 1902-1903, p. 105.

⁸¹ University Calendar, 1901-1902, p. 868.

theory of rights and obligations and related functions of the State, the structure and forms of government, and the history of political philosophy. Henry Barker MA, of the Department of Moral Philosophy, gave these lectures.⁸²

Beginning in 1914, Heatley also offered a Political Science course at Elementary level; at its inception, it was taught in the Spring Term on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 12. Its syllabus was:

- I. Fundamental Terms and Considerations in the Study of Politics.
- II. The Organisation and Conduct of Government in Britain to-day (with references to other States)
- III. (a) Federalism.
(b) Government within the British Empire.
- IV. Relations between States, and the Conduct of international policy.⁸³

It is arguable that the teaching of courses in Political Science in the History and other curricula would not have come about had it not been for an endowment of £2000 made to the University in 1900 by Sheriff Aeneas Mackay QC, and accepted by the University Court in its meeting of 14 May. The interest of the endowment was to be applied to supplement the salary of the Assistant in the Historical Department.⁸⁴ This income supplementation was likely to have been made in recognition of the greater burdens placed on teaching in the History Department from 1894. These had resulted from the establishment of an Honours curriculum in History, which led to an increased demand for course options. It ‘imposed increased work on Heatley’, the Assistant who had been discovered by Kirkpatrick, who ‘secured his services for the University, and bequeathed him to his colleagues and successors’.⁸⁵ At its meeting on 22 October 1900, the Court declared that ‘The Assistant was appointed University Lecturer, with the designation Mackay Lecturer in the Department of History; the lecturer to deliver during the current winter session a course of twenty lectures on a historical subject’ which was free to History students, 1 guinea to other students, and with a 5s. entrance fee for non-matriculated students.⁸⁶ That course was designated ‘The Mackay Lectures in History’, 20 lectures on ‘Political Thought and Action in Britain Since the Reformation’⁸⁷ as given by the first Mackay incumbent – Heatley – who also gave the lectures in Political Science. In effect, the Mackay endowment helped to support Heatley, and it continued to do so until his retirement in 1935.

We owe something to these precursors of the later Politics Department. Who, then, was Aeneas Mackay, and what more is known of DP Heatley?

The Edinburgh University Library Gallery of Benefactors – which does not deal with his lectureship endowment – informs us about Mackay and his bequest to the Library:

‘Aeneas James George Mackay’ (1839-1911) Advocate, historian, Professor of Constitutional History at the University of Edinburgh, Sheriff of Fife and Kinross.

⁸² University Calendar, 1901-02, p. 83.

⁸³ University Calendar, 1913-1914, p. 232.

⁸⁴ University Calendar, 1901-02, p. 869.

⁸⁵ Lodge, R., ‘David Playfair Heatley’, *University of Edinburgh Journal*, 7, 1934-1935, pp. 247, 246.

⁸⁶ University Calendar, 1901-1902, p. 872.

⁸⁷ University Calendar, 1901-1902, p. 101.

‘Educated at the Edinburgh Academy, at King's College London and the Universities of Oxford, Heidelberg and Edinburgh, Aeneas Mackay held the Chair of Constitutional History at the University of Edinburgh from 1874 until 1881. He was awarded an LLD by the University in 1882 and founded the Scottish History Society in 1885. He devoted the rest of his life to the practice of law, notably as Sheriff of Fife and Kinross from 1886 until 1901, as well as farming and forestry. ‘He bequeathed to the Library some 4,000 volumes on Scottish history, law, literature and many other subjects...’⁸⁸

Heatley’s own academic interests lay partly in international relations, as the author of a Historical Association of Scotland pamphlet, *International relations* (1916) and *Diplomacy and the Study of International Relations* (1919)⁸⁹ – a vast compilation, with considerable commentary, of relevant extracts from political theory sources spanning several centuries – following his *Studies in British History and Politics* of 1913.⁹⁰ In his retirement, and anticipating the end of the Second World War, Heatley produced an unpublished manuscript, ‘Britain, the United States of America and the Comity of Nations’, covering topics that included ‘Nationality and the State in International Affairs’, ‘The Ordinary Man and Public Opinion’, and ‘Security and Community’, and including appendices on ‘Freedom and Security’ and ‘The End of Isolationism’, among others.⁹¹

One memorialist of Heatley, while acknowledging that students owed him gratitude for his teaching and his personal interest in them, also remembered that his teaching was laboured: ‘His sentences were long, abounding in qualifications and parentheses and one had to be a diligent note-taker to escape being lost in a parenthesis.’⁹² Another appreciative memoir noted that Heatley never talked down to his students, who ‘valued instead of resenting the strain imposed upon them’ by his ‘stimulating teaching.’⁹³ Yet his teaching of History as well of Political Science, including the history of political thought, show the comprehensiveness of his knowledge across a formidable range of subjects, from ancient, mediaeval, and modern political theory, to the modern state, the American Constitution, authoritarian and liberal forms of government, political parties and representation, federalism, legislatures and executives, and the growth of law.⁹⁴ But Heatley also served as the first ‘Official

⁸⁸ <http://www.docs.is.ed.ac.uk/docs/lib-archive/bgallery/Gallery/records/nineteen1/mackay.html>, accessed 20 December 2011.

⁸⁹ Oxford: The Clarendon Press. A detailed table of contents is at http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Diplomacy_and_the_Study_of_International_Relations#cite_note-0; accessed 13 August 2012. The full text of the book is at http://archive.org/stream/diplomacystudyof00heatuoft/diplomacystudyof00heatuoft_djvu.txt; accessed 13 August 2012.

⁹⁰ Some biographical details are at: <http://archiveshub.ac.uk/data/gb237coll-243>, accessed 20 December 2011.

⁹¹ University of Edinburgh Main Library, Special Collections, Box Dk. 6.6

⁹² Macleod, N., ‘Memories of the University, 1903-09’, *University of Edinburgh Journal*, 23, 1967-1968, p. 36. The University Library’s Special Collections hold, in several lengthy notebooks, what are apparently the lecture notes from Heatley’s courses, 1902-04, taken by one such ‘diligent note-taker’, J.C. Higgins; see GB 237 Coll-243, Gen. 815-818.

⁹³ Lodge, R., *op cit.*, p. 248. H. Victor Rabagliati’s ‘David Playfair Heatley – a Memoir’, written 3rd December 1945, has a similar memory of Heatley’s teaching, at p. 2); see GB 237 Coll-243, Box Dk 6.7 in the University Library’s Special Collections.

⁹⁴ ‘[I]nto [the Political Science lectures] was compressed enough material to occupy the student for several years.’, Rabagliati, H. V., *op.cit.*, pp. 2-3.

Adviser' in Arts, a kind of Director of Studies, who had to guide students through the bewildering array of course options that had come about when restrictions on the curriculum in Arts were abolished in 1908. Moreover, his interest in the Home and Indian Civil Services saw many of his students taking up administrative posts.⁹⁵

When Heatley retired in 1935, he dedicated the testimonial money given to him by his colleagues to establishing an annual prize for the best student in Political Science – ‘a fitting memorial for one who has done so much to promote the scientific study of Politics’.⁹⁶ This prize is still awarded today, although the criterion has been adapted to reflect changing circumstances: in 1965-1966, for instance, it was given to the ‘most distinguished student in Politics in the Honours classes in that subject’,⁹⁷ but the advent of joint Honours degrees led to discussions about the precise interpretation of the rubric. It is now given for ‘Excellence in Politics’. When Heatley retired, his place was taken by Douglas Nobbs as Lecturer in Political Science; he was to remain in post in the 1960s with the creation of the Department of Politics, and with a Readership.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.* The University Library’s Special Collections, at GB 237 Coll-243, Gen. 825/1, hold several sheets in Heatley’s handwriting, showing the list of candidates and places achieved in the open competitions for the Indian and Home Civil Services, and Eastern Cadetships, from 1896 to 1914. Rabagliati’s memoir, p. 3, states that most of the civil service candidates took one or both of Heatley’s courses. Rabagliati had been a student of Heatley’s in the early years of the century, achieving high marks. He subsequently became a QC of Lincoln’s Inn, and served in the Royal Air Force during the Second World War as Wing Commander. He maintained friendly contact with Heatley throughout his life. He died in 1962.

⁹⁶ Lodge, R., *op.cit.*, p. 249.

⁹⁷ University Calendar, 1965-1966, p. 809. Alice Brown received the prize in 1983; see Annex 9.

Annex 2: Jeremy Mitchell (1964-68; student)

I did not intend to read Politics when I went up to Edinburgh. Indeed, before the Robbins expansion to the number of universities, and to the range of subjects taught at universities, Politics as a degree subject was taught at very few places – possibly only Oxford, Manchester and the LSE. It certainly was not an option at Edinburgh and in 1961 I went up to read Chemistry. I changed course following my science degree in 1964 and decided to join Harold Wilson's 'white heat of technology' – and go into industry. For some reason I thought – probably wrongly - that a degree in Economics, as well as a BSc, would make me more employable.

So, in 1964 I started a second undergraduate degree in Economics. In the first year I took Economics I and Economic History I. I needed a subsidiary subject and chose Politics I. All three courses were taught in the 'traditional' way – lectures, a weekly tutorial group with assigned reading, several essays throughout the year and an end of year exam if you achieved your DP (Duly Performed) certificate. Of the three Politics was the most interesting and appealing - the subject matter was more congenial and the lecturing style of Professor Hanham was more amusing!

In the second year I was still reading Economics and took Economics II, Politics II and Comparative Constitutions, a course taught in the Law Faculty. At the end of the year I could go on to Honours. I really wanted to do a combined degree in Economics and Politics but that was not possible, so I opted for Politics on its own. What did we study in the first two years? The nature of politics, and its analysis, through the recent history and politics of four major systems – the United Kingdom, the United States, France and the USSR. This introduced us to the structure and role of political institutions – legislatures, executives and judiciaries – as well elections, parties, pressure groups and the functioning of informal political actors and other political processes. We also examined political ideologies – particularly communism and fascism - subsumed under the concept of 'totalitarianism' and contrasted with 'democracy'.

There was a broad survey of political thought – Plato to NATO by way of the usual suspects - Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Marx, Mill, Lenin and others. The lectures introduced us to the members of the Department of Politics who gave the lectures and took our tutorial groups – Professor Hanham, James Cornford, Charles Raab, Michael Clarke, Henry Drucker and others.

The third and fourth years were different. There were fewer lectures and more seminars, usually held in the department in Buccleuch Place. There were about twenty of us doing honours Politics. Most were studying for single honours but a few were taking joint degrees in either Politics and Modern History, or Politics and Sociology. (I could not do Politics and Economics but continued with Economics III as my subsidiary subject in the third year.) Apart from the seminars a great deal of time was spent reading either in the departmental library or in the reading room of the National Library, which was quieter, one was less subject to distraction and there was less competition over access to books!

The main course we all took in this third year was Modern Political Thought, a survey course that examined the contemporary analysis of politics. In many ways its coverage was similar to Mackenzie's book, *Politics and Social Science*, that appeared

at about the same time, although it was less discursive than Mackenzie and went into individual topics in more detail. Discussions in the weekly seminar were held around a large table in James Cornford's office. Most of the material we looked at was American and reflected the current research concerns of political science there.

During the year we looked at the debate about the nature of power and decision making in local communities – Dahl's classic *Who Governs?* was a key text here; the political socialisation of children was examined through Greenstein's *Children and Politics*; the growing literature on public choice and the economic analysis of politics was approached through Downs' *An Economic Theory of Democracy*, Olson's *Logic of Collective Action* and Buchanan and Tullock's *The Calculus of Consent*. We grappled with game theory and social choice via Riker's *Theory of Political Coalitions*, Black's *Theory of Committees and Elections*, Arrow's *Social Choice and Individual Value* and Farquharson's *Theory of Voting*, not always with success or understanding!

We had outside speakers too although we did not necessarily appreciate them for their academic concerns. John Erickson had recently joined the department and came to talk to us about strategic studies, but we were less interested in what he had to say than in seeing if he ever took off his belted mackintosh, and if so what he wore underneath. We were disappointed; he kept the coat on throughout his talk!

I can only remember two elements of the final year. The first was a personal research project. Mine was on political education, ostensibly developing out of the earlier discussions of the political socialisation of children. I can remember little about it except the extreme difficulty over access to research subjects in schools and the problems of developing a systematic research instrument or questionnaire! All in all, a very valuable early indication of the dilemmas facing researchers in political science! The other memorable element was a course on 'Parties and Elites' with Charles Raab. This was a final option course taken by about five or six of us. It involved what seemed like very large amounts of reading – Pareto, Mosca, Michels and other elite theorists as well as more modern material on political parties by Duverger, Eldersveld and others. This was supplemented by a weekly three-hour seminar.

Looking back, I'm aware not just of the topics and areas that we covered but also of those that we did not. This is a little unfair. It was the early years of the department, the course was being established and there were not the resources to cover all the subjects or areas that one might now include in a politics degree. However, in retrospect I remember little on politics outside Europe and the United States, and nothing systematic on research methods or international relations.

Other 'gaps' reflected the then current political environment. Britain was not a member of the EU, or rather the European Economic Community as it then was, so there was little related to it or its institutions. Scottish and Welsh nationalism were 'in the air' but it was only in 1967 that Winifred Ewing won the Hamilton by-election for the SNP, after Plaid Cymru had won Carnarvon in 1966. In 1969 the Wilson government established the Crowther Commission to examine possible changes to the UK constitution. It did not report – under Kilbrandon – until 1973. In the period before the beginning of the tortuous process leading to devolution and the establishment of assemblies in Scotland and Wales, there was little if any discussion

of Scottish governance in our academic studies.

One other aspect of the degree strikes me too – the predominance of academic material from American political science. There were two main reasons for this. Firstly, political science was only just developing in the UK and in Europe. There was a lack of relevant published research studies, although this would change over time. Secondly in these early days many of the departmental staff had studied in the US and so were very familiar with American political science. In creating new courses for the new degree they necessarily drew upon their own academic studies.

