It is with great pleasure that I welcome you to LSE Connect.

From its inception, LSE has embraced diversity. The first truly international university, the School continues to welcome students and staff from across the globe. When I joined LSE in 1985 we numbered 540 staff and 4,575 students. Today we are a community of over 14,000 with 142,000 alumni in 190 countries worldwide.

Our founders sought to bring the emerging disciplines of social science together to find novel solutions to challenging social questions; a maxim that has served us well for over 120 years.

So as we mark the 75th anniversary of former LSE Director Sir William Beveridge’s blueprint for the modern welfare state, it seems fitting to draw on his welcoming address to students from the 1924/25 academic year as we start another almost a century later. In that address he warned against treating the School as “a shop which sells learning and degrees” and instead urged LSE students to view their institution as a “living society whose life is in its traditions”. He defined those traditions in terms that sound incredibly relevant to today: “keenness, fairness to all points of view and friendliness to all nations”.

From its earliest days, LSE expected its graduates to be engaged with ideas and with the world – as I am sure all of you are. I hope you find much in these pages that will remind you of what makes the School a special place and that LSE Connect will inspire, educate and entertain you.

Minouche Shafik
Director of LSE
The LSE Festival has launched **BEVERIDGE 2.0: RE-THINKING BEVERIDGE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

LSE has announced its newest public engagement initiative to be a social science festival in February 2018, exploring themes from the 1942 Beveridge Report re-cast for the 21st century.

One of the Generation Brexit project leaders, Dr Jennifer Jackson-Freeze from LSE’s European Institute, said: “We’re going to invite millennials from across the UK and Europe to debate, decide and draft policy proposals that will be sent to parliaments in Westminster and Strasbourg during the negotiations.”

Dr Roch Dunin-Wąsowicz, another project leader, said the pan-European project would seek views from a whole cross section of millennials, including Leavers, Remainers, left and right-wingers, European federalists and nationalists.

Beveridge identified “Five Giants” blocking progress: Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor and Idleness. By re-imagining Beveridge’s ideas for 2018, the LSE Festival hopes to stimulate interest in the social sciences through a programme of thought-provoking events rooted in research at LSE and its impacts across the world.

LSE Festival co-chair Adrian Thomas said, “At the heart of the festival lies our desire to be the people and ideas that transform the world. We’re looking forward to welcoming our alumni, who already do just that.”

The LSE Festival takes place 19-24 February 2018.

**LSE Festival launched BEVERIDGE 2.0: RE-THINKING BEVERIDGE FOR THE 21ST CENTURY**

---

**Public authority in fragile AFRICAN COUNTRIES**

The centre is funded for five years and will be led by Professor Tim Allen (pictured), Director of the Firoz Lalji Centre for Africa, where CPAID will be hosted. He said: “If the pessimistic headlines and official statistics about Africa were all true, most people in Africa would be dead. Yet, when you travel to places where the reach of governments is limited and political upheavals make the provision of formal services limited, we encounter vibrant social lives. “Mutuality is possible even in circumstances in which it appears to be impossible from the outside. How it happens is unclear. What is apparent is that ideas about good governance are not immediately actionable from the outside. They come from in the world, you will find LSE welcoming and stimulating.”

Professor Allen will lead a team of African and international researchers who have accumulated a wealth of experience over many years in the study of governance on the ground in Africa and elsewhere. Working together they will produce research that will inform local, national and international development policies so that they successfully promote economic growth and stability in these fragile states.

---

**LSE RISES IN WORLD RANKINGS**

LSE has risen in the latest World University Rankings compiled by higher education data specialists QS.

Despite a national trend of decline for UK universities in the rankings, the School rose two places to 35th in the world, and has surged 33 places since 2014. The result also places LSE in the top ten of universities ranked within Europe. Within the rankings, QS places LSE as seventh in the world for its reputation among employers, achieving a maximum score of 100 out of 100. The School was also ranked seventh in the world for its international students, and ranked highly for international faculty, achieving the maximum score of 100 in both categories. These two factors are used by QS to measure the international appeal of universities.

Earlier this year, the QS World University Rankings by Subject placed LSE as the top university in Europe for the social sciences, and second in the world overall. Commenting on the news, LSE Interim Director Professor Julia Black said: “LSE’s rise in this year’s rankings is a richly-deserved credit to our community of staff, students and alumni. It is particularly pleasing to be commended for our international outlook. While deeply rooted in London, we are proud to be a globally-facing and diverse institution. Wherever you come from in the world, you will find LSE welcoming and stimulating.”

The School also retained its place as London’s leading university in the Complete University Guide rankings for 2018. The Complete University Guide is produced annually and assesses universities by a number of measures, including employment data, non-continuation rates, research quality and student satisfaction.

Wherever you come from in the world, you will find LSE welcoming and stimulating.
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Colombian president and LSE alumnus
Juan Manuel Santos
(MSc Economics Course 1973-75) (pictured) was awarded the 2016 Nobel peace prize for his work to bring Colombia’s 50-year-long civil war to an end. The Colombian civil war is one of the longest civil wars in modern times, and the sole remaining armed conflict in the Americas. President Santos initiated the negotiations that culminated in the peace accord between the Colombian government and the FARC guerrillas. Gareth Jones, Professor of Urban Geography and Director of the Latin America and Caribbean Centre, said: “The Prize was given for President Santos’s brave decision to conduct more than four years of negotiations with the FARC that resulted in the Havana peace agreement. The negotiations attempted to put an end to decades of internal conflict that have left an estimated 260,000 people dead, over six million displaced, and many millions more in extended conditions of poverty and daily lives faced with violence and insecurity.”

Since attending LSE in 1975, President Santos has been a regular visitor and strong supporter of the School over many years.

The Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences was awarded to Professor Oliver Hart, a Visiting Centenial Professor in the Department of Economics at LSE and Andrei Shleifer Professor of Economics at Harvard. Professor Hart shares the award with Bengt Holmstrom of MIT for their contributions to contract theory – work which “lays an intellectual foundation for designing policies and institutions in many areas, from bankruptcy legislation to political constitutions” the prize awarding body said.