I think I was lucky to be one of the first students on this new degree. Because it was new there was a degree of flexibility and a (relative) absence of bureaucratic constraints. It is almost always easier to do things for the first time! In what ways did this affect the department staff? I don't know but for most of them it was their first academic post and they were developing new courses from scratch. They were mostly in their late twenties or early thirties and so the gap between 'them' and 'us' felt relatively small. Perhaps it seems different in retrospect but I remember the politics department as one of few academic communities that I have experienced. By this I mean a group of individuals interested in ideas for their own sake and characterised by relative openness, freedom and equality in the discussion between the members of the community, between staff and students.

The other major question of the final year was 'what do I do next?'. I had long since abandoned the idea of industry and the 'white heat of technology' and like several others was thinking of graduate work. The USA was the only destination for anyone aspiring to be a 'real' social or political scientist at this time and I was helped towards graduate work first at the University of California and then at Yale. For this my Edinburgh undergraduate degree was a very good preparation and I feel privileged to have been a student in these early days of the department.

Annex 3: Mary Chamberlain (1965-1969; student)

I arrived in Edinburgh in October 1965, courtesy of the Butler Act and a student grant. I was just eighteen, and the first girl in my family to go to university. Convent educated, naïve, gauche and plump, I entered a savvy world of blue jeans and donkey jackets, of Mary Quant dresses, white boots and mini-skirts.

The department was small, young and ambitious. Harry Hanham was the Professor, James Cornford his second in command. Charlie Raab had been in place a year or so, to be joined by Richard McAllister, 'our man' from the India Office, Martin Clark, Henry Drucker, the ink still wet on his doctorate and John Erickson, who reputedly caused a diplomatic incident by declaring his nationality to be 'Geordie' as he crossed the border between Russia and Poland. With skilful multi-tasking, the range of courses offered punched above its weight: US, British, and European politics, the Common Market, decolonisation and Bandung, development and exploitation, non-alignment and the Cold War, Strategic Studies, leavened with Theory, ancient and modern, from Plato to cutting-edge American political modelling, flawed, in our view, for its lack of the obvious: that outside of the US, people did things differently. We demanded to set our own syllabus, an idea given short shrift by James, who had succeeded Harry as Professor, although we did institute in our final year a seminar based around our own ideas and enthusiasms.

Seminars were compulsory and we were required to work. There were no handouts, and no concessions. If you did not do the reading, you could not expect tuition. Charlie Raab sat through a seminar drinking coffee from his flask and reading a book when we arrived unprepared. (An anecdote I repeated frequently to my own students when they failed to work.) So we filibustered seminars to disguise our lack of preparation and syndicated lecture notes. I don't recall any course books, much less aims, objectives and learning outcomes. Essays were frequent and returned scrawled over and with no breakdown of assessment grades. First class degrees were as rare as diamonds in a dung heap. The Quality Assurance Agency would have despaired at the haphazard, probably negligible, paperwork, but the teaching was inspirational, and we were privileged.

There was a field trip to Brussels, war games in the University's country retreat (and Sweatie Betty until the early hours). If we hung around the department at the right time, we were invited to tea where others homed in and out of view: the departmental *eminence grise*, Douglas Nobbs, Gianfranco Poggi from Sociology, Charlie Bloomberg a mysterious exile from South Africa, Malcolm Rifkind, hot gossip from Rhodesia.

There were no more than a dozen of us in Honours Politics in my year. Half a dozen in the year above, half that again for the year above them. We were known and listened to. There was little to differentiate, in years, between students and staff. The departmental air was democratic and egalitarian and we socialised, in pubs and homes. The party James threw when we graduated, to which he invited Charles Stewart, the University secretary, and our meddlesome cohort, was memorable.

In 1967, we set up the Politics Society, of which I was its first secretary, writing to Julius Nyerere, an alumni, to ask him to sit as its Honorary President. Political luminaries agreed to come and talk to us, bums dragooned onto seats to give our

speakers a credible audience. Perhaps Politics attracted a particular kind of student interested not only in understanding the world, but changing it. This was a department of Politics, not political science, and it is no coincidence that most of us were engaged in political activity, at student or town level (a young Robin Cook and Gordon Brown were part of our student ether). Most of the articulation of student unrest between 1967 and 1969 was spearheaded from students in the department.

Paris erupted in May, 1968, Ireland in October. The anti-Vietnam protests were at their height, Leith 1967, Grosvenor Square 1968. The American consul invited us Politics students to his home in an attempt to win hearts and minds. We drank his wine, smoked his cigarettes (packets of Kent, decanted into jars, a world away from No.6 and Old Holborn rollies) and left at 10pm, unconvinced. The LSE was occupied in October, Essex University earlier. Sit-ins were everywhere. We boycotted Spain, held talk-ins over Rhodesia, signed up to anti-Apartheid, rooted for Bernadette Devlin. We were part of a transnational movement for change, exciting and empowering, lived in the shadow of the Cold War and nuclear annihilation. It made us a generation of internationalists.

There were at least as many women among the politics students as men. Women may even have been in the majority. The staff, with the exception of the secretaries, were all men. We thought, at the time, there was nothing strange about this gender disparity. Yet the first stirrings of feminism were already in evidence. Anna Coote, one of 'us', was the then editor of *Student*. (*Student*, staffed almost entirely by Politics students, was a serious, professional campaigning newspaper and the launch-pad for many careers in media, journalism and activism). Anna challenged Malcolm Muggeridge, the University Rector, to demand the University Health Centre prescribe single women the Pill. At the time, securing a reliable contraceptive for single women required finding a sympathetic doctor and/or adopting the subterfuge of being married. The Brook Advisory Centre had only recently opened a branch in Edinburgh. The demand was prescient, reasonable and practical.

Muggeridge resigned as Rector in protest, using the opportunity of a sermon in St. Giles' Cathedral to publicise his decision nationally, 'How infinitely sad;' he railed,

how, in a macabre sort of way, funny, that the form their subordination takes should be a demand for Pot and Pills; for the most tenth-rate sort of escapism and self-indulgence ever known! It is one of those situations a social historian with a sense of humour will find very much to his taste. All is prepared for a marvellous release of youthful creativity; we await the great works of art, the high spirited venturing into new fields of perception and understanding – and what do we get? The resort of any old slobbering debauchee anywhere in the world at any time – Dope and Bed.
98

Reminds me of Coleridge, Malcolm... After his resignation in January 1968, the battle was on to replace him with a student Rector, which came to fruition with the election in 1972 of Jonathan Wills, whose brilliant Gaston LeJobbe cartoons in

⁹⁸ 'Another King.' The Sermon to students at the University of Edinburgh, *The Gargoyle, The Journal of the Malcolm Muggeridge Society*, Issue No. 3, July 2004, p.7. See www.malcolmmuggeridge.org/gargoyle, accessed 2 August 2012.

Student had highlighted student life and lambasted the skirmishes between town and gown in the fall-out from the Muggeridge affair.

Town and gown was a strange business. Edinburgh was a capital city with a cosmopolitan and European past. It *felt* like a European city. But it was dour and puritanical. Women were not admitted in many bars. From time to time anti-English sentiment was stirred. There was an annual Orange Parade. The International Festival sat uncomfortably within its walls and the Traverse Theatre in the Lawnmarket was repeatedly threatened with closure. The city was marked with poverty, older people with rickety legs and the gaunt legacy of starvation on their faces. The Grassmarket was lived in by dossers and much of the Royal Mile bore the scars of slum dwelling. Students could rent flats with no bathrooms for five shillings (25p) a week in a no-man's land (now redeveloped) between Chambers Street and George Square.

Haggis sausage in Leith Street, fresh doughnuts at 3am from the all-night bakery in Patrick Square, and cheap gut-rot wine from Valvona's. No party was complete without a barrel of beer and a police raid...

I sat finals in 1969, hundreds of us in the intimidating interior of the McEwan Hall, and graduated from the same building. In my subsequent professional life I returned to my first love, history, but it was a new history driven by the impulses of the 1960s and 1970s. As I charted the bleak underbelly of politics, the impact of political decision making and the power of political ideas through the lives of women picking up the pieces, or colonial subjects resisting racial and Imperial categories, or West Indian migrants navigating the crucibles of international relations, I realised more and more how my own work had been formed and informed by my early mentors. I cherish my friends of those years, many of whom remain close, including the late James Cornford, to whom I am eternally grateful for inviting me into Honours Politics and who remained an inspiration to me all his life.

P.S. I think I still owe someone an essay. Will this do?

Annex 4: Sarah Nelson (1967-1971; student)

My four years in Edinburgh's Politics Department in the "golden era" of student politics were among the happiest, most supportive and energising of my life. If I read such sentiments from other people I'd be cynical and think of cliches. But it's true – especially of the two honours years before graduation.

That era brought many famous student names – Gordon Brown, Jonathan Wills (who both became early student rectors), Anna Coote, Sheila McKechnie and many more. But for me what was memorable wasn't those legendary names – exciting as some of the battles and ill-temper in *Student* could be – but the atmosphere in the department.

It was quite a small department then, and the sense of equality and friendship in the middle of this vast amorphous university was set by the institution of the coffee room, where staff and students would mix every day if they wanted. Not in a false ghastly "let's- be-friends-and-first-names" way but all rather incidental and casual. And our small group of honours students became friends, as well as colleagues.

Professor Harry Hanham with his big round glasses looked a somewhat jolly version of ex-Labour leader John Smith. He was rather elitist about students: telling me cheerfully in the corridor once "we're gonna weed out the heathen!" But he was the first staff member at university to believe I had ability and transmit that to me; he remained an inspiration.

James Cornford took over as professor in my second year; rather dashing, fun and dusty with chalk for some reason, setting the tone for youth (the lecturers must nearly all have been unusually young, though I guess to us then, 30 was out of sight). How better to sum him up than to quote from obituaries after his recent death? "He was full of fun and mischief, but underlying that was a real seriousness of purpose, and a capacity to puncture any kind of humbug or sloppy thinking. ..deeply sceptical of management dogma his style was collegial, he led by persuasion. One remembers above all his sharpness and clarity of thought, his irreverent sense of humour and his innate decency and kindness."

Meanwhile frenetic John Erickson dashed about the department and the Soviet Union, moody but inspiring. His course on strategic ideas and modern war was unusual and interesting, his sherry receptions in the department with generals and admirals extraordinary and memorable – but why were they decked in full uniform? Henry Drucker with his contemplative pipe, quietly forcing us to think, seemed very learned and wise: his untimely death later felt a cruel waste. Martin Clark seemed even brainier, and detachedly cynical – which I came to think was much more likely to be disillusioned idealism.

In fact, they all seemed heavy with brains, like contemplative young Irish Soviet expert David Holloway, and the tall, shy and kind political theorist John Wilson, plunged into gloom that he'd reached his grand old 30th birthday. Richard McAllister would dazzle our international politics tutorials by machine-gunning expressive French to his mysterious phone callers. We imagined them some hugely important French politicians or cravatted diplomats. We counted with fascination how many cigarettes Charlie Raab chain-smoked in early lectures before he quit, to turn strongly

anti-smoke. “Tome Three” he’d scribble with despairing wit, on my endlessly-long essays about African politics.

Great was it indeed in that dawn to be alive. The late 1960s and early ‘70s were a wonderful time to be young, relatively secure, and politically driven. Across the world young people were changing the world. We were naive in our political idealism, carrying out momentous acts like liberating the university cafeteria. In some ways, that naivety was a virtue and strength; in other ways a fault that looms embarrassingly in the recollection.

Marcuse was all the rage: It was too tempting to swallow aspects of the political philosopher’s writings. Especially his disillusion with the mainstream working class as agents of and allies in radical change – after all, when student “Trots” went down to support the miners in an industrial dispute, the workers chucked water on their heads. We gave up on them uneasily, in favour of?.....well, ourselves and a ragbag of ill-defined marginalised groups about whom we knew even less!

Yet we were barely aware that the university servitors working among us were earning less than five shillings an hour – nor that countless Scottish homes were still unfit to live in. We would tease or criticise student colleagues like Philip Mawer (whose distinguished career was to follow) for their serious immersion in bread-and-butter university politics. Gradualist social improvements seemed dull and inadequate for such momentous times. I recall James angrily explaining in the coffee room: “I am a child of the Thirties” after listening to much Marcusean-ism: defending the postwar welfare state’s hungrily-needed, hard-fought social reforms that we did not remember. We were bemused, yet his outburst stayed in my mind till I understood it much later.

More accurate than naive, perhaps, was the judgment of my first-year tutorial group. We were shocked by the ideas of a couple of talkative, hardline right-wingers in the group, who went on to St Andrews University (as most right-wing thinkers did!) Those ideas seemed socially irresponsible, and politically off the scale. That was correct I think: one of them later became a major adviser to Margaret Thatcher, his off-the-scale ideas put into national practice. Harry Hanham was a mischievous devils’ advocate, goading us to respond, appearing to agree with them, even when (hopefully) he did not!

Most of us were certainly naive in barely even noticing feminist issues – such important parts of my own later political commitment. Looking back, that lack of thought was first of all a sign of the times. New wave feminism developed partly out of students’ increasing politicisation and confidence in the ‘60s, and gradually from women’s exasperation at the burial of women’s issues and at degradations within the radical movement; but it was still nascent then. I remember the shock many of us felt in the early ‘70s when Women’s Aid groups began speaking at universities. In my sheltered world, I had never heard of men beating up their wives or partners.

The politics staff at that time were all male, and occasionally you’d feel rather baffled to hear criticism of this. I felt quite flattered and “one of the boys” to be in a department whose students were also heavily male. This is embarrassing now, but that’s how it was then. Awareness may also have been submerged because my recollection is of a non-sexist atmosphere of equality and respect (intellectual and otherwise) between students and staff. This made the department progressive and

admirable for its time, given the ghastly tales from female students in other departments.

It's blush-making now to think how very little I retained – then or now – from those four years of study, debates, exams, and voluminous lecture notes on Machiavelli, international politics, developing nations or modern warfare – all washed down with gallons of coffee. What on earth did Locke say anyway? Did we understand anything about the real world of politics we would meet afterwards?