Professor Leonardo Felli, head of the Department of Economics at LSE, said: “The Department of Economics at LSE is absolutely delighted about the decision of the Nobel prize committee to award the 2016 Nobel prize in Economics to two of the most distinguished economists of our time, Professor Oliver Hart and Bengt Holmstrom, for their work on the theory of contracts. Their analysis of the contractual relationship between individuals has enhanced our understanding of the inner functioning of modern firms, corporations and organisations, as well as providing a key insight into the basic contractual relationships between economic agents, the building block of all economic activities.”

Nicholas Stern, John Hardman Moore, Emily Jackson, Christine Chinkin and Andrew Webb have all been recognised in the 2017 Queen’s Birthday Honours.

Nicholas Stern, IG Patel Professor of Economics and Government at LSE, has been made a Companion of Honour, one of the most prestigious awards for a civilian, limited to just 65 people at any one time. The title is granted to those who have made a major contribution to the arts, science, medicine, or government over a long period. Professor Stern – who is also Chair of the Grantham Research Institute at LSE and the outgoing President of the British Academy – was given the title in recognition of his contributions to economics, international relations and tackling climate change. Only three other academic economists have ever held the award – Lionel Robbins, Friedrich Hayek and Amartya Sen, all former LSE professors.

Professor Julia Black, Interim Director (2016/17) of LSE, said: “This is richly deserved. Time and time again Nick has shown himself to be an outstanding public servant, an inspiring academic colleague and a dedicated member of LSE’s global community. The achievement is even more remarkable when you consider he is only the fourth ever academic economist to be made a Companion of Honour. Many congratulations also to Emily, Christine, John and Andrew and to all the members of the LSE community who have been recognised for their contributions to public life. At LSE we focus on research and teaching which helps to tackle real world problems, and here are some great examples of colleagues who have put this into practice.”

John Hardman Moore, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Edinburgh and Professor of Economic Theory at LSE has been awarded a CBE for his services to economics; Emily Jackson, Professor of Law and Vice Chair of the LSE Academic Board, has been awarded an OBE for her services to higher education; Christine Chinkin, founding Director of the Centre for Women, Peace and Security at LSE, was made a Companion of the Order of St Michael and St George (CMG) for services to advancing women’s human rights worldwide; and Andrew Webb, LSE School Secretary, has been awarded an OBE for his services to higher education and to the community in East Anglia. Andrew is a long-time servant of LSE, having worked in different areas of the School’s professional services since 1985.

The website will provide the latest commentary, analysis and evidence on issues such as the political consequences of macroeconomic policy reforms, the impact of global economic trends – such as trade liberalisation on developing countries – and the latest research on welfare schemes across the world.

Robin Burgess, member of the VoxDev editorial board and Professor of Economics at LSE, said: “VoxDev creates a direct link that did not exist before – between the ideas produced by frontier researchers in development and the policymakers and practitioners who can put them to use.”

Tavneet Suri, Editor-in-Chief of VoxDev and Associate Professor of Applied Economics at the MIT Sloan School of Management, said: “We are committed to making VoxDev the most successful development policy portal in the world, the premier site for evidence on economic issues facing the developing world.”
London School of Bollywood, a dance team that includes current LSE students and alumni, wowed the judges on this year’s Britain’s Got Talent with a performance inspired by their studies at LSE. At the time of writing, their routine, which challenged traditional stereotypes and embraced the idea that gender is not a barrier to success, has been viewed over 700,000 times on YouTube. Pranath Palliath, group choreographer and MSc Philosophy and Public Policy alumna said: “I am really excited to promote our message of equality and showcase LSE as a university with well-rounded students that combine their education with their hobbies.”
The reality of robots may not be what fiction has led us to believe, says Andrew Murray, according to a 2015 YouGov survey for the British Science Association. The alternative, the passive or socially useful robot has become demonised as a direct threat to human employability. The Bank of England warned in 2015 that up to 15 million jobs in Britain are at risk of being lost to robots, while a 2016 report from Forrester research suggested that, by 2021, robots will have eliminated six per cent of all jobs in the US.

Despite these dire warnings, we continue to press ahead in robotics and AI research. Why? Because there is a dissonance between the Sci-Fi debate and the future role of robots in our society. The first generation of truly smart AI devices is likely to be self-driving vehicles, which offer potentially massive social benefits. From a public safety perspective these benefits are clear. In 2016, 1,810 people were killed on Britain’s roads and 25,160 were seriously injured. With human error being attributed to around 90 per cent of road traffic accidents, self-driving cars could save around 1,600 lives and reduce serious injuries by around 22,500 per annum. Then there are the economic benefits for major corporations. Delivery companies, ride-share apps and even public transport providers can replace employees with smart robots, saving billions per annum and removing the risk of industrial action. Against such a backdrop it is clear to see how AI is attractive. Similar arguments can be made for the objective impartiality of AI judges and the precision of robot surgeons.

These arguments and debates are not the root of my interest in AI and robotics, however. While most people are looking at the challenge of AI and robotics to society, I’m looking at the challenge of the robots to us. What is the human cost of integrating AI and robotics into society? It is clear that using intelligent devices, even the base algorithmic intelligence of a current smart agent like Alexa, changes the way that humans think and make decisions. We retain less information and outsource the storage of data to our devices. This means that these external devices filter the information provided to us when we make a decision: we lose some of our autonomy by trading it for convenience and for a perceived “fuller picture” which is not the case. As Eli Pariser has shown in his book The Filter Bubble, a vital role of technology is choosing what not to reveal to us. In 1987 we might have made a decision based on incomplete information, but the question of what to retain and what to discard was a purely human decision. Thirty years later we have more information but that information is valued and presented to us not by a human thought process but by algorithmic design. The information society we value so highly has created too much information for us to process. We are faced with a tyranny of choice created by overwhelming data and have outsourced the filtering of that data to algorithms and devices. This has led to developments like the Big Data Analytics and Algorithmic Regulation.

As we approach the brave new world of human-level machine intelligence, which some commentators believe could be with us by 2030, we will, however, be asked some very deep questions about our identity and what it means to be human. The first significant challenge is likely to be how we treat our new equals. A common theme of Sci-Fi is human inability to recognise and treat with respect sentient life forms different from our own. If we do achieve human-level artificial intelligence within the next 20-30 years, what we do next will define us as humanity and our relationship with our creation. Will we treat it with respect, as an equal, or will we treat it as a tool?

Today when we talk of AI and robotics we normally define them as tools or devices to be used as we please: to drive cars or fly planes, to mine in dangerous environments, or simply to manage our everyday lives. This may be acceptable with the current standard of low-level machine intelligence; however, when the machine intelligence reaches human level and becomes sentient and self-aware we will have to consider it an intelligent life form.
Felix Alexander was a promising 17-year-old sixth form student when, last year, he threw himself under a train near his home town of Worcester after years of bullying by other teenagers. In an open letter published in the local newspaper, his grieving mother Lucy explained that cyberbullying, which often accompanies other forms of harassment and bullying, had contributed to his extreme unhappiness.

She urged others: “Be that one person prepared to stand up to unkindness. You will never regret being a good friend. I have been told that ‘everyone says things they don’t mean on social media’. Unkindness is dismissed as ‘banter’ and because they cannot see the effect of their words they do not believe there is one.”

Mrs Alexander went on to explain that she had tried to get her son to stop using social media as it was causing him so much distress, but that just isolated him further. So she was trying to get the message across that everyone has a collective responsibility to help prevent other young lives being lost.

Dr Ellen Helsper, Associate Professor at LSE’s Media and Communications Department and an expert on online interactions, is feeding her research into the script of a West End play due to be performed in October 2017. Cookies, to be staged at the Theatre Royal Haymarket, has been formally endorsed by Dame Judi Dench as a way of “addressing the issues associated with cyberbullying.”

The Theatre Royal Haymarket Masterclass Trust and the anti-bullying charity Kidscape, worked with students from four London sixth form colleges to create the play through a series of theatre-based workshops which helped provide fresh material for the script. This will then be performed by professional actors.

Dr Helsper played an active role as an expert advisor, working with the director, writer and producer and attending the workshops.

She explained: “In the workshops it was very clear that young people often don’t realise that some of the things that they’re doing, that make them popular with their friends or that seem just like fun can have a really big impact on the person on the receiving end. I saw slow change in
awareness, that this is not something that is just done by evil people, sometimes we do it without even realising. It’s something that is part of our everyday lives and we are often bystanders. By not interfering or not recognising it, we are part of creating a world in which it is possible.

“What we are trying to do is create awareness amongst young people, to have them feel what it’s like to be on both sides and why you might or might not do something when you’re a bystander.

We also want to help create a better understanding for parents who have no idea that this is going on, and teachers who might not really understand the ins and outs of this, but also for everyone who comes to see it.”

As well as two performances on 29 October, with possibly more in the pipeline, the aim is to film it for streaming to more than 30,000 schoolchildren in the UK and beyond in November 2016 with a live Q&A with actor David Tennant and RSC Artistic Director Gregory Doran.

Dr Helsper explained how her research has helped in understanding the difficulties for young people who are faced with cyberbullying. “There are certain patterns in the kind of strategies that these young people use. What we call less productive strategies are the ‘ostrich’ strategy and the ‘toughen up’ strategy. The latter tends to be a bit more prevalent in the young male participants in our research and the attitude is that you just have to develop a thick skin and don’t show that you’re affected by it and they will stop. This is one thing that we know doesn’t actually work.

“The other strategy is a total disconnect and we see that a bit more amongst young women where they say ‘I can do without it’. That’s also not a good strategy because social media is important for our wellbeing: it’s where people make connections, where they meet friends, where they find out about exciting things that are happening, where you share, where a lot of the relationships and friendships that we have offline are nurtured.” Asked whether there was any material from the workshops that really shocked her, she explained: “For me the shocking thing was the reaction when we were playing out these bullying scenarios, where there was victim blaming, such as ‘maybe it’s because you are a little stupid or a little slow’, or ‘if you wear that kind of thing or listen to that type of music then what do you expect?’ Blaming the victim for not being tough enough or not adjusting their behaviour to fit in with social groups was quite shocking for me. I’d heard the stories from those on the receiving end, but less from the people who are observing this happen.”

Dr Helsper helped lead the workshops to create realistic scenarios, she added: “We played out certain scenarios where a young person was bullied and then we asked what would you do to stop this from happening? Someone would insist that they would intervene, but as the leaders of these workshops, we would say ‘OK, but is this realistic?’ Let’s play it as if the person who is doing the bullying is in a group of maybe two or three, is the most popular person of the class who will be organising a big party that everybody wants to go to at the end of the week, who your popularity or confidence depends on being recognised by this person.” It was then that you could see their awareness of this changed and that they understood how difficult it was, and that for me was a really interesting switch.

“Bullying is not new, but with social media it’s the pervasiveness of it, the 24/7 thing that makes it so hard to escape. It’s also the social aspect.

“Bullying is almost never one on one, it’s almost always a group against an individual and those groups can be very physical groups in the sense of a bunch of friends teaming up with a leader steering them on. Or it could be an anonymous group which we see a lot in relation to sexism and sexual harassment online of women on Twitter for example, where because there are so many voices that are heard doing that and relatively little pushback, it might become seen as acceptable, a social norm.”

Ellen Helsper is Director of Graduate Studies and Associate Professor in the Department of Media and Communications at LSE.

Hear Dr Helsper and others discuss “Is social media good for society?” on our LSE podcast. Search LSEIQ on your favourite podcast app.
What is “fake news” and why is it the best thing to have happened to journalism? Professor Charlie Beckett and Associate Professor Bart Cammaerts discuss the rising trend of hoax stories and the challenges and opportunities they present.

Professor Charlie Beckett, Director of POLIS: I think fake news is amazingly addictive but also very, very damaging. It’s a kind of weird, perfect storm. We have a political and social situation in the world now where there is a lot of fragmentation, combined with the rise of populist movements, global polarisation and the technology to create fake news and spread it so rapidly. All these factors have come together to act like tinder to the fire. Fake news is like a canary in the digital coal mine and a sign that not all is well with the mainstream news media because they are not as effective as they once were.