Not much in my case: heading straight into the cauldron of Belfast in the worst years of the Troubles, I had to learn new truths in a hurry. For instance, that in many parts of the world people see politics as a zero-sum game, where one side's gain must be the other's loss; that people are not clearcut goodies or baddies, but come in shades of grey where good brave people can kill, and bad people sit back to encourage them; most of all that passion and total commitment are not always a good thing in politics. I learned ever after to value the fact that in "boring" British politics, very few people kill through their idealism.

Naivety or unpreparedness for harsh realities apart, those years in Edinburgh's politics department had a profound impact on me and I know on many others. We were respected as equals, led and encouraged to think for ourselves and argue for ourselves; immersed in challenging ideas and critical discussion and neither of these things ought to leave anyone; and the values of social justice have stayed with most of us ever after, whatever profound disillusionments with British political realities that has brought.

I have stayed angry, and stubbornly a left-wing Herbert Gussett, which may date me indeed. But maybe one day, our time will come round again...

Annex 5: Richard Parry (1970-1974; student)

My first face-to-face contact with the department was in early 1970 when, having already been accepted to study Politics and Modern History, I came with my parents to an Open Day and we saw James Cornford in his office in William Robertson Building. James, dressed in what I remember as an ever-present grey herringbone tweed jacket, said ‘this is Dr Drucker my director of studies’ and that was the start of my relationship with these great mentors. Henry never actually taught me, but it was a heady experience to be able to sign up – unusual in the university at the time – for one of James’s Politics 1 tutorials, where he addressed us as Mr or Miss so and so, and to experience the his fearlessly critical intellect that was also elegantly well-connected to the English intellectual aristocracy.

Politics 1 lectures, on British and American politics and some political theory, were already given in the William Robertson Building room 8. They were given mostly by James but also Douglas Nobbs and Henry (who started a lecture on the 1970 mid-term US elections by saying ‘in Britain politicians stand for office, in the United States they run. The metaphor is apt’ – one of the rather small number of sound-bites I remember from my lectures (along with Richard McAllister’s apoplectic outrage the day after Bloody Sunday in Northern Ireland in 1972)). The building, the new Main Library, the Pollock Halls and further demolition around Potterrow lent an air of architectural modernity to our studies (a temporary one, as the department moved back to Buccleuch Place in the mid-1970s). The refinement of student politics along various nuances of far left theory had become totally normal. We had our own departmental library and seminar room in WRB (where coffee was served for all in the morning), with an extraordinary democracy of lecturers and undergraduate students not far apart in age.

There were just so few of us, around 15 per honours cohort. Classes fitted easily into the seminar room. There were no taught postgraduates and few PhD researchers; tutorials were mainly taken by lecturers; we ran a Politics Society to which luminaries like the BBC and LSE’s Robert McKenzie and our own Principal Michael Swann were glad to come (there being no regular departmental seminars). We took part in departmental meetings, pushing through a change to examine third year work at the end of that year (thought it was not marked until after the Finals) and allowing an optional dissertation. Student representation on Boards of Studies and the Faculty of Social Sciences helped these changes, innovative for the time, to be accepted. Quickly I moved out of stuffy History, took Economic History 2 very happily as an outside subject, and did an honours curriculum that included no political theory or research methods at all (how could that have been possible?). Longer-lasting friendships with Martin Clark, Michael Clarke, David Holloway and Charles Raab resulted. Chris Allen, Ronnie Irving and John Holloway were also on the scene. John Erickson, the most celebrated member of staff, was an occasional and detached presence as if emerging from a 1960s cold war spy film. Michael Clarke became BBC Scotland’s election pundit, James Cornford casting a beady eye on his seduction by the media at the February 1974 election party at James’s house in Trinity. Michael, helping to advise on local government reorganization in Scotland, found himself offered a policy planning job with the new Lothian region in 1975, a loss to the academic world rectified years later when he became Professor of Local Government Studies, and later Pro-Vice Chancellor, at Birmingham University.

As a student I captured a great fragment of the department's history in which fissures between political theory, European and international politics, public policy studies and single-country politics were evident in the interests of the staff but they were less set in their ways than later. It was a great vintage, best drunk young. The hosting of the IPSA conference in 1976, under the administration of former student Sarah Kilbey, was an important accolade, as was the embrace of devolution in the Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland. James Cornford's departure, during an era when the professor was explicitly the leader, marked a change of tone, as the bold internal promotion that had advanced James could not be repeated on behalf of the implicit *primus inter pares* Henry Drucker.

During the John Mackintosh era I was working in the civil service though to my eternal gratitude I slipped into one of his first year lectures (on housing policy) in 1978, the one session he took. Leaving the civil service in that year, I wrote my letter of resignation in James's new Outer Circle Policy Unit. Planning to return to postgraduate study in the department (though this was trumped by the offer of a research job at Strathclyde by Richard Rose) I had a single meeting with Mackintosh, not knowing that he had only weeks to live.

In 1981 I did return as a Leverhulme Research Fellow on central-local relations in Scotland, also doing some tutoring and course teaching before moving to a lectureship in Social Policy in 1983. Malcolm Anderson was head, and a model academic; I recall a networking dinner he gave at Abden House at which the unknown Alex Salmond, not yet 30, was a guest. But by that time Henry Drucker, still only a Senior Lecturer, was the uncrowned king among the students, taking them on trips to by-elections that resulted in journal articles by the 'Edinburgh University Politics Group'; fascinated, I tagged along to Tony Benn's by-election campaign at Chesterfield in 1984 and got into a public meeting closed to the media. In 1983, Henry was propelled into Michael Clarke's old role on BBC Scotland election television after Strathclyde's William Miller moved to 'commercial', and until 1987 I became his chief of staff in the task, as we put teams of students on to the BBC payroll on election nights (including a long-haired John Swinney). Helped by his devoted wife Nancy (a lecturer in Social Administration) Henry edited *The Scottish Government Yearbook*, launched the pioneering textbook, *Developments in British Politics*, and was able to write a journal account of the 1983 Labour leadership election from a position of close Labour Party friendship with the two campaign managers, John Smith and Robin Cook. His move to Oxford was a huge loss and also a commentary on the balance between old and new academic norms in the University's perception of its talent.

To my mind the strength of Edinburgh Politics has been its brand name, resulting in an extraordinary, continuing demand for student places, and the appetite it showed for 'real' politics the world over as well as political science. We were junkies for political journalism, party infighting and elections as much as for scientific theory, as evidenced by the succession of future politicians and journalists who passed through the student body. The original 1960s structure, with its strong connections to History, Philosophy and Economics was a more comfortable one than the 21st century School of Social and Political Science. When I came I suppose it was at the cusp of a university atmosphere set even for the youngest staff in the 1950s, and the colourful radicalism of the 1970s. We had the assurance of the old and the excitement of the new – a wonderful realisation of the potential of university life.

Annex 6: Richard McAllister (1966-present; Assistant Lecturer, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer and Honorary Fellow)

I joined the Department in 1966, having (after Cambridge) spent a couple of years with the UK Diplomatic Service. I thus joined a very small outfit – Harry Hanham; Douglas Nobbs; James Cornford; Charles Raab; Martin Clark; me – in the process of rapid expansion of its ‘footprint’ –in terms both of its own offerings and its connexions and alliances across the University.

To illustrate how different were those times, one personal anecdote. I well remember one of the first (ever) ‘lectures’ I gave in the University. It was the inauguration of a course called European Institutions and the European Movement. The ‘audience’ consisted of three Professors (Hanham; John Mitchell [then Constitutional Law]; Iain MacGibbon [International Law]) and four students. It was on the ‘Ideas of Monnet and Schuman and the Treaties of Paris and Rome’. Since the Professors did not themselves agree on the nature and implications of these Treaties (for MacGibbon, ‘just more International Treaties’; for Mitchell a new and *sui generis* set-up not classifiable simply as IL; for Hanham a puzzle that raised a quizzical eyebrow, [or a twiddle of the ‘worry-beads’]) this was a fine introduction to being ‘dropped in at the deep end’. It was, however, more than that for me: the beginning of a long involvement with teaching and research on the European Communities/Union. Edinburgh was early in on the act and has ever since retained a focus on the very important issues – both ‘theoretical’ and practical – involved. It was also, for me, the start of a long and I believe fruitful relationship with colleagues in Law.

Because we were running pretty fast to ‘work up’ and put on new courses, the research output was for quite some time not prolific. That didn’t mean that what there was lacked importance. One ‘joint venture’ was the book Cornford edited, *The Failure of the State*, with contributions from six of us and an Introduction by the editor. Another ‘joint venture’ was the format of the (then) political theory course, which sought both to ‘locate’ and to relate politics vis-à-vis the other social sciences, and thus involved several of us. And the Department was involved in quite a few other ventures across the disciplines: on (the then more significant) EFTA notably with the economists – Professors Nat Wolfe, Ian Stewart etc; and on the future of European defence and security, an international conference involving John Erickson, James Cornford, and John Mitchell, *inter alia*, on the home team, and written up by me.

I think it’s fair to say that most of the students from the ‘early period’ had some pioneering attributes. This was inevitable, given that several of the courses to which they were committing themselves had little by way of previous ‘form’ or reputation. Relatively small numbers helped, however, in creating a lively atmosphere less possible post-*massification*.

Other activities in which I was involved (a small selection only) have included:

- time spent at US Universities: an intensive (and very hot) ‘moon-landing’ summer at the University of Michigan’s prestigious Institute for Social Research; and a year’s exchange when I worked at UCLA at the time of ‘Watergate’ and Nixon’s departure;
- time spent with James Cornford’s *Outer Circle Policy Unit* in London, writing the monograph *Local Government: Death or Devolution?*

- time spent in Brussels getting to know more about the processes of *influencing* and shaping policy.

- with John Erickson, David Holloway and others – the Universities/Services Study Group (USSG), which always included both academics and members of the armed forces and, in the early and mid-1970s, produced a number of papers on civil/military relations; recruitment and retention in the face of educational change and (un)employment; and comparative profiles of the military in three European states – the UK, France and the Federal Republic of Germany.

- pioneering, from about 1984 to 1993, with a colleague from the University of Keele, the *Annual Review of the Activities of the European Communities* for the University Association for Contemporary European Studies and then the *Journal of Common Market Studies*: (it has now, with a bigger, new team expanded to ‘book-length’ each year).

- running Erasmus ‘year abroad’ exchange programmes: our most successful being with the *Institut d’Études Politiques* at Grenoble; less successful (because of lack of sufficient language competence among the UK students) with Bonn. It was of course necessary to stress that Grenoble was *not* an ‘extended ski-ing holiday’; and rather forcefully to remind people that not merely would they be taught in the other language but that they would be examined in it. Few seemed to come to too much harm, and over the years, many used this programme, plus the College of Europe in Bruges, to begin careers in fields related to the EC/EU. I also for several years organised and led (often with colleagues from Law) study visits to the institutions in Brussels and Luxembourg. ‘Leading’ thirty or so undergraduates on such trips could be described as ‘not for the faint-hearted’: but everyone survived. Our success in ‘populating’ Brussels was clear: on one occasion, I had arranged to meet two former students who were working in the institutions, at a café on Place Luxembourg when my attention was caught by a surprised wave and we were joined by a third. On another occasion, I mentioned to the visiting Cabinet Office ‘Euro Fast Stream’ recruiter that we had scored three out of three ‘Blue Book’ successes in the previous year, which she deemed unmatched. ‘What do you do to them?’ – ‘Motivate them, of course!’

There have also been popular exchanges with several leading North American universities which, too, have served as jumping-off points for some notable careers. The four-year degree – similar to most others in Europe and North America - greatly facilitates this ‘Junior Year Abroad’ option: our students who choose it do the two ‘ordinary’ years here, then the JYA, and return for the final year.

Other teaching (once I had shifted from the entire International Politics (IR) course to the European Community) included –

- our first course on quantitative approaches/ methods in the study of politics (jointly with Michael Clarke, who went on to Birmingham);

- a course for joint Politics/Economics (when we finally managed to create the degree -against some resistance!) with Malcolm Anderson and Stuart Sayer of Economics: ‘The Making of Economic Policy’.

- a full-year course jointly with Ronnie Irving on contemporary France: 'Institutions and Politics of the Fifth French Republic'. (At one time, the Department had a 'suite' of specialist course-offerings on other major European states as well as France. This at least gave students with any serious grasp of other languages a forum in which to retain/enhance that).

Some mention might also be made of other 'outreach' activities - 'other public involvement'/dissemination: consultancies; broadcasting etc. Many of us have been involved in these over the years and my own was in no way unusual. But it did include, *inter alia*, the Civil Service College; BBC including Radios 3 and 4, World Service, French Service; pieces written for the Economist Intelligence Unit; Oxford Analytica; serving on the committee of various academic bodies (such as UACES), other public bodies and governmental organisations.

A very important area, especially at times of economic flux, has been that of 'employability'. We early on developed strong links with the Careers Service, and put on quite a number of sessions and events with them. The 'Careers Evenings' in particular proved both informative and enjoyable. Former students came back to give brief presentations about not just *what* they were currently doing, but about how they got there; what had happened on the way; what had influenced them; what they liked (or didn't) about their chosen paths, and how their student time related to what had happened since. It all went to show what a wide and interesting range of careers our graduates have entered. And to see *that* is one of the pleasures and rewards of being an academic!

Annex 7: Malcolm Anderson (1979-1998; Professor of Politics; 1998-present, Professor Emeritus)⁹⁹

The succession of Professors in the early years gave a shaky start to the Department, so it was not in a good condition at the start of the 1980s. It had no clout in the university, and a low profile. There was no concept of professionalism, political science, training, research, methods, etc. except for two persons. Almost no-one had a political science degree or a regard for that discipline, and there was little receptivity to new developments. Hardly anyone went to Political Studies Association or European Consortium for Political Research conferences: for many years, we were not even a member of the latter. This was a serious weakness as we moved into the 1980s. Things began to flourish when I was Dean and Provost, with new people entering the Department, including Desmond King and others, who went to political science conferences and developed high profiles in the discipline. But there were personal difficulties as well. The Department needed a Professor who had status and standing in the university, and a good run of years to make a difference. It is worth mentioning that no-one who was appointed between 1979 and 1989 – my years of Headship – was someone whom I did not want.