The fake news crisis reflects a pervasive loss of faith in the idea of authority and whether you can trust experts and professionals. Mainstream media is battling with a serious credibility problem but the rise of fake news actually gives it an opportunity to stand apart as the trusted news source.

It’s a business opportunity to say “we are not fake”. Journalists are in the business of not just killing fake news and countering it by fact-checking and myth-busting, but also providing a healthy alternative. This is a great chance for journalists to go on an ethical mission that in the end will benefit them revenue-wise. Mainstream news that can be trusted is a good business model in a world where there is so much misinformation.

The next question we have to address is who should take responsibility for fake news? Do we want the platforms that carry it – Google and Facebook – to be accountable? Do we really want Mark Zuckerberg deciding what fake news is?

How harmful is it? It is very difficult to measure its impact. It may be mobilising opinion without actually changing it and the idea that fake news altered the course of the US election is probably exaggerated. It does also seem to be less prevalent here in the UK than the US. One of the reasons is that we have a more subjective and partisan press in Britain and the public accepts this. They are used to the mainstream media is producing without giving anything back. Maybe the time is ripe for some new configurations to come out of this situation.

What is the next step in the cycle of fake news? It looks messy at the moment, it feels messy and it has downsides to it. But we cannot disintegrate the internet. The mainstream media have to tackle it by finding a way forward that doesn’t reject the public’s appetite for the emotional and instinctive news that it finds so appealing. The mainstream media need to provide news that is argumentative, human and social without being fake, destructive or deceitful.

Professor Charlie Beckett is the founding director of POLIS, the think-tank for research and debate into international journalism and society in the Department of Media and Communications at LSE.

Associate Professor Bart Cammaerts, Department of Media and Communications: Spreading propaganda and fake news is not a new trend; there have always been people pushing out conspiracy theories and the like. The difference today is that we now have a technological and media infrastructure that feeds on clicks and on the politics of provocation.

We also have a whole range of political actors whose agenda is to spread untruths via social media, which has profound consequences for our democracy. A political economy has also been created which allows people to make a lot of money by creating sensationalist stories which attract a lot of clicks. Google and Facebook are now realising how problematic this actually is because advertisers don’t want to be associated with this fake news.

Early on, Facebook and Twitter were merely telecommunication platforms that hosted news. However, they are now seen as a different form of media which is ingrained in our society, taking editorial decisions on what content is acceptable for their sites.

Just who is responsible for policing fake news in this new environment? Social media platforms are not necessarily neutral, so there is a role here for journalists to adjudicate. It’s called fact-checking. The media are seen to be losing their legitimacy, have very low public trust and are viewed by the populists as part of the problem – the “dishonest” media elite. The challenge for journalists is to take up their democratic responsibility and make it very clear to the public what content is trustworthy and what is not.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the US had a very strong tradition of civic and public journalism, which might be up for renewal given the situation we face today. The role of journalists to defend democracy has taken on even greater importance since the election of Donald Trump, who has a hostile relationship with the media and absolutely no respect for their role in society.

Maybe there is a middle ground we need to find. On one hand, journalism needs to find new models to reinvent itself and become profitable and trusted again. On the other hand, advertisers are starting to complain about what is happening on social media platforms. There is a long-standing tension between traditional media and social media, with the latter profiting from all this content that the mainstream media is producing without giving anything back. Maybe the time is ripe for some new configurations to come out of this situation.

Associate Professor Bart Cammaerts is director of the MSc in Media and Communications.
MEET THE new Director

AN INTERVIEW WITH Dame Minouche Shafik

LSE’s incoming Director sets out her priorities and discusses what makes the School unique

“People have stopped me in the street to comment on how LSE has changed their life,” notes the School’s incoming Director Dame Minouche Shafik. As the first LSE alumnus to become the School’s Director, that’s certainly something to which Minouche can testify. Following an MSc in Economics in 1986 and a DPhil at St Antony’s College at the University of Oxford, Minouche went on to work for the World Bank, the Department for International Development (DFID), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and, most recently, the Bank of England, where she served as Deputy Governor.

MINOUCHE AT LSE

Her LSE training was dominated by two themes – intellectual rigour and a global outlook – which stayed with her throughout her professional life. “The MSc here was incredibly tough – I had never worked so hard in my life as I did that year!” But that course provided a strong foundation for her later successes. “The tradition of getting to ‘the causes of things’ at LSE is about seeking evidence in order to improve the world. It’s a principle that has guided me since. In every job I’ve done, at the very core it has been about using knowledge of the social sciences and analytical skills to find evidence to improve things. That was something I learned at LSE.” As well as the School’s focus on intellectual rigour and evidence, Minouche believes that LSE’s global outlook was another important factor in her career choices. “At LSE, I became part of something much more global,” reflects Minouche, who was born in Egypt and spent part of her childhood in the US. “My class had students from around the world and I discovered the joys of being a part of an internationally diverse community.”

But it’s the ‘community of ideas’ and public purpose embodied by LSE that Minouche feels really united her and her fellow students. “At LSE, it doesn’t matter where you come from – it is the coming together around learning and ideas that brings people together,” she says. “By its nature, the School’s sense of community is not about rolling lawns and college balls, it is about foundational intellectual experiences with kindred spirits that transcend geography.”

“I love the fact that the School was set up with the explicit purpose of not being an ivory tower. It is in the heart of London, one of the most global cities in the world, and our faculty and students are from everywhere and actively engaged in the issues of the day. Our public events programme is the best in the world and everyone who comes to London wants to speak here because they know it matters.”

PRIORITIES

So, as a former student and someone who has engaged with the School in her professional life, what are Minouche’s priorities for the School as incoming Director?

“There is a big part of the job which is about stewardship. Preserving LSE’s intellectual excellence and its truly global perspective and nature are a priority,” she says. Minouche concedes the School also faces many challenges and one of the most prominent of these is Brexit. The incoming Director says she will do everything in her power to ensure the School remains global both in terms of resolving practical issues around visas and funding and by sending out signals that the School is open and continues to be engaged with the world. “Intellectual life and the life of ideas can only thrive in open societies. I think we have to make sure that every day, in everything we do, we reinforce the importance of this being a place that is open to people and ideas from all over the world.”