It was important to open up Politics to other Departments, subjects and initiatives because we were not getting research funding. One such initiative was towards a Scottish Civil Service training place, similar to the one used by the Civil Service in Sunningdale. Lewis Gunn (Professor of Administration, Strathclyde Business School) was involved, and I got John Burnett (University Principal) and Sir Kerr Fraser (Permanent Secretary, Scottish Office) into the picture but the Civil Service would not go along with it because they preferred to go to events at Sunningdale for training and possible career mobility. So it came to nothing. James Cornford had had this idea before I did, but I did not know this at the time.¹⁰⁰ It was my idea to give Honorary Fellowships to retired civil servants such as Angus Mitchell, formerly Secretary of the Scottish Education Department, and Eric Gillett, who was from the Scottish Development Department. But then this idea faded. I wanted to have Modern Studies school teachers as Fellows, but they could not get in-service release for this.

A good sign was that there were colleagues who were active in other Departments and units, such as the Centre of African Studies (Chris Allen) and the Centre for Educational Sociology (Charles Raab), which was very important with reference to policy studies. The Centre for European Governmental Studies (CEGS; later Europa Institute) involved me, Willie Paterson and David Edward; I was Acting Director 1981-1986 during the period of 'European Stagnation' and Paterson then capitalised on this. CEGS had been started by John Mitchell (Law), who had a fund of goodwill in Europe, but he moved it from the Law Faculty to Social Sciences, which explains why they would not fund it. I took it back to Law. There was also a departmental

⁹⁹ This Annex has been edited by Charles Raab from Malcolm Anderson's written notes and a subsequent conversation.

¹⁰⁰ Footnote by Charles Raab: Raab and Drucker knew this. For an interesting footnote: see <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/catalogue/DisplayCatalogueDetails.asp?CATID=182&CATLN=1&FullDetails=True&j=1> where it says 'in November 1968 the Civil Service Department took over from the Treasury the work on planning for setting up the College on three sites in central London, Edinburgh and Sunningdale.' Eugene Grebenik was the first Principal of the Civil Service College at Sunningdale from 1970 to 1976, and I recall that his name was frequently mentioned in Edinburgh too. The Edinburgh centre of the Civil Service College was opened in 1970, but public expenditure manpower cuts forced its closure in 1976.

presence outside the University in the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES), through Richard McAllister, Ronnie Irving, and me. But the link to CEGS did not bring in postgraduates or research money because no-one in the Department was that way inclined. Also, no-one in the Department thought it useful to apply to the ESRC for research funding. Henry Drucker and the Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland was important. Henry was a brilliant Politics I lecturer, and that was very important in pulling students in. His writings were criticised by some as somewhat lightweight, but he was productive, especially on Scotland. He had lots of external contacts, he remembered students, and he followed them up.

There were some difficulties about the part played by John Erickson in the Department. John was an eccentric in the old-fashioned manner, and had a very wide impact although he did not do the expected routine job of work that others were doing. I therefore moved him out of Politics and into a separate Defence Studies unit (it was not a Department). He was sometimes given to unverifiable stories about himself and his work, but he had real achievements, especially externally. Unfortunately, he clashed with David Holloway, the other Soviet specialist, and that caused severe problems.

The departmental Marxists and leftists posed no difficulties, but there was the potential for that, given the mood amongst students, but that faded in the late 1980s. I had good relations with Richard Gunn, but not with John Holloway. Alice Brown liked and approved of John Holloway, but she moved on. During my time, we appointed many women, which was a very good thing, and they have been crucial to the success of the Department.

Overall, there had been objective reasons for the difficulties, but the Department – under different labels and circumstances – has overcome its difficulties well.

Annex 8: Mary Buckley (1983-2000; Lecturer to Reader)

When I was appointed to the Department in 1983 to teach Soviet Politics, I was the only female member of staff. After spending my graduate years in Vanderbilt and Michigan Universities where women were on the faculty, this felt somewhat strange and rather out of date. Although the Department had a very male atmosphere, I remember it as a place of great gossip. In my first week I realised that the stereotype of women as ‘gossips’ was way off the mark. Men were just as good at this as women.

For me the job was a wonderful liberation. After coming back to the UK from the USA, I worked in London for two years. Having few contacts in the UK, I had to go out and find teaching work and approach institutions in person. I ended up employed part-time in seven institutions in London, teaching from 9am until 9.30pm. I worked at the LSE, Working Men’s College, Open University, Polytechnic of Central London, City Literary Institute, Institute of Education and University of London Extra Mural Department. I had to teach across the social sciences from political theory, British Politics, World Politics, Soviet Politics and Sociology to Women’s Studies. I taught whatever was needed in an attempt to break into a job somehow.

The Edinburgh Politics Department offered me one job, in one place, responsible for a specialist subject. I felt very lucky and privileged to have the post and I loved the work. The salary was twice as much as I had earned in seven places simultaneously in London and the teaching hours much lower. At last I had time to do research. I loved the freedom of the post more than anything. I could design my own course with no-one looking over my shoulder. I felt a huge space to do what I wanted. In that, I thrived. And research grants from Nuffield, the Carnegie Trust, British Academy and ESRC enabled me to go to the USSR, then Russia. In short, the freedom given to me by the Edinburgh Politics Department allowed me to flourish. I remember publishers knocking on my door for book contracts – something that would never have happened outside a full-time job. Again, it was all very enabling.

There was also a good fellowship among some colleagues, which made life pleasant and supportive. On my first day in Edinburgh Henry Drucker rang me at home and said ‘I’m Henry Drucker. Let’s have lunch.’ I had never met him before but he was so welcoming and supportive and we had a lovely lunch in Stockbridge which I shall always remember. Colleagues in my early days also used to go for a Friday night drink at the Jolly Judge on the Royal Mile, which was generally convivial. This routine must have lasted over two years or so. Welcoming dinner parties also took place. I remember such events at Malcolm Anderson’s and Charles Raab’s. These gatherings mattered very much for morale, for cementing good feeling and for making one feel a sense of belonging.

Finally, I remember once meeting Malcolm Anderson on the stairwell and commenting to him how none of his conferences on Western Europe ever concerned gender. He came back to me pretty quickly with the suggestion that we co-organise one. As a result, the conference and the book *Women, Equality and Europe* appeared. It is my only publication that is not on Russia but was intellectually stimulating and good fun. It is one more illustration of how the Department was an enabling place for me. I got a great deal out of it intellectually and it was the setting that made me

academically. In sum, it set me up very solidly on my career ladder. For that I am hugely grateful.

Teaching Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics at Honours level was highly stimulating for me. It was always a pleasure to watch students go on in this field and make it their career path too. For instance, Kenneth Wilson got a first in Politics, did post-graduate work in Glasgow and at St Antony's and is now an academic teaching Russian politics. I also remember in 1989 taking a group of very keen students to Moscow, Vilnius and Leningrad. We met with Sajudis (the nationalist movement in Lithuania) and listened to their views on how fast they should win independence from the USSR. I arranged travel with a new cooperative organisation so the students could stay in the homes of Soviet citizens and not in hotels. It was a time of rapid change and the students who came with me learned a great deal there.

I should also mention collaborative projects. When I was working in the late 1990s on perceptions in Russia of international issues, I was acutely aware that how political actors in Russia viewed intervention in Kosovo differed greatly from politicians in other states. Then I looked around the Department and saw various specialists of different states and decided to draw them together. I invited Sally Cummings to co-edit a book with me drawing on the expertise in the Department. In *Kosovo: Perceptions of War and its Aftermath*, we included chapters by Roland Dannreuther, Robert Singh, Richard McAllister, Martin Clark, Sally Cummings, John Erickson and myself. Nine others across different universities wrote for me as well. If anything, the book highlighted the research strengths within the Department.

Having put the Kosovo volume together, it was easy to draw on the same specialists when I produced *Global Responses to Terrorism: 9/11, Afghanistan and Beyond*. I co-edited this with Rick Fawn and again included chapters from the Edinburgh Department by Robert Singh, Richard McAllister, Roland Dannreuther and Sally Cummings.

Annex 9: Alice Brown (1979-2002; student, Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Professor; 2008-present as Professor Emeritus and Honorary Fellow)

Introduction

I look back at my time at the University of Edinburgh, and the Department of Politics in particular, with great affection and gratitude. I can honestly say that if it had not been for my experience as a student and member of staff within the Department, I would not have enjoyed many of the opportunities that subsequently opened up for me. I should explain that I left school at 15 (without the permission of my parents) determined to earn a living. I married young and had two children before deciding to return to study in 1979 when I was in my thirties. I was encouraged to do so by my husband, Alan, who had himself returned to study History at the University when he was in his mid-twenties. It is worth noting that we both received mature student grants that provided some financial assistance to allow us to pursue our studies. And, of course, there were no student fees at the time.

My experience of the Department is, therefore, drawn from my time as a student, as a member of staff (including as Head of Department) and later as one of the University's Vice Principals.

Student Life

Why Politics? I had not originally intended to study Politics when I became a student at Edinburgh. Indeed I signed up for an Economics and Business Studies degree. Having worked in the private sector before returning to full-time education, I soon tired of studying business and looked for a greater intellectual challenge. I found it in the study of Politics. Initially I took Politics as an outside course, but then became hooked. It was at this time that a new Honours Degree in Economics and Politics was introduced, largely following pressure from the then Head of Department, Professor John Mackintosh. This was an ideal opportunity for me, as I saw it, to combine the two areas that interested me most – Economics and Politics – and to develop my understanding of the links between the two subject areas.

Another important factor for choosing to study Politics was the way in which the Department welcomed mature students who had pursued a non-traditional route to higher education. I made friends with the younger students but also with others who had returned to study later in life such as those who had come through the trade union movement and initially studied at Newbattle Abbey College. Housed in a tenement building in Buccleuch Place, students made themselves at home in the Department and especially valued the fact that the Department had its own Library which could be used over the weekend as well as weekdays. The Politics Library became home from home for many and a forum for meeting and debating political ideas.

First year lectures on British Politics whetted my appetite for the subject. I thoroughly enjoyed Henry Drucker's lectures and the way in which he sought to connect much of the study of Politics to the practice. For example, because of Henry's interests and connections, students were able to participate directly in election campaigns. Students from the Department were involved in the famous Hillhead by-election in 1982 when Roy Jenkins from the recently formed Social Democratic Party (SDP) won the seat

from the Conservative Party and caused an embarrassing defeat for the Labour Party who had hoped to gain the seat themselves.

During the first year I was also introduced to the ideas in Political Theory and still remember the impact of reading Aristotle and Plato for the first time. Other texts, such as Bernard Crick's book, *In Defence of Politics*, still stick in my mind and I became engrossed in the writings of Paul Addison and Andrew Gamble who sought to explain post-war history, politics and economics.

My interest continued through my second year when we turned to look at European Politics and comparative study. I particularly recall the excellent lectures given by Richard McAllister and David Holloway, who participated in the lecture series. The decision was then made that I would transfer to a joint Honours course in Economics and Politics.

In the next two years – 1981-1983 - my Honours courses covered a range of topics including Economic Policy – a course I would later go on to teach – and introduced me to new ideas including Marxist theory taught by John Holloway. I also opted to write a dissertation on Training Policy – a lively topic at the time because of high youth unemployment. I have a real sense of *déjà vu* as many of the debates about youth unemployment today mirror those of the 1980s. My dissertation was my first real introduction to independent research, which I thoroughly enjoyed. Supervised by the then Head of Department, Professor Malcolm Anderson, I learned the skills of quantitative as well as qualitative research methods and set off to interview people as part of the study. It was then that I interviewed the late John Fairley, who at the time was working at the GLC in London. (John and I went on to work together on different labour market research projects. Those were, of course, the days of Thatcherite Britain which provoked strong and opposing opinions about the impact of the Conservative government's policies in general and on Scotland in particular.

I graduated from the University with a First Class joint degree - an MA in Economics and Politics – in 1983. I was also honoured to receive the DP Heatley Prize that year although I have to confess that I did not know who DP Heatley was at that time. Having read a draft of Charles Raab's excellent history of the Department, I now know about DP Heatley's part in the story of the study of Politics at Edinburgh.

At that stage, I thought I would be leaving the University and looking for employment. However, with the encouragement of Malcolm Anderson and the late Professor Vincent Wright who was the external examiner of my dissertation, I decided to consider postgraduate study. I was fortunate in that an ESRC studentship was advertised to support the study of the Advisory Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS). This involved the Department of Economic History and ACAS collaborating in supporting a full-time studentship. I applied and was successful, and then began my time as a postgraduate student supervised by Roger Davidson in the Department of Economic History and Malcolm Anderson in Politics. Little did I know at the time just how instrumental and helpful this work would be to me in later life.

Academic Career

My first academic job was a temporary lectureship in Economics at the University of Stirling from 1984-1985. One year later (1985-1986) I returned to Edinburgh

University to teach Economics, as a temporary replacement for Stuart Sayer who was on sabbatical leave. This included responsibility for joint teaching of the Economics and Politics course on which I had been a student myself. I held two further temporary posts, the first in Politics (1986-1987) and the second a joint post with Extra-Mural Studies (1987-1990) before obtaining my first tenured post as a Lecturer in Politics in 1990. I was promoted to Senior Lecturer in 1992 and then awarded a Personal Chair in Politics in 1997. During this period I was Head of the Politics Department (1995-1998) as well as Head of the Faculty Planning Unit (1996-1998). In 1998 my career took a new turn when I was appointed as Co-Director of the Institute of Governance (formerly the Governance of Scotland Forum) with Professor David McCrone; and appointed as a Vice-Principal of the University one year later in 1999 by the then Principal, Professor Sir Stewart Sutherland. In 2002 I left the University to take up the position as Scotland's first Scottish Public Services Ombudsman, a post I held until my retirement in 2009.

My time in the Department covered the three key areas of academic life – teaching, research and administration – and my memories of these are summarised below. It is important to note the significance of the interaction between these three roles as well as the impact and relationship with public policy and engagement in public life. I have, therefore, organized my reflections under these headings.