A second priority for Minouche is teaching and the student experience. “There is excellent teaching going on everywhere in the School but I think students’ expectations have shifted and we haven’t kept up,” she reflects. “I think aspects of the student experience, Preserving LSE’s intellectual excellence and its truly global perspective and nature are a priority.”
The IMPORTANCE OF EVIDENCE

One of LSE's founders, Beatrice Webb, wrote in her diaries that “reform will not be brought about by shouting”. She went on to argue that what was needed was careful gathering of evidence and analysis and debate. “I think one of the problems with the modern world is that people often hear views that reinforce their prejudices rather than challenge them,” Minouche argues. “We can be the place that shows that engaging with ideas that differ from your own is the way we make intellectual progress.”

THE ROLE OF ALUMNI

It’s through that focus on evidence that Minouche believes makes LSE students and alumni unique. “LSE creates citizens of the world who, because of the rigour of their training, will be good citizens wherever they live. They will make choices based on evidence; they will want to see policies that improve the world based on facts and good research.” That also means the School needs to engage with its alumni differently. Recalling a conversation with an LSE alumna, Minouche says: “She said to me that her undergraduate university engaged with her as a nostalgic 19 year old whereas LSE connected with her as an adult citizen of the world engaged with the issues of the day. She clearly preferred the latter.”

The School has an exceptional track record in placing its graduates in great jobs. “We often cite the 37 world leaders and 18 Nobel laureates associated with the School. But equally important are the thousands of alumni doing important jobs in areas such as government, finance, industry, teaching, and civil society.” Minouche notes. Recent research has shown that LSE graduates are the highest paid five years after graduation in the UK.

The networks built as a student can also be a powerful force in later life. Minouche reflects on her own experience: “The relationships I built with faculty and fellow students at LSE stayed with me throughout my career. Many became future colleagues and life long friends. What we shared was a commitment to intellectual rigour and openness to the world.”

Minouche feels alumni have an important role to play not just in the wider world but in the future of the School and its mission going forward. “I want to ensure that our alumni can continue to be part of the LSE community by engaging with us through our research and public events programme. We can do this digitally, through events and alumni networks around the world, as well as by creating a space for them on campus when they visit London.

I would also encourage them to remember that if they themselves were transformed by their time here, that by giving back to the school, they can extend that opportunity to others.”

Dame Minouche Shafik, LSE’s incoming Director, was talking to Adrian Thomas, Director of Communications.
GIFTS TO LSE’S CAMPUS REGENERATION

GENEROUS LSE ALUMNI MAKING LANDMARK GIFTS TO LSE’S CAMPUS REGENERATION

The Centre Buildings development, which will be completed in 2019, will transform LSE. Within it, the new LSE-style lecture theatres are an innovation in campus-based education, providing flexible ways for educators and students to interact and learn. The Sumeet Valrani Lecture Theatre is named in recognition of a gift to LSE from alumnus Sumeet Valrani (BSc Economics 1989). On making his generous gift, Sumeet commented: “LSE does me a significant honour in attaching my name to this new theatre, for which I am deeply honoured. I am proud of the outstanding record of my alma mater in researching and finding solutions to the problems of the world, especially poverty, low-growth and expanding inequality in the underdeveloped regions. I make my modest contribution as an expression of my profound gratitude for the privilege of being a member of your alumni and I hope that much good may come from it.”

Dr Saqib Qureshi (BSc International Relations 1995, PhD International Relations 2002) has generously donated £50,000 to the new building, in support of the Department of International Relations that will be housed on floors 8-10. In recognition of this gift, the Dr Saqib Qureshi Room will be located on the 10th floor.

Virginia Beardsley CBE, Chair of the Annual Fund, commented: “The Annual Fund is a real LSE success story, demonstrating the collective impact alumni and friends have on the life of the School. In surpassing £1 million for the second year in a row, it has helped to raise funds that can be used this academic year to support scholarships, enhance the student experience, help LSE departments and assist the School leadership in providing funding to a range of priority projects.”

£1m success

ANNUAL FUND REPEATS

Funding boost for AFRICA CENTRE

Pii Ketvel (LLM 1995) and Gisella Ketvel (MSc European Studies 1995) have made a generous unrestricted donation to the Firoz Lalji Centre for Africa. The couple met at LSE while completing their master’s.

In making the gift, Gisella was partly inspired by her attendance of the inaugural 2016 LSE Programme for African Leadership (PAL) Forum in Uganda. PAL – also supported by Firoz and Najma Lalji and part of the Centre’s activity – was established at LSE in 2012 to provide scholarships and nurture a new generation of leaders in Africa. Pii commented: “We are delighted to further support the School, and the work of the Centre. We both favour giving in an unrestricted way, so that the School can choose to direct the funds towards the areas of most pressing concern.”

Professor Tim Allen, Director of the Africa Centre, added: “Unrestricted funding helps us to build on Firoz Lalji’s remarkable generosity which enabled us to found and maintain the Centre. We can invest in new activities and develop parts of our existing portfolio. The support and vision of Pii and Gisella will enable us to bring the strategic aspect of the Centre’s work to fruition in its early stages.”

£2.7m AWARD FROM KUWAIT FOUNDATION RENEWS LONG-TERM SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH AT LSE

LSE Benefactor the Kuwait Foundation for the Advancement of Sciences has extended its existing support for the Kuwait Programme at LSE’s Middle East Centre. In the decade since it was established at LSE in 2007, the Kuwait Programme has become a world-leading hub for research and expertise on Kuwait and the wider Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC).

New LSE Director Dame Minouche Shafik and Professor Julia Black celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Programme and joined a signing ceremony with the Foundation’s Board in May to mark the additional £2.7 million five-year funding.