Administration

When I was a student in the Department of Politics I could never have imagined that one day I would be the Head of Department. Malcolm Anderson was Head of Department during my initial period in the Department, followed by the late Chris Allen. Professor Russell Keat joined the Department when I was Head and subsequently took over this role from me at the end of my term of office. I had enormous support from these colleagues in progressing my career and in addressing the many challenges that come with the responsibility of heading up the Department. For example, Russell worked directly with me when I was Head in helping to prepare the Department for its first experience of the Teaching Quality Assessment (TQA). His input was invaluable, not least because the introduction of this initiative was a huge challenge for the academic community and marked a shift in government policy towards universities. It is true to say that a number of colleagues did not welcome this shift. Nevertheless it was a policy that had a number of positive outcomes for the Department. I particularly recall our first 'Away Day' at a venue outside Edinburgh on the east coast. It served to bring colleagues closer together as a team and helped facilitate a collective approach to teaching – quality and content - in the Department. And we had some fun on the way! It also helped pave the way for the second government initiative, the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), which followed and which concentrated on research and the links with teaching. In preparing for the TQA, I also worked closely with David McCrone, who was Head of the Department of Sociology at the time. I learned a lot from Dave's experience of being a departmental Head and am grateful for all the advice he gave me during the TQA period and more generally during my time as Head.

Before becoming Head of Department, I held other administrative posts. I was a Director of Studies, a role that improved my own understanding of the courses offered in the University and the opportunities for cross-disciplinary work; and introduced me to the workings of the University administration – an area that had previously been

completely baffling to me. It was during this time that the then Head of Department, Malcolm Anderson, asked me to take on a new role as Women's Adviser. He had decided to create this position in response to demand from a number of women students who felt that it would be important, in certain circumstances, to be able to discuss issues with a female member of staff. Of course, like most academic departments, female staff were in a minority in Politics. Nevertheless, I had the pleasure to work with a number of first class women – including Mary Buckley, Pippa Norris and Kimberly Hutchings – and also to see the promotion of women I had taught and supervised like Fiona Mackay. My administrative role developed further in the roles of Co-Director of the Institute of Governance and as one of the University's Vice-Principals with responsibility for Community Relations.

Teaching

My teaching responsibilities in the Department covered giving lectures to the first year Politics students on British Politics, and my area of specialism was post-war political history. This extended up to the time when Margaret Thatcher became Prime Minister in 1979 and the period of Conservative government from 1979-1997. As indicated, I also taught on the Honours course on Economic Policy. In addition, I developed new areas of teaching, namely Women and Politics and Scottish Politics, which were to prove to be central to my research interests and role in contributing to public policy. Women and Politics was a course initially taught by Mary Buckley. I then taught the course jointly with her before taking over responsibility for the course when Mary moved on to a Chair in Politics at Royal Holloway, University of London. Teaching this course enhanced my own understanding of feminist theory and stimulated my interest in researching the role of women in politics and public life.

My other new area of interest, Scottish Politics, could not have been developed at a more appropriate time. During the 1980s and 1990s the campaign for a Scottish Parliament gathered momentum. I taught a number of courses for undergraduate and postgraduate students over the years on this topic, and a lot of this teaching was either delivered jointly with Dave McCrone or collaboratively with others including Lindsay Paterson and Eberhard Bort. It was a fascinating time and provided a unique opportunity to link the theory and practice of politics at a crucial stage in Scotland's history.

Over the years I also supervised a number of students undertaking PhD study, two of whom now work in the School of Social and Political Science – Fiona Mackay and Ailsa Henderson. I thoroughly enjoyed teaching and learned a lot from those I taught. As a teacher, it is extremely rewarding to see your students thrive and flourish and very satisfying to see them develop their careers. I taught a number of people who are prominent in politics and public life including John Swinney (Cabinet Secretary in the current Scottish Government), Douglas Alexander (former Minister in the last Labour Government at Westminster) and others in the media such as Emma Simpson and Paola Buonadonna (both BBC reporters), to mention just a few. It is rewarding too when former students come up to you and introduce themselves. This still happens to me even though it is some time since I taught in the Department.

Research

Much of my teaching helped inspire my research interests and research projects. My first major research grant from the ESRC was obtained with Professor Janette Webb,

then in the Department of Business Studies. Jan and I had a mutual interest in arbitration which was the subject of both our PhDs but which we approached from different academic disciplines and perspectives. It was through discussions with Jan that we developed our ideas for a research project on studying the experience of women returners to higher education. We were successful in obtaining further research funding for different gender research projects that we conducted with Fiona Mackay and Esther Breitenbach.

Esther, Fiona and I obtained other research grants over the years from the Equal Opportunities Commission and the ESRC and others to study the role of women in political and public life and measures to increase the participation of women in politics. This research was to be extremely relevant in the debates surrounding the creation of a Scottish Parliament in the 1990s as one of the key questions was how to achieve more equal representation of women in the new parliament. This was reflected in the work of the Scottish Constitutional Convention and the approaches taken by the different political parties to the issue. Scottish politics and constitutional change were also central to my research and publication activities. In pursuing this work I collaborated with Dave McCrone and Lindsay Paterson.

It is important to note, as is outlined in Charles' history of the Department, that the work on Scottish politics and constitutional change was part of a long tradition within the Department. Very early on in my academic career I was asked to participate in the Unit for the Study of Government in Scotland and also to co-edit the Scottish Government Yearbook with David McCrone. David and I were editors for some years until Lindsay Paterson took over the role. In response to demand for more frequent publications. The quarterly journal, *Scottish Affairs*, was established to replace the Yearbook and it continues to thrive today. The three of us – Dave, Lindsay, and I – also jointly published a book on *Politics and Society in Scotland* and were responsible for other publications with Professor John Curtice and others analysing the results of the British and Scottish Social Attitude Surveys.

Interest in Scottish politics and constitutional change was widespread and the Department was often approached by media from different parts of the world to help explain political developments in Scotland. This leads me neatly to the inter-relationship with the outside world and public life.

Public Life and Public Policy

I referred earlier to the way in which Henry Drucker involved students in political life during their studies in the Department. Henry was also responsible for establishing the JP Mackintosh lecture series, following John's untimely death. What was unique about the series is that Henry very much involved the people from John's political constituency in East Lothian, and the lectures were held alternately at the University and in the constituency. This was a development that was highly valued by those who knew and worked with John during his political career.

Other members of staff were also involved in interacting with the policy community. For example, very early on in my academic career I recall Malcolm Anderson hosting dinners in his flat in the New Town for politicians, civil servants and other policy-makers including Alex Salmond and the late Robin Cook. The object was to make important links between the department and the outside political and policy world and to this end they were successful.

As an academic, I very much believe in being engaged in public life and contributing to public policy debates. It is a fundamental way in which academics can be accountable but also a valuable way of improving the research that we undertake. I believe it also reflects well on a Department when its members are active in this way.

Such participation can take different forms. I very much enjoyed serving on organisations including the Political Studies Association, the Economic and Social Research Council and the Scottish Funding Council and I learned a lot through the positions I held on bodies such as the Committee on Standards in Public Life (the Nolan Committee), the Equal Opportunities Commission in Scotland, the British Council and the Hansard Society. Most directly related to my teaching and research interests were the roles I played in serving on the Scottish Constitutional Commission of the Scottish Constitutional Convention (where we made recommendations for a new electoral system and gender balance in the Scottish Parliament) and accepting the invitation from the then Secretary of State for Scotland, the later Donald Dewar, to be a member of the Consultative Steering Group that made recommendations for the Standing Order and Procedures of the new Scottish Parliament in 1999. I feel very privileged to have played a role at the heart of constitution building in this way. I was only able to do so because of the knowledge, skills and expertise I gained in the Department of Politics as a student and an academic, and I hope I was able to feed back some of the value of these experiences to my students.

Conclusion

In writing this personal reflection I have been reminded about just how rewarding my time in the Department of Politics was and how this experience opened up so many opportunities to me in the most unexpected way. I was immensely proud, therefore, to be made an Honorary Fellow of the Department and then to be granted the title of Professor Emeritus in 2008 before receiving an Honorary Degree from the University (Honoris Causa) in 2010.

I have not done justice to all I learned and the skills I gained in the Department of Politics - from those who taught me and those who became my colleagues and with whom I worked directly in teaching, researching and engaging in public life. Can I take this opportunity to say a huge 'Thank You' to all of you. I owe you a great deal.

Annex 10: Russell Keat (1994-2006; Professor of Political Theory, 2006-present, Professor Emeritus and Honorary Fellow)

Introduction

I arrived in the Politics Department in January 1994 to take up the newly created Chair of Political Theory. I had spent the previous 24 years in the Philosophy Department at Lancaster University, one of the ‘new universities’ of the 1960s. I had never worked in a Politics Department. But at Lancaster I had for many years taught a joint course in contemporary political philosophy for politics and philosophy students, so maybe that, together with my research on the ethics and politics of markets, made my appointment seem a bit less implausible. As it turned out, it was my other main research and teaching interests, in the philosophy of the social sciences, and social theory, that proved to be more relevant.

At the time I arrived, the Department was located at 31 Buccleuch Place, and I was allocated what seemed to me an enormous room near the top of the building, previously occupied by John Erickson. Chris Allen was coming towards the end of a long period as Head of Department. He had taken over this role when the Professor of Politics, Malcolm Anderson, became Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences. After his period as Dean, much of Malcolm’s time and energy went into establishing and running (with the assistance of Eberhard ‘Paddy’ Bort) the International Social Sciences Institute. Located at High School Yards, along with the Unit for the Study of Scotland (co-directed by David McCrone from Sociology, and Alice Brown from Politics), ISSI provided a home for visiting fellows from other (mainly overseas) universities, and organised seminars and conferences around annual research themes. It aimed to be, for the social sciences, something similar to the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities, though it lacked the latter’s financial resources, and was disbanded a few years after Malcolm’s retirement in 1998.

One of the first tasks I was given was to consult members of staff (and PhD students, who then included Fiona Mackay) about who should replace Chris Allen as the next Head of Department. It was quite an interesting process, especially for me as an outsider: I got to know my new colleagues a bit, none of whom I had known before, and also got some sense of the various tensions and alliances in the Department (though these also became fairly visible during Department meetings, which could be somewhat fractious at times). There were about a dozen academic staff on permanent contracts, nearly all of whom had been there for a pretty long time, and a few others who had been on a succession of short-term contracts, including Leo McCarthy and Lisa Dominguez. There was a fairly clear consensus that Alice Brown should be the next Head, probably to be followed by me. Alice, however, due to research commitments, was unable to take over until 1995-6, and Malcolm agreed to return as Head ‘for one final year’, in the interim.

Soon after I arrived, four new appointments were made: Kim Hutchings and Tim Hayward (both political theorists who, like me and the already long-time resident Richard Gunn, had philosophy as their main intellectual background), and Richard Freeman and Roland Dannreuther. This turned out to be the beginning of a succession of new appointments, and of retirements, over the next decade, so that by the time I retired in 2006, only four of the academic staff who were in the Department when I arrived were still there: Martin Clark, Richard McAllister, Richard Gunn and Charles

Raab. Alongside these big changes in personnel were a series of broader developments, which I'll describe in terms of three transitions: from 'teacher-scholars' to 'researcher-teachers'; from 'political studies' to 'political science', and from 'department' to 'subject area' (within the School of Social and Political Studies/Science).

From teacher-scholars to researcher-teachers

Like the philosophy department I had come from in Lancaster, Politics at Edinburgh was still a 'traditional' UK university department in that the primary focus was on undergraduate teaching, and academic staff mainly regarded themselves as 'scholars' rather than 'researchers'. They kept up with the literature and debates in their own field (and usually in several others), occasionally contributing to it through seminar papers and journal articles or even a monograph, and they taught introductory level broad-picture courses, plus Honours options in their own areas to quite small groups of students (a dozen or two) whom they got to know quite well, especially since they also did all the tutorial group teaching in Year 1 and 2 courses. PhD students were small in number (maybe 6 or so at any one time), and supervised by just a few of the staff. By the time I arrived, the group of PhD students connected with John Erickson (Soviet military specialist) had more or less finished, but there was a group linked to the 'Open Marxism' trio of Richard Gunn, Werner Bonefeld (now Professor at York) and John Holloway (when not teaching in Mexico), and another group (including Fiona Mackay) linked to Alice Brown, working on women and politics and Scottish politics. There were no research training courses for doctoral students. There was also one large taught Master's programme, in European and International Politics, which had proved very successful in recruitment.

This traditional pattern of undergraduate-focused teaching and scholarship was to change quite rapidly, as it did (and in some cases already had) throughout UK universities during the 1990s. The biggest driver for this was probably the increasing significance of the RAE (Research Assessment Exercise), combined with big increases in student numbers without much increase in staff numbers. In the first round of the RAE, Edinburgh Politics had scored a rather modest '3' (on a scale of 1-5). In the second, which took place a couple of years after I arrived, this improved to a respectable '4'. I doubt if the 'performance' had improved, but we were getting a bit better at presenting ourselves. In both cases, we had essentially been doing what we would be doing anyway, and then dressing it up for RAE self-representation. But it became clear that in future we'd have to start actually doing things differently, if we were to retain or improve our RAE rating (which, unlike the Teaching Quality Assessment, introduced during the mid-1990s, had serious financial implications).

This required a lot of changes, including: more focus on publications, especially in high-ranked journals; more externally funded research/projects; the recruitment of more PhD students, and the replacement of academic staff by part-time tutors (mainly our own PhD students) for tutorial group teaching, initially for Years 1 and 2 but later for large Honours courses also. These changes also meant that we had to define differently what we were looking for in job applicants. Instead of thinking primarily in terms of someone being needed to fill a gap in the department's undergraduate teaching provision, we had to look also, or even instead, at the research-profile

impact, at the potential for publications and research-funding, and so on. One indicator of this shift is that whereas in the mid-1990s we asked candidates to make presentations related to their teaching (such as a mock mini-lecture), by the early 2000s, this had been replaced by a research presentation, including plans for future research etc. This didn't mean that the staff we appointed were no longer interested in teaching, or were worse at doing it: far from it, in many cases. But there was a definite shift in ethos, at the least.