THE FRANK ANTON LECTURE THEATRE

In 2017, the Home of the Department of Economics – recognises the valuable contribution made through a generous legacy gift which established a scholarship for graduate students in the department. Dr Frank R Anton (BSc Economics 1950) was navigator of an RAF Lancaster bomber shot down over Germany in 1943 during the second world war. Subsequently held in a prison camp for two years, Dr Anton used this time to advance his education and develop his passion for economics. After the war, he won entrance to LSE and obtained his BSc in 1950.

SANTANDER UNIVERSITIES UK has donated £15,000 towards a social entrepreneurship event series taking place in 2017/18. Social Entrepreneurship 360° combines the strengths of LSE’s Innovation Co-Creation Lab (ICCLab) and LSE Generate, the School’s entrepreneurship programme within LSE Careers. The initiative sees UK- and Latin America-based social entrepreneurs collaborate and connect with internationally focused counterparts to analyse their work and share experiences with invited academics, practitioners and students. Santander’s funding covers travel and accommodation costs, and complements its existing support for scholarships, travel bursaries and internships at LSE.
Khaled Khateeb was unable to attend focus increased when cinematographer social commentators on its launch. That attention from a range of political and attraction from international acclaim and country’s continuing conflict, the film volunteers supporting victims of the year’s Academy Awards. Highlighting news even before it won an Oscar at this The White Helmets was international SOCIAL CHANGE/ LSE CONNECT LSE SEEKING THROUGH FILMMAKING LSE Anthropology and Development the spotlight on two LSE alumni, its (Short Subject) Oscar success increased Turkey. The film’s Best Documentary from boarding a flight to the US from the ceremony after being barred their introduction came by chance. “I had been working on my previous film Virunga for about a year and it project, but there were other strong reasons for making the film. “At that point, the Syrian war had been going on for five years. The public had started to disengage with the conflict and there was also a lot of misinformation about Muslims and Syrians,” continues Orlando. “We thought by telling this very powerful and compelling human story that cuts through the politics we could re-engage the public and shed light on what was happening to civilians on the ground.”

Making the film was extremely challenging. Western journalists were not allowed inside Aleppo at the time, and the crew had to film on the Turkish-Syrian border. “We were invited to collaborate with the White Helmets and worked with Khaled – a very young white helmet who has been documenting the conflict since he was sixteen – and two of his colleagues. They made the entire film possible, filming inside war-torn Aleppo and capturing footage in a dangerous environment.”

Orlando is enthusiastic about the possibilities that have opened up for independent filmmakers with the eruption of online platforms such as Netflix, which distributed The White Helmets. He sees them as very powerful tools with the potential to reach millions of people in countries across the world. “There is something really good about the algorithms of these platforms: after watching an action film, a very obscure documentary might be suggested as your next ‘watch’. That is amazing from the social impact point of view, as it brings documentary films to vast new audiences.”

What is next for them? “Our next project is very inward-looking,” reveals Orlando. “There is a difficult story at the heart of my own family I’d like to tell. The only reason I can work on this now is because the team has become very close, and I feel we are ready to address something much closer to home.”

When you are making a film you hope will have social impact, it is hard to describe just how incredible it is being nominated for one of the big American or British awards,” says Orlando. “We attracted an entirely new media profile, getting attention from the entertainment and celebrity press. All of a sudden we were hitting completely different target audiences, reaching people who otherwise wouldn’t have been interested. It shone a really bright spotlight on the work of the White Helmets and on the issues at the heart of the film.”

After the success of Virunga, which was nominated for an Academy Award, Joanna and Orlando embarked together on a new project: The White Helmets. “Joanna and I saw the footage of a very young白 helmet who has been documenting the conflict since he was sixteen – and two of his colleagues. They made the entire film possible, filming inside war-torn Aleppo and capturing footage in a dangerous environment.”

Joanna and Orlando were postgraduate students at LSE in the 2000s, their paths didn’t actually cross on Houghton Street. Instead, their introduction came by chance. “I had been working on my previous film Virunga for about a year and it became pretty clear there was a gap in production,” says Orlando. “Bridsoc Foundation, a non-profit organisation supporting documentary filmmaking, put me in touch with Joanna and she filled that gap very quickly. She is an incredible person, and we trust and understand each other creatively.”

“I was also the impact producer for Virunga, a role which is relatively new,” continues Joanna. “Our focus is on outreach, and on working strategically to use film to create a real-world impact. It’s about engaging and connecting with audiences – from cinema goers to high level policy makers – with a specific goal in mind. That film is an obvious example: the aim was not only to tell the story of Virunga National Park’s heroic rangers, but to protect a UNESCO World Heritage site from oil exploration and to hold a British oil company to account for their activities in the area. The campaign around that was focused on engaging the public as well as industry and investors, to put pressure on the company to stop their activity – which was illegal under Congolese law – and to commit not to explore within the park boundaries.”

The White Helmets was international news even before it won an Oscar at this year’s Academy Awards. Highlighting the work of Syria Civil Defence volunteers supporting victims of the country’s continuing conflict, the film attracted international acclaim and attention from a range of political and social commentators on its launch. That focus increased when cinematographer Khaled Khateeb was unable to attend the ceremony after being barred from boarding a flight to the US from Turkey. The film’s Best Documentary (Short Subject) Oscar success increased the spotlight on two LSE alumni, its director Orlando von Einsiedel (MSc Anthropology and Development 2004-09) and producer Joanna Natasegara (MSc Human Rights 2004).

“When you are making a film you hope will have social impact, it is hard to
Commercial surveys typically ask whether respondents voted or not and use that figure to estimate turnout. The elephant in the room is that this is not, however, how turnout is calculated in real life. Legally, electoral participation is the proportion of people who vote among eligible (registered) voters, and not among the population as a whole. The distinction is critical because we know that young people are far less likely to be registered electorally than any other age group. In July 2014, the Electoral Commission confirmed that “younger people (under 35) are considerably less likely to be registered”, with only 70.2 per cent of 20-24 year-olds on electoral registers, against 95.5 per cent of those over 65. While the Electoral Commission has made tremendous efforts to reduce this gap, there are well-known structural reasons why younger people remain less likely to be correctly registered electorally in any country. Therefore, if we do not control for registration in surveys, we significantly underestimate youth turnout compared to other categories.

The question of whether young people voted or not is politically important for two critical reasons. Firstly, a year on, there is still a significant proportion of younger voters who are deeply unhappy with the result of the referendum and want to be heard, yet who are met with the answer that “they should have bothered to vote if they cared that much”. Secondly, the Government chose not to allow 16-17 year-olds to vote in the referendum, and some ask whether allowing them to vote could have changed the result.

Much has been said of the generational gap between young and old voters in elections in general and in the UK’s referendum on EU membership in particular. But while the contrast in terms of preference – with young people massively supporting a vote to remain in the EU – was unanimously accepted, the question of youth turnout was, surprisingly, far more controversial.

Differences in turnout across age groups are rarely contentious, both because most aspects of electoral behaviour do not vary that much by age and because it is already well-known that young people tend to vote very significantly less than older ones. In this case, however, the question of youth turnout was raised immediately on election night because generational differences in preferences made commentators wonder if a greater youth mobilisation would have led to a different result.

The first figures that hit the news were released by Sky Data in a tweet and were understood to mean that only 36 per cent of young people aged 18-24 voted in the referendum. Comparing that figure to the 83 per cent of those over 65 who were quoted as having voted, the verdict was returned that the young were foolishly apathetic. However, while most articles published shortly after the referendum on the subject referred to that alarming statistic, the figures that Sky Data released had effectively nothing to do with turnout in the referendum. As they transparently explained in a further tweet, the figure came from a survey conducted for the 2015 General Election, more than a year earlier, which looked at the proportion within each generation who say that they always vote. In that sense, the Sky Data figure is arguably a measure of what generational turnout should have been expected to be if young people had behaved the way they usually do on the day of the vote. In truth, however, they did not behave as usual. Rather than failing to engage, they turned out in much higher numbers than past voting behaviour would lead us to expect.

Alongside a general lack of certainty about young voters’ turnout there is another factor which further complicated matters.

Commercial surveys typically ask whether respondents voted or not and use that figure to estimate turnout. The elephant in the room is that this is not, however, how turnout is calculated in real life. Legally, electoral participation is the proportion of people who vote among eligible (registered) voters, and not among the population as a whole. The distinction is critical because we know that young people are far less likely to be registered electorally than any other age group. In July 2014, the Electoral Commission confirmed that “younger people (under 35) are considerably less likely to be registered”, with only 70.2 per cent of 20-24 year-olds on electoral registers, against 95.5 per cent of those over 65.

While the Electoral Commission has made tremendous efforts to reduce this gap, there are well-known structural reasons why younger people remain less likely to be correctly registered electorally in any country. Therefore, if we do not control for registration in surveys, we significantly underestimate youth turnout compared to other categories.

The question of whether young people voted or not is politically important for two critical reasons. Firstly, a year on, there is still a significant proportion of younger voters who are deeply unhappy with the result of the referendum and want to be heard, yet who are met with the answer that “they should have bothered to vote if they cared that much”. Secondly, the Government chose not to allow 16-17 year-olds to vote in the referendum, and some ask whether allowing them to vote could have changed the result.

Much has been said of the generational gap between young and old voters in elections in general and in the UK’s referendum on EU membership in particular. But while the contrast in terms of preference – with young people massively supporting a vote to remain in the EU – was unanimously accepted, the question of youth turnout was, surprisingly, far more controversial.

Differences in turnout across age groups are rarely contentious, both because most aspects of electoral behaviour do not vary that much by age and because it is already well-known that young people tend to vote very significantly less than older ones. In this case, however, the question of youth turnout was raised immediately on election night because generational differences in preferences made commentators wonder if a greater youth mobilisation would have led to a different result.

The first figures that hit the news were released by Sky Data in a tweet and were understood to mean that only 36 per cent of young people aged 18-24 voted in the referendum. Comparing that figure to the 83 per cent of those over 65 who were quoted as having voted, the verdict was returned that the young were foolishly apathetic. However, while most articles published shortly after the referendum on the subject referred to that alarming statistic, the figures that Sky Data released had effectively nothing to do with turnout in the referendum. As they transparently explained in a further tweet, the figure came from a survey conducted for the 2015 General Election, more than a year earlier, which looked at the proportion within each generation who say that they always vote. In that sense, the Sky Data figure is arguably a measure of what generational turnout should have been expected to be if young people had behaved the way they usually do on the day of the vote. In truth, however, they did not behave as usual. Rather than failing to engage, they turned out in much higher numbers than past voting behaviour would lead us to expect.

Alongside a general lack of certainty about young voters’ turnout there is another factor which further complicated matters.
The two studies are very different in conception. Panel studies are in many ways the gold standard for election studies because of their invaluable insights into election effects and change over time. However, they are not ideal for inferring such elements as electoral choice and turnout because they disproportionately lose abstentionists across waves and also because the very fact that people were asked three times about the referendum could have made them more interested in it than average voters. In other words, those surveys are ideal for understanding processes and effects, but not for taking a snapshot of the population. After weighting for the over-reporting of participation, our panel study findings suggested a turnout of young people of about 70 per cent for 18-24-year-olds and 67 per cent for 25-39-year-olds – a figures that had to be taken with caution, but which suggested nonetheless that the young had taken more interest in the referendum than had initially been suggested.

Our second study, which specifically asked respondents if they were registered to vote or not in order to control for it in our estimated turnout, had less explanatory power but gave a more reliable depiction of the reality. After weighting the results to match the actual overall turnout of 72 per cent, we found that turnout was 64 per cent for 18-24-year-olds and 65 per cent for 25-39-year-olds. This was almost identical for 40-54-year-olds (66 per cent), but below the 74 per cent for the 55-64 bracket, and the 90 per cent for those over 65.

The findings suggest that, while young people voted slightly less than average, they were probably close to the national average, at only 8 points below according to our survey. Our figures also suggest that, although 18-24-year-olds voted less than voters above 55 in particular, the differential was likely to have been less than in General Elections, suggesting that young people made a greater effort to mobilise in the EU referendum than in recent General Elections. In that sense, it is certainly unfair to criticise their right to have an opinion on the outcome on the grounds that they "did not bother to vote".