From political studies to political science

Although Politics at Edinburgh was like Philosophy at Lancaster in being a 'traditional', teacher-scholar department, one thing that was very different was the absence, in Edinburgh Politics, of any clear sense of what the 'discipline' of politics consisted in, and hence of the proper shape or contents of an undergraduate curriculum. Of course, Politics departments in the UK are more internally diverse in disciplinary terms than, say, Philosophy or Sociology departments, and this is reflected in their professional association being called the Political *Studies* Association. One element of that diversity is straightforward: the presence of political theorists/philosophers, and/or of historians of political thought, alongside their more numerous 'real-world' oriented colleagues. But what surprised me was the lack of disciplinary identity amongst the latter group, and hence of a shared view of what undergraduate students needed to learn, as students of politics.

The largest proportion of Politics staff at Edinburgh were single-country or area specialists, and their own first degrees were mainly not in politics. History was perhaps their most common background, and they certainly didn't regard themselves as social *scientists*, let alone as *political* scientists. This was reflected in the undergraduate curriculum. Politics I ran two distinct elements in tandem: British Politics and Political Theory (mainly historical texts/thinkers). Politics 2 was mainly European Politics, taught largely on a country-by-country basis. In Honours, the only required course was in Political Theory. The other courses were all options, and again mainly country/area based. And in departmental discussions of Honours courses, there was little interest in what the array of options added up to as a whole. Rather, it was assumed that individual staff members would teach whatever they were interested in.

This state of affairs began to change fairly soon after I arrived, though the debates went on for quite a number of years, and were at times a bit heated. The Year 1 and 2 courses were eventually re-shaped to embody a more explicitly comparative politics outlook, and an additional compulsory Honours course was introduced, on methods of political analysis. Although I was not, of course, any kind of political scientist myself, my previous work in the philosophy of social sciences made me sympathetic to this kind of change, as were an initially small number of other academic staff. What, in practice, made the transition take place was the appointment of new staff who were also more sympathetic to the teaching of theoretical approaches to politics, to a focus on the logic and methods of comparative politics, and so on.

From department to subject area: the formation of the School

At the time I became Head of the Politics Department, in 1997, the academic and financial organisation of the University was very different from what it is now: in particular, there were no Schools or Colleges. Instead, Departments belonged to Faculties, and the only level above Faculties (for academic matters) was the University Senatus and its committees. Politics belonged to the Faculty of Social Sciences which, by comparison with social science faculties in other UK universities, consisted of a rather large number of quite small, or at most medium-sized, departments, across a wide range of disciplines. (For example, in addition to the present constituents of SSPS, it included Economics, Education, Psychology, Archaeology, Architecture, Economic and Social History, Business Studies and Nursing Studies). The Faculty of Arts was also quite large and diverse, though a bit less so than Social Sciences, partly because Music and Divinity were faculties, not departments. Law, too, was a separate Faculty, with separate departments of private law, public law and so on.

The Faculties all had their own Deans, administrative offices and staff, etc. They were exclusively concerned with academic matters, including the administration of undergraduate and graduate studies (approving new courses and programmes, defining the rules for degree classification, dealing with student progression, etc.). Responsibility for resource allocation and planning was held by so-called Faculty *Groups*, composed of groups of Faculties, and headed up by Provosts. The relevant Faculty Group for Politics was Law and Social Sciences, whose Provost, during the crucial period of university re-structuring, was Tony Cohen, the Professor of Social Anthropology. (He had been preceded by the late, and greatly missed, Neil MacCormick: to give him his full title, Regius Professor of Public Law and the Law of Nature and Nations).

Crucially, the Faculty Groups held the budgets for every department in the Group, including the main item in these, the staff salary budgets. Departments were allocated small, non-salary budgets to cover such things as casual teaching, visiting speakers' expenses, etc. There was no formula for these allocations, which depended mainly on history and the advocacy skills of those who represented the departments on the key committee, Planning and Resources (P & R). In Law and Social Sciences, there were far too many departments for each to be directly represented. So departments were grouped into *Planning Units*, of around three departments each. Politics, Social Policy and Sociology (with Science Studies) comprised one of these; Social Anthropology, Economic and Social History, the Centres for African Studies and Canadian Studies another; Social Work and Nursing Studies another; and so on. The Headship of the Planning Units rotated between the Heads of their constituent departments. At the time I became Head of Politics, it was the turn of Politics, so I became Head of Planning Unit (HoPU). In theory, Planning Units were meant to 'plan', but all they actually did was forward to P & R, via their HoPU, the bids by their constituent departments, either for additions to their mini-budgets, or (more importantly) for the replacement of academic or non-academic staff.

This was a pretty cumbersome system. It made any kind of strategic planning for resource-dependent developments very difficult, and although P & R discussions were generally good-natured and reasonably sane, much of what was decided was pretty ad hoc, and lacked relevant financial information at a level below that of the Faculty

Group. And this was one of those periods when the University's finances were not especially rosy. Tony Cohen, the Provost, reckoned that what was needed was a beefing-up of the Planning Units, to make them into more unified entities that could carry out their own strategic planning, and that to do this there would need to be some devolution of budget-holding responsibilities to them, so that everyone had some sense of the resource implications (as well as the academic merits) of possible decisions. He also thought that in many areas of the Faculty Group, there were groups of departments that were sufficiently cognate, in their teaching and research, that if they got together in a more organised way, they could economise on some of their course-offerings and the need for staff replacements, and could also develop collaborative research projects, re-shape their future research activities to reflect synergies, and so on. So he encouraged (or was it 'instructed'?!) a couple of the HoPUs to set to work on this, turning them into *Schools*.

I was one of the 'chosen' ones, and soon became Head of the not-yet-quite-existent School of Social and Political Studies (SSPS). (Why 'Studies' and not '*Science*', as it came to be called some years later? One reason was that I was sure most of my then colleagues in Politics would resist the latter term strenuously, and this was one battle I reckoned wasn't worth fighting. I put my efforts instead into the even less popular cause of getting Politics and Sociology staff to move from their Buccleuch Place offices into the Adam Ferguson Building, where Social Anthropology and Social Policy were already located). The new School was also to include one member of another Planning Unit, Social Anthropology; its other main member, Economic and Social History, remained undecided for a long time, and eventually went with History when the University's grand restructuring came in, a couple of years later. (Social Work was initially pencilled in to join with Law, but this proposal was eventually rejected, and it joined SSPS).

I was pretty keen on the School/SSPS idea, mainly for academic/intellectual reasons: my own background in philosophy had involved a lot of contact with sociology, anthropology etc, and at Lancaster I had worked closely on interdisciplinary projects with colleagues in these areas. Further, my first years at Edinburgh had made me feel that the departments were very inward-looking and too isolated from one another, and also that heads of department had far too many responsibilities to discharge on too small a scale to be effective.

The Heads of the new proto-School's various Departments started to meet frequently, as its proto- Management Committee, and actually to do some planning, this time of a new entity, the School. We reckoned we'd not get far without an administrative-grade post, and eventually persuaded the Faculty Group to fund one. We were very fortunate in being able to appoint Saladin Rospigliosi, a fantastically good administrator and a great person to work with. Saladin had first worked at the University as a temporary secretary in the Politics Department. He then moved into the Faculty/Group office, working first with Michael Rayner, who was responsible for the administration of degree programmes, and then with Jan Hulme, the FG supremo and finance officer. So he knew a lot about most of what would be relevant in creating something like SSPS.

The School was to have one big advantage. Quite early on it was agreed at FG level that the Graduate School in Social Science (to be renamed 'in Social and Political Studies') would be assigned to SSPS, with some continuing responsibilities to non-

SSPS departments in the Faculty. The Graduate School had been established in the late 1980s/early 1990s, through the efforts of John Holmwood, in Sociology, and Ruth Jonathan, in Education; Sue Grant was its administrative secretary. It had two main functions: to provide generic social science research training courses, and to run cross-disciplinary taught Master's courses. John and Ruth had realised, very soon after the Economic and Social Research Council began to lay down requirements for departments to gain recognition (and hence be able to supervise ESRC award-holding doctoral students), how valuable it would be to have a Graduate School dedicated to providing these research-training courses. But Politics staff (and often research students) were not so enamoured, partly because they didn't regard Politics as a social science anyway. Correspondingly, Politics staff played little part in teaching any of these courses, though they were heavily involved in several of the taught Master's degrees, especially European and International Politics (as it was then called), and Social and Political Theory.

During the time the School was being created, we had no idea that this was very soon to become the general model for the restructuring of the University that took place in the early 2000s. I have never worked out whether Tony Cohen already knew this, or himself proposed it to the senior Vice-Principal, Michael Anderson, who became the chief protagonist (and 'enforcer') of the new structure. But I think that, at least within the parts of the University that now form the College of Humanities and Social Science, SSPS was the first School to be established. It is even possible that our 'success' in doing so provided some impetus, or support, for the wider restructuring of the University. And certainly some of the other Schools were closer to being 'forced marriages' than SSPS was, when they were established later on. But that's not to imply that all the SSPS departments were happy to sign up. Social Policy were probably the most enthusiastic; Sociology the most sceptical. Most Politics staff seemed largely indifferent (perhaps because I didn't say too much about it to them!). But there were some enthusiasts, including Kim Hutchings, who had succeeded me as Head of Politics, when I became Head of School-designate, and Richard Freeman, who played a major part in imagining what the School might be like.

Richard was commissioned by the Faculty to investigate different ways in which teaching might be organised and delivered in departments/Schools, including what might be learned from the School of Biological Sciences (over in the Faculty Group of Science and Engineering), where a somewhat similar process of School formation had been going on, pre-dating the developments in the social sciences and humanities. What had established there was a Teaching Organisation, responsible for the delivery of all undergraduate courses in biological sciences, which had previously been run through departments. Departments ceased to exist as such; instead, there were several distinct *research* centres and groups, but only a single teaching organisation. Richard was enthusiastic about this organisational – and pedagogic – model, and came up with a way of applying it in SSPS, at least in Years 1 and 2. He worked out how all the subject-based courses in years 1 and 2 could be replaced by a set of School-based courses, co-taught by staff from the different subject-areas/departments, and genuinely interdisciplinary in character. For example, there would be a course on Scottish Politics and Society; another on Global Society and Politics; and so on.

I loved this idea, but we didn't manage to persuade departments to support it: they were concerned about equipping students to study for Honours in their subjects, and also argued that this new scheme would de-motivate students and put off applicants

etc. The fallback or compromise was to adopt the mixed system the School has had since it was formally established, namely two School-based Year 2 half-courses, in Social and Political Theory, and Social and Political Enquiry, replacing the subject-based courses in the second half of Year 2. I took on responsibility for designing the former, and Ian Dey (from Social Policy) the latter, and both of us ran the courses for their first few years. These two courses were also the first in the Faculty to make serious use of WebCT, and received financial support from the University to set this up. (Pauline Watts, a PhD student in Sociology, was the key IT figure in doing this).

This rowing-back from a maximalist position took place across several dimensions, both during and shortly after the creation of the School. The central organisational issues were explored by a working group on De-Departmentalisation, and ugly name but one that expressed a radical project. It was convened by Fran Wasoff, from Social Policy, and came up with proposals that involved major transfers of powers and responsibilities, away from departments and their heads, and to the School and its Head, together with the Directors of Undergraduate Teaching, Research, and the Graduate School. At one time, we even envisaged a School Management Committee consisting exclusively of School officers, with no Heads of Subject (the term that was used to replace 'Head of Department'). But these ideas gradually got watered down, both before and after the inception of the School.

Looking back at it now, I think there were two crucial things that stood in the way of a more radically/fully integrated SSPS. The first was strong resistance to (or perhaps lack of serious advocacy of) the idea of a single undergraduate degree. If you still have subject-based degree programmes, someone has to organise their delivery, be able to assign staff to courses, etc.; that's the Head of Subject/Department. The other was that during (and since) the period that SSPS was being created, the UK bodies responsible for the RAE decided against establishing a single, multi-subject *social sciences* research panel, and stayed with the separate subject/discipline-based ones. That meant that you had to organise research on a subject basis (and integrate this with the organisation of single-subject teaching delivery, etc.). So you were stuck with departments, in effect if not in name.

So has the establishment of SSPS been a positive move? I doubt that I'm the best person to judge this, and since my retirement I have (deliberately) not kept in touch with the ways the School has developed, and the place of Politics within it. But I think the devolution of budgets to a body that is small enough to enable departments to have a voice in, and sense of engagement with, resource allocation is a big plus. And a lot of the administrative streamlining, and organisation of IT use for academic administration, has been much easier to achieve through the School structure. But one thing that bothered me from early on is the relationship between Schools and the College. When SSPS was being set up, no-one realised we were going to have Colleges, or 'the College', in our case. We had always hoped, and even believed, that the administrative resource at Faculty and FG level would be transferred down to Schools; further, we wanted to simplify decision-making rather than make it more complicated. But given that departments have pretty much survived the transition to Schools, and that the College operates at a level between Schools and the University, retaining the administrative resources of the old faculties/faculty groups, what has emerged is arguably a more complex and time-consuming system, with the extra work being done without additional resources. (But perhaps I should also note that, as an

honorary fellow and retired professor, I have an office in a Buccleuch Place location that is unofficially designated as 'the grumpy old men building'...).

Annex 11: Mark Aspinwall (1994-present; Senior Lecturer to Professor of Politics and International Relations)

When I first arrived as a part-time lecturer in 1995, I was working at Durham University. Roland Dannreuther phoned and asked whether I could teach one course for the department. The department was located in a tenement building on Buccleuch Place and had a small town feel, much like the Politics department at Durham. There was a sense of intimacy about the place. Everyone seemed to know each other well.

I initially took an undergraduate tutorial on an IR course, but also led a Master's course on International Political Economy. Alice Brown was head of department for part of that time at least, and I recall distinctly her warmth and generosity. She made me feel very welcome, despite my being an outsider. I had several meetings with her, and she invited me to at least one department meeting (which was held in her office – I'm trying to imagine that happening now!), and to various seminars and other activities. Her support made a deep impression on me, and in fact Alice served as something of a role model for me in terms of how to treat junior colleagues.

The Graduate School was in High School Yards, where Sue Grant presided over the scheduling and timetabling with her usual eccentric efficiency. I did most of my teaching there, on a course central to the Master's degree which would become known as International and European Politics – still, to this day, our most successful postgraduate degree.

I joined the department full time in 2004. The interview had me up against some stiff competition, including Alasdair Young from Glasgow. There were some tough questions in the presentation from David Howarth ('aren't you really a comparativist and not an IR scholar?') and Russell Keat ('MP attitudes to Europe ... whatever next?!'). But fortunately I prevailed.

By this time the department had migrated to the Adam Ferguson Building, a strange building in which the walls did not quite reach the ceiling in many places, and were so thin that one could hear sneezes and laughs several offices along. We had to remember this when holding sensitive meetings.

Shortly after arriving I was asked to marshal negotiations along on the new International Relations undergraduate degree. The issue was over the curriculum for students on this new degree, and how it would differ from the curriculum for the existing Politics degree. Inevitably, feelings were strong about required courses for the two degrees (get 10 academics together in a room to discuss curriculum issues and you end up with 20 or 30 opinions). In one of the lulls in these negotiations a very senior member of the staff took me aside and said there was a deep fear among certain colleagues that IR would be more popular than Politics, and the latter would eventually attenuate. Part of the rationale for engineering course requirements therefore was to ensure the continued popularity of the Politics degree. So there were more required courses in the final agreement than there necessarily needed to be (as I write this we are revisiting the curriculum – the years have shown that the IR and Politics degrees are equally popular and the fear was unfounded).

The undergraduate IR degree propelled us into the stratosphere. Student numbers rocketed upwards. Within five years it had become the most difficult undergraduate degree to enter, overtaking medicine. By 2011 that single degree provided some 10%

of all income (research, teaching, undergraduate, taught and research postgraduate, consulting ... everything) across not simply Politics, but the entire School of Social and Political Science. We've not been the same since. It marked a turning point as sharp as I've ever seen in an academic department. We became the department of Politics and International Relations (PIR). We continued hiring, adding colleagues virtually every year.

In 2008 we moved from the decrepit Adam Ferguson Building to the newly renovated Chrystal Macmillan Building. It was a change in status that spoke both to our material rising fortunes and also to our values – Chrystal Macmillan was the University's first female science graduate and she went on to break a number of barriers in her campaigning for women's rights and for peace.

When I became head of department in 2010 we created another IR degree, this time at the MSc level. We also created two specialised Masters degrees on the IR of the Middle East which cemented our relationship with the Institute for Middle East Studies. More students and colleagues followed. Few colleagues seemed to leave. So many students wanted to transfer in from other degrees that we had to negotiate a quota. As space constraints appeared in CMB, we expanded into 21 George Square.

Meanwhile the growth of student numbers was accompanied by a rise in attention to the student experience. Some of this was coincidental, in that a new metric known as the National Student Survey came into being in 2005. It surveys final year students on their satisfaction over teaching, assessment, support, personal development, and similar issues. We do very well on this – in fact overall satisfaction rose by 11 points from 2011 to 2012. But our scores have not been as high as they might, given the number of colleagues receiving teaching award nominations and prizes.

Had we become a sausage factory? Counting undergraduates on all degrees, single and joint, we have around 900, an enormous rise. Master's student numbers were up, though not as dramatically. In the 2011-12 academic year, more than 85% of our income came from teaching (though we spend far less of our time on it than that). So we worked against the sense of 'bigness' by creating social events, a Town Hall meeting, induction events, skills workshops, careers events, and other forms of interaction in addition to the usual liaison committees.

Another broad change is that we have professionalised a lot. We organise teaching and treat students very differently now. Gone are the days when we enjoyed a leisurely glass of sherry with students – a ritual I remember from my Durham days in the 1990s. Teaching is more rule-bound, arms-length and contractual, especially when it comes to students' special circumstances. In fact, student support has become such a big part of our job that we now have a special administrative officer dedicated to this task. The rules over how students are to be treated when they report special circumstances have become ever more specified, and the types of documentation which constitute valid evidence of special circumstance are now more clear than ever. So we are more professional, more legalistic, and probably less spontaneous. Ironically it seems like there are more ways to interact with students, but less time for interaction.

Student expectations about their time in university have changed too. They are more concerned about results than in years past. How many times do we hear comments like these - 'I don't know what's expected of me. I did the essay according to what the

tutor said, but the feedback wasn't clear at all.' (here's a blog I wrote on the issue <http://edinburghpoliticsandinternationalrelations.wordpress.com/2011/01/11/newsflash-edinburgh-lecturer-submits-essay-and-is-stunned-by-feedback/>)? Have students become more molly-coddled and spoon-fed or do academics lose tolerance as they age? I don't know the answer. One thing is for sure. Graduates face the harshest job market in living memory at the same time as non-Scottish UK students have steep new fees to pay. It's no surprise they're concerned about results and how to improve performance.

Meanwhile, the Edinburgh University Students' Association, to its great credit, created a set of awards for teaching excellence. One of our own – Elizabeth Bomberg – won the award for overall best performance in 2009. She was selected from among the several thousand lecturing staff as being the best teacher in the university (she also won the Political Studies Association award for best politics lecturer in the UK a few years earlier). I won a EUSA award for innovation in teaching. Chad Damro won another PSA award for best teacher in the UK. Naturally we're all proud of these achievements, but squaring them with National Student Survey results remains a challenge.

On another front we're gearing up for the Research Excellence Framework as I write. The REF is the 'son-of-RAE', last held in 2008. We've made improvements in every one of these evaluations and they increasingly drive our research agenda. We're focused on bibliometrics – on journal impact rankings and citations, the quality of our publications (as objectively as we can judge it), its originality, its impact, etc. What's potentially lost in the REF race? A wider scholarship in which understandings of politics and policy are improved for the broadest possible community, and issues are put in context through textbooks and other outreach. We've worked hard – and need to keep working – to make sure we do not obsess on narrow research outputs, important as they are.

We're now focusing on how to grow our research income and profile, including PhD students. PhD students are like the capillaries between undergraduates and lecturers. Their classroom experience is an apprenticeship for them and a plus for undergraduates who are exposed to fresh minds at the cutting edge of their research disciplines. They are an important part of our community.

We are now more integrated than ever with the School of Social and Political Science and its component Subject Areas, institutes and centres. PIR is the lead department in the new Academy of Government, which comprises a Master of Public Policy degree, the Public Policy Network to foster knowledge exchange, and the Institute of Governance to promote research. We are also involved in the Global Development Academy, the Global Public Health Unit, the Europa Institute, and a number of other centres and institutes.

We've established or are creating new degrees to help us all address some of the most pressing issues humanity faces – sustainability, development, climate change and others. As I write we are bringing several new colleagues on board, including a political theorist (Mathias Thaler), a critical IR security specialist (Xavier Guillaume) and a specialist in security governance in Africa (Jana Hoenke). Since 2010 that's a total of nine 'newbies,' with three more to come in 2012-13. This in an environment of budget cuts in other universities.

What else? The curriculum review now underway is likely to lead to more political theory and more skills training (research, communication, data analysis) in the first year courses. We think we could improve transferable skills, build numeracy, encourage better scholarship among students, built on a solid foundation of data analysis and logical argumentation. We also hope to create an advanced optional course for Honours students in which students would act as research assistants for academic colleagues and take part in original research. This would formalise a practice that now occurs on an ad hoc basis. Both sides stand to gain.

We're also now building engagement with alumni. We created a network of alumni ambassadors who have volunteered to discuss Edinburgh with prospective students, and jobs with on-course students. A number of former students have given talks about their careers. A new fund is under construction (The Next Generation Fund) to support needy students.

All these initiatives pose challenges as we continue to work on student experience and research ranking, but they are the right kinds of challenges. As I write, some five senior colleagues have roles in the School, College, and University (not counting those involved in institutes, on sabbaticals, research buyouts, and other forms of leave). When they go we lose their expertise, judgement and leadership. What do we get in return? We get some proportion of their salary, which we can use to pay for teaching support, typically from PhD students. Our PhD students are great teachers, but they are not yet leaders. Meanwhile all the key metrics are departmental – NSS, REF – and the identity is too. Everyone from our alumni to fellow academics on the other side of the world recognise us as Politics colleagues. So we must make sure we don't lose the focus while building many of the worthy links to other parts of the university.

In conclusion, we've gone from a good to a great department. The ranking – number 35 in the world as a Politics department – may or may not be an accurate way to judge us. We've grown, and in doing so have renovated ourselves considerably. We don't simply hire people who make us feel comfortable and good about ourselves. Instead we hire those who push us, challenge our thinking, test the boundaries. We're stronger as a result. We're also younger and more collegial. There is more sunlight than ever in the department, and fewer corners of Dickensian grumpiness.

Finally, in a great squaring of the circle, the longest-ever serving member of the department, present at the creation and retired these past five years or so, has been rehired on a part-time basis due to his many continuing research activities. Charles Raab was recently invited by the Principal to attend a welcoming event for new staff, and so once again will take his place with the new generation of academics.

Annex 12: *Student* in the mid-1960s (compiled by Sofia Widen)

Recurring themes

The Politics Department first took shape in the 1960s when the Vietnam War was at its peak and the Apartheid regime were soon to deprive black people of their citizenship in South Africa. *Student* frequently published articles about the Vietnam War and the Edinburgh University Council for Peace in Vietnam collected £230 for the Medical Aid Fund. In addition to this, talks were given on the origin and development of the War throughout 1966 and a fund for orphanages was established. A University ballot was held in which 436 respondents answered 'yes' or 'no' to the question whether the British government should support US policy in Vietnam. Throughout the 1960s, the Vietnam War frequently featured in *Student* either as articles or as appeals for charity donations (21 April 1966, p. 6).

Alongside the attention drawn to the Vietnam War, *Student* devoted numerous articles to the Apartheid Regime during the 1960s (27 January 1966, p. 10). *Student* reported on attacks on the National Union of South African Students during the anti-apartheid November month. The world's attention is directed towards the South African government and *Student* urged Edinburgh University students to stand up for students in South Africa and show them their full support. The Edinburgh branch of World University Students' activity sent aid to non-white students in Basutoland to enable them to continue their higher education, which had been reduced to nothing more than cynical mockery during the 1960s.

At the same time as the British government condemned Rhodesia's self-proclaimed independence, *Student* reported on an illegal regime victimising students who in any way opposed its policies (29 January 1966). Incidents of arrest and search in the middle of the night along with illegal imprisonment were noted and the Scottish Union of Students President George Foulkes issued an urgent appeal for the legal aid of these students. Ian Smith's promises of multi-racial education were reported by the *Student* as empty promises never to be fulfilled in a police state such as Rhodesia.

The Rectorial Election

Dr. James Robertson-Justice, the actor, was re-elected as Rector for the University (Thursday, 14 November 1963). Dr. Robertson-Justice wins the election with 1,961 votes compared to Mr. Peter Ustinov (1,512 votes), Dr. Julius Nyerere (354 votes), Mr. Yehudi Meuhin (239 votes) and Mr. Sean Connery (224 votes). Dr. Robertson-Justice is photographed on a moor near to his home in Sutherland with one of his trained hunting falcons. After the election, he commented on the outcome: 'I must admit that the joy over my elections is tempered with a tinge of regret in that victory was achieved over one of my great friends, Peter Ustinov, and over two other persons for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration. I refer to President Julius Nyerere of Tanganyika, a graduate of this university, and to Yehudi Menuhin.' This year's fighting in the Old Quad was not nearly so rowdy as it has been previous years: only 17 windows were broken and two students needed hospital care.

In the 1960s, Vietnam protesters and anti-Apartheid activists debated pressing issues. A well-established political community in the form of student parties enriched this debate. *Student* ran an article (28 October 1965, p. 4) in which student politicians were allowed to publish their party manifestos and express their opinions on a range

of issues. The parties represented in this article were: the Socialists, the Conservatives, the Liberals (sympathising with the Scottish Nationalists' claim to increase home rule), the Nationalists and the Communists. The parties were referred to as the University Liberal Club, the Tory Club, the Labour Club apart from the Communist politicians who were active in the University Communist Society founded in 1960. At this point in time, there were about 100 Communist Societies in Universities and Colleges and they campaigned for a higher grant, and against the Bomb and Apartheid. About their ideology, one student noted: 'It is not an intellectual tool based on some premise, as many academics and so-called "professors" would have us to believe. Marxism is a living philosophy'. Other parties, such as the Conservative Club, acknowledged that their politics had been downgraded over the years to give room for more social activities, something that the Labour Club positioned itself against, claiming the merit of having absolutely no social life – a club for the ascetic and slightly narrow-minded person. The Nationalists maintained that their members 'constitute what is probably the most balanced, the most dedicated and the most social of any of the political parties'. Drink, it has been suggested, is the failing of the Nats but the author of their party programme maintained that 'their main aim is a political one and not a Bacchic one'.

Political Clash

During the years 1963 and 1964, the Student Handbook reported a dismal story: the three main student parties (Tories, Labour, and Liberals) all held their meetings on Mondays at 7 p.m. (9 January 1964). According to J.W.D. Arnold of *Student*, this prevented students from hearing speakers from different parties giving their view on current affairs. Student politics in Edinburgh ran the risk of being reduced to mere indoctrination since students were unable to understand different perspectives and then judge which political ideology best suited their own worldview. This is an example of how *Student* began to comment on the student political life in Edinburgh.

The first Politics Chair

Student portrayed Professor Hanham as one of the brightest Professors at the university (20 January 1966, p. 4). *Student* reporters were astonished by the views held by Professor Hanham on the topics of tutorials: following the syllabus strictly is less central, the real aim of tutorials is to create lively debates in which students fully realise the problems of their subject and from there figure out a way of facing up to them. Professor Hanham's ideal tutorial was one in which 'the tutor could walk out without the tutorial either noticing or caring'. In order for this tutorial to be realised, students had to get to know each other and the tutor properly. Surprisingly, Professor Hanham was not an advocate of the Cambridge system of learning, arguing that students often lack the factual knowledge and the confidence to have individual tutorials. Professor Hanham also noted that it tended to be the English students that spoke up in tutorials while the Scottish students had a tradition of 'dour taciturnity'.

Annex 13: *Student* in the 1970s (compiled by Sofia Widen)

During 1974, 1975 and 1976, much attention was devoted to nuclear disarmament and the CND campaign, the gay movement and the political regime in Portugal. What the outside world considered a ‘thaw’ in the Cold War, Hugh McMillan of *Student* warned against (Letters, 22 May 1975). The balancing of the superpowers came to be dangerously regarded, according to McMillan, as something normal and almost desirable in international politics. Furthermore, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970 did not include countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Israel, Japan and South Korea – all judged (by McMillan) to have the technical capacity to develop nuclear weapons by 1980. A series of articles, letters and editorials addressed this theme, which was debated in *Student* during the mid 1970s.

Another interesting variation in *Student* was the focus on gay rights (5 December 1974). In 1974, Ian Dunn and Derek Ogg organised the International Gay Rights Congress 1974, featuring prominent homosexuals from all over the world. This was the first time Edinburgh ever hosted an event of this kind and during the years following this Congress, a number of articles explored the situation of gay students in Edinburgh and in the UK more generally. Prior to the Congress, *The Scotsman* was flooded with letters by supporters and antagonists of the event and the public interest was large. The activism around the event took on a pragmatic character since previous militant activism proved ‘counter-productive, producing only a brief flare of public attention followed by a “no change” situation’.

While *Student* reported intensely on the students’ political parties during the mid-1960s, more attention is devoted to the government of the University in the mid-1970s. A massive division of opinion over the future government of the University was brought out in two reports (14 November 1974). The majority report of the Constitution and Structure Committee, chaired by Sir William Murrie, a court member, advocated minor changes in the University’s government while a minority report produced by The Rector, Gordon Brown, Senior President Derek Ogg and Vice President Ian White said that the university’s whole ethos and policies must be changed. In particular, the minority report argued that the University Court and Senate stood condemned because of their failure to act as policy-makers for the University and because their membership was elitist.

In November 1974, 6,000 Edinburgh fans went to see a historic performance by Pink Floyd (14 November 1974, p. 12). The group played songs such as *Shine on Crazy Diamond*, *Raving and Drooling* and *Got to be Crazy*. The concert was enhanced by a supplementary film projected into a giant circular screen above the group and the tone of the images related to the fundamental madness that Roger Waters (bass guitar) was saying exist in each and every person. The Traverse Theatre offered an ‘apocalyptic’ comedy, *Fourth Day Like Four Long Months of Absence*. The reviewer, Justin Greene, was rather negative about the author Colin Bennett’s play, but the Traverse was still a well-attended venue.

Student ran an article (25 January 1974) about Scottish politics and the SNP. The article considered Scottish independence, and the author analysed the role of oil reserves in the North Sea and Scotland’s ability to successfully extract it. The article also explored how nationalism – the real and vital cultural identity – played a role in the debate on independence and how an independent Scotland would look

economically. The author compared ideas of capitalism with a working-class perspective. This could have been written by a student of politics or a member of staff in the field.

A very in-depth coverage of the political situation in Portugal was published in *Student* (14 November 1975, p. 7). This article combined a thorough analysis of the political landscape in Portugal with much knowledge of the historical roots of the conflicting parties. The author criticised the British Press for polarising the debate and simplifying the Portuguese situation. The article was clearly structured and the arguments considered military, civilian and political elements, as if the author had undergone training in political studies.

Student reported on a well-attended lecture about the Watergate scandal given by the former special prosecutor in the trial, Archibald Cox (Harvard). The lecture, titled 'Watergate and the US Constitution' was given in the George Square Lecture Theatre and included a presentation on the historical factors that played a role in the Watergate scandal. Cox analysed the enlargement and 'the isolation of the Presidency at the expense of the institutionalised departments and agencies' (9 January 1975).

A debate concerning the National Front and Fascism was begun in the *Student* (28 November 1974) when Nestor Makhno drew attention to political radicalism in terms of crisis in his article, 'Shades of Fascism'. This article, including the illustration, resembled many articles in the current (2012) Politics journal, *The Leviathan*. Or perhaps more to the point, many *Leviathan* articles could have been modelled on this line of argumentation, engagement with racial parties on the right, visualised with the help of a simple but telling illustration. In the following issue of *Student*, the then Chairman of the University Liberals (no name quoted) responded to the article, and something of a public University debate could be observed (5 December 1974). In an even later issue, Makhno gave his reply to the Liberal Chairman.

In a letter to the Editor (5 December 1974) Richard Gunn of the Politics Department responded to a review of Tony Cliff's book on the state of capitalism that had been published on 28 November 1974.

On 4 February 1977, *Student* gave its 'take' on the appointment of John P. Mackintosh MP to the Chair of Politics (spelling mistakes in the original):

'MACINTOSH MEGALOMANIA

'Considerable disquiet has been aroused by the appointment of John P. MacIntosh to the head of the Politics Department. Since "Student" gave details of the agreement reached between the Labour MP and the University two weeks ago further information has been revealed about the appointment. The University hardly rated the job itself as very prestigious, taking six weeks of leisurely discussion to decide the Professorship was even worth filling. When they did there was only a trickle of applications of whom MacIntosh stood the best chance. With Henry Drucker, the caretaker head of the Department an outside bet. The interest attached to the job was also reflected in the University's difficulties in finding outside assessors.

'Ralph Dahrendorf, now head of the London School of Economics, declined the invitation, telling them he wasn't interested. No so lucky was S. E. Finer, the Professor of Government and Public Administration at Oxford. Although he withdrew

as external assessor he was persuaded to correspond with Edinburgh University, no doubt being able to inform them that the post wasn't attracting any particularly distinguished academics.

'When the Chair of the Politics Department had last come up for grabs MacIntosh had been widely tipped for the job. Rumours at the time ascribed his failure to secure the appointment to reports of the gentleman's behaviour during a sojourn in Nigeria, which had upset some of those in the University with higher moral views.

'Having now been selected, MacIntosh is on a part time contract which is renewable annually by mutual agreement. As yet details are not known of the salary MacIntosh has been awarded. A maximum and minimum set down by the Principal is free to fix the final figure within those limits. On top of the £6,000 or so MacIntosh gets for sitting on the cross benches he can also expect to coin in £4,000 or so for his new job which is not so far away from the proposed Scottish Assembly and which allows him to dangle his big tone in Westminster.

'One story now circulating through the Old College suggests that when he was interviewed Mr MacIntosh proposed that if required he would reduce his attendance in the House to the necessary minimum, flying down for three line whips. No doubt that will be a joy for the Labour Whips who run a book on how the MP for Berwick and East Lothian will vote.'

Annex 14: *Student* in the mid-1980s (compiled by Sofia Widen)

General issues that were reported in the mid 1980s in the *Student* were environmentally oriented to a larger extent than during previous decades. For example, *Student* ran an article concerning deforestation (24 January 1985), saying, 'Tropical rainforests are being fuelled and burned at a rate of 110,000 square kilometres a year – that's an area as large as Switzerland'. The author described worldwide deforestation taking place in places such as Nepal and Brazil, affecting our climate negatively. An environmental awareness is clearly displayed in *Student*. In terms of politics, 'the last few years have seen a phenomenal growth in the number and size of ecological environmental groups known collectively as the Green Movement' (21 January 1985). The article covered basic facts about climate change and its possible impacts by studying population growth, acid rain, the use of fertilisers in agriculture, and deforestation. The article ended by spelling out the mission statement of the Green Movement that was taking shape, explaining that 'The Green Movement is working for changes both general and specific and it seeks the recognition of fundamental realities such as the link between human welfare and ecological integrity'.

In the mid 1980s, *Student* reported on protests against cuts in the grants scheme (22 November 1984, p. 2). Chancellor Nigel Lawson's threat of further cuts in student grants motivated Edinburgh students to demonstrate their opposition. Throughout the mid-1980s, frequent protests of this kind were held. The House of Commons was voting on the Chancellor's statement on public spending (6 December 1984) and the government's policy towards student grants was questioned.

The East-West dialogue finally opened at the highest level in the mid-1980s in Edinburgh. In 1985, *Student* devoted several articles in one number to Senator Gary Hart's lecture in the George Square Lecture Theatre, entitled 'America and Europe: Living Together?' The theme of the lecture was conventional deterrence and NATO. Senator Hart's idea was not just to spend more money or to blindly invest in new technology, but to develop a new cohesion strategy between defence personnel, technology and hardware. The Senator's lecture concluded with a warning that 'change is not a danger. Our task is to manage change, offer our people goals, not memories, and we must speak to them, not of the 1940s but of the 21st century. (17 January 1985, p. 1).

Student reported on a trip undertaken by ten students from the University of Edinburgh to Canada (9 May 1985). As part of one course that the University offered in Canadian Studies, Northern Telecom of Canada sponsored a three-week field trip to Toronto and Montreal, among other locations. The students gathered material for their essays on Canadian Politics and met with former Prime Minister John Turner (Pierre Trudeau's successor), journalists and other MPs in Ottawa.

An article was run on President Reagan's policies in Nicaragua against the democratically elected Sandinista government (9 May 1985). President Reagan had just attempted to secure military aid to the Contras, fighting against the Sandinistas. Siobhan Bygate, author of the article and a member of the Latin American Solidarity Society, dispelled several misconceptions about Nicaragua. The article gave a comprehensive review of the Nicaraguan state, their elections, the role of the church and the health of the economy. Again, many comparisons can be made with the type

of article published in *The Leviathan*, today's student-run Politics Journal. The article focused on the state of Nicaraguan democracy. There is an active Latin American Society in Edinburgh today; as well as organising frequent social events, in 2012 they are hosting a business Congress in Edinburgh.

An article headed 'Devolution is not a Dead Duck' was published in *Student* (24 October 1984, p. 2). The author, Devin Scoble, explained that the issue of Scottish devolution was still a subject that interests many. The Extra-Mural Department held discussions at 11 Buccleuch Place on a Saturday and Peter Wassell of that Department chaired them. This was the first discussion and no set topic was given. After the discussion, it was clear that devolution gave rise to various views and the author stressed that it was still a key issue in British Politics.

More articles were devoted to politics in *Student* in the 1980s. One example was the article entitled 'Younger's Tartan Special' (18 October 1984). George Younger had been Secretary of State for Scotland for over five years and had showed great loyalty to Thatcherism north of the border during all this time. Bill Williamson of *Student* interviewed Younger about his views on Scotland. The author posed questions that combined academic insight with selling journalism: 'Margaret Thatcher seems to mix abstract, idealistic rhetoric about the future with a stern talk of realism and practicality in an instinctive, often contradictory way. Do you have a personal vision of a future ideal Scotland, or do you believe definitions of ideal future to be irrelevant and possibly dangerous?'

Several letters and opinion pieces were published concerning the Pollock Halls of Residence. Students express their views concerning rents and the quality of catering. A student newspaper exclusive to Pollock Halls was released in the mid 1980s and the same views as students express today were aired in *Student*.

Annex 15: *Student* in the mid-1990s (compiled by Sofia Widen)

One of the most striking developments in *Student* from the 1980s to the 1990s was the new section called 'International'. During the early 1980s, this section occupied one page of the newspaper and featured political stories from around the world. The section gradually grew and by the mid-1990s, it occupied two pages in every issue. One writer, Tom Hickman, made frequent contributions and his stories provided an analysis of political events. Hickman wrote an article about US involvement in Haiti, critically labelling Clinton's 'Operation Restore Democracy' 'a well orchestrated media exercise'.

In combination with the 'International' section, several students went on exchange in Europe and provide the *Student* with articles relating to their own experiences abroad. In combination with the section named 'International', the *Student* now assumed a more intercontinental or global character. The students now related not only via the national newspapers to foreign regimes, but experienced life in other countries during their exchanges. This might have been the beginning of a larger trend of student interest, contributing to the creation of the study of International Relations at the University.

On 27 October 1994, *Student* ran an article with the heading 'Whither Russia?' in the 'International' section. Ed Talfan considered the rapid political and economic changes Russia was undergoing and related it to his own experience there. Talfan was not formally on exchange in Russia but spent a few weeks travelling there. Despite this, the article followed a way of reporting that might be characterised as typical for the *Student* in the 1990s: a political or historical analysis combined with a personal and more intimate portrait.

Another recurrent theme in the mid-1990s was the introduction of the Criminal Justice Bill, causing many students to take to the street both in 1994, and later in 1995 when the Bill was passed into law. Some protests became very violent and the controversial piece of legislation officially entitled 'The Criminal Justice and Public Order Bill' was put before Parliament in October 1994. The Bill proposed to criminalise outdoor parties and raves, picket lines, demonstrations against new roads, hunt sabotage and so called New Age travelling. In England and Wales it also meant increased fines for cannabis possession from £500 to £2500. Students gathered on the Mound and walked along Leith Walk together. This kind of protest was seen on repeated occasions in the mid-1990s.

On 20 October 1994 *Student* ran an article about Alex Salmond in the 'News' section. This article occupied the bottom half of a page. The top half was devoted to Lord Runciman and Professor Malcolm Anderson photographed in conjunction with the launch of the International Social Sciences Institute (ISSI). There was only a brief caption under the photograph and no in-depth article.

Student also reported on pressing student issues. On 27 October 1994 a particularly firm picture emerges when Rachel Henson and Simon Stuart reported that around 20% of the students considered or had considered dropping out of University due to financial difficulties: 'The National Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals have recorded an outstanding 188% rise in the number of students dropping out of university courses because of debt'. Throughout the mid-1990s, *Student* reported

intensively on rising Edinburgh rents forcing students to take on part time work and in some instances to move to other areas.

Actions of the British Government caused *Student* to investigate fears about University privatisation. On 12 January 1995, front page, *Student* ran an article entitled 'Big Business encouraged to finance further education'. At the same time as this topic was discussed, several Departments within the Faculty of Arts disputed their funding and the Department of Russian was forced to close down. In sum, money was a hot topic during the mid-1990s.