What this tells us about what might have happened had 16-17 year-olds been allowed to vote is far more complex. Our electoral psychology team has done a great deal of work on both first-time voters and the electoral behaviour of 16-17-year-olds across Europe. Invariably, we find that people in this age-group vote less than older voters but significantly more than the 18-30 bracket. We had confirmation of this recently in both Austrian elections and the Scottish independence referendum, and other studies such as the ICM Scotland independence referendum survey confirmed our finding, with a 75 per cent turnout among 16-17-year-olds compared with 54 per cent for 18-24-year-olds. Moreover, 16-17 year-olds (as well as 18-19-year-olds) are significantly more likely to register than 20-24-year-olds.

There are structural reasons for those differences: many in their early twenties leave home to work or study, are new to local political stakes (an important predictor of voting), are more likely than any other group to travel or live abroad, and may not even know that this does not affect their right to vote. Moreover, they may have registered to vote in a place where they are not physically present on the date of the vote (the 2016 referendum occurred after the examination periods in universities, for example), and may not even live at their term address to receive a postal vote. Conversely, 16-17-year-olds often live with their parents, are more likely to be present both to register and to vote, and are likely to be connected with political debates and local networks.

Allowing 16-17-year-olds to vote would have added nearly 1.6 million potential citizens to the electorate, but it is of course extraordinarily difficult to know whether it might have affected the outcome of the referendum. On balance, the results of our surveys on the turnout of 18-24-year-olds suggest that it would not have been enough to overturn the result of the referendum, unless 16-17-year-olds were almost unanimously in favour of remaining. It would, however, have almost certainly reduced the advantage of Leave to such a point (probably fewer than 500,000 votes) that the very concept of a majority might have become controversial.

Overall, while young people remain less likely to vote than their older counterparts – not least for technical reasons and because of a timing that disadvantaged them more than any other age group – it is clear that they considered the 2016 referendum sufficiently critical to their future and that of their country to participate far more than they had in any election in recent years. This is particularly clear when controlling for their lower registration levels. With a preference that was dramatically more supportive of remaining in the European Union than older voters, it is therefore not surprising that, a year after the vote, the rift not only between Remain and Leave voters but also across generations remains more dramatic than virtually ever before in post-war Britain.

Michael Bruter is Professor of Political Science at LSE and director of the ECREP Initiative in electoral psychology in the Government Department. Sarah Harrison is Assistant Professorial Research Fellow in Electoral Psychology and co-directs the ECREP Initiative, see www.ecrep.org
Since its inception in the 1970s microfinance has emerged as an important tool to support livelihoods among those who lack access to traditional banking services, though the method has its critics. Erica Field and Rohini Pande carried out a series of experiments in India that have given insights into ways microfinance could be refined to strengthen their beneficial impact for the world’s poorest women.

When the United Nations published the latest version of its Gender Inequality Index in 2016, India scored relatively low compared to other countries at a similar level of economic development. The reasons why are clear: Indian parents invest less in daughters than they do in sons, leading to high child malnutrition. Household surveys also show that Indian women suffer high rates of domestic violence and have relatively little say in household decisions and limited ability to move about the community.

How do we enable Indian women to take power and increase their voice and self-determination?

The approach many leaders in government and the private sector have taken is to increase women’s economic independence. These efforts are based on solid evidence highlighting the beneficial effects of financial autonomy. Getting money into the hands of women promises not only to benefit them, but society as a whole, research from across the world has shown, because women spend more than men on children’s health and education.

The ways to achieve this goal, however, are constantly in question. Since the 1970s, one tool has been microfinance – small, collateral-free loans, given predominantly to poor women. In lieu of collateral, these women help (or pressure) each other to make their payments. The classic microfinance contract resulted in repayment rates nearing 100 per cent, allowing this sector to reach the very poorest people who previously had no access to banking.

But recently, critics have claimed that microfinance methods are coercive, and researchers have found in repeated tests in different countries that microloans have little poverty-reducing effect – and, in fact, little effect on the standard measures of female empowerment. Something, however, has been lost in this conversation: the fact that, whether or not a microloan “transforms” the life of a poor woman, it represents something important, perhaps the first time she engages with the world outside the domestic sphere and, importantly, with other women.

To better understand these dynamics, we have been conducting experiments around microfinance for over a decade. Our work shines a different light on this beleaguered sector – one that marches forward despite academic criticism and regulatory constraints because there is actual demand for these loans among the poor. Here are some of the ways we have been testing out ways that the standard loan contract can be redesigned to improve conditions for the world’s poorest women, and some of the conclusions we have reached to date.

Give them time

While loans made available through microfinance are meant to foster business creation among poor people in developing countries, the standard loan contract requires them to start repaying loans immediately. As a result, the borrower may keep part of the loan aside for those first payments. In order to understand more about the impact this schedule might have, we worked with a microfinance provider in West Bengal. The study, co-funded by LSE’s International Growth Centre (IGC) and co-authored with Natalia Rigol and John Papp, separated borrowers into two groups, giving one the standard microfinance contract, which requires repayment instalments to start immediately, and the other a contract that featured a two-month grace period before the first instalment. We hypothesised that the grace period might allow clients to invest in more profitable activities that take more time – for example, buying a sewing machine and fabric to make saris, rather than buying readymade garments from a wholesaler. We surveyed clients at the time of the loans and revisited them three years later to check on their businesses.

We found that clients who received the grace period invested six per cent more in their businesses and were twice as likely to start new ones. Astonishingly, their weekly business profits three years later were 41 per cent greater and monthly household income 19.5 per cent greater, and they reported roughly 80 per cent more business capital. There was a drawback, however; grace period clients were three times as likely to default. This suggests that if microfinance is to achieve its
aim of fostering entrepreneurship, it will have to take into account the real needs of small, fragile businesses, and deal with high default rates.

Give them space
A frequent criticism of microfinance is that the system is built on coercion – women pressuring each other into making payments even when they are in desperate need. An IGC co-funded study we carried out in Kolkata with co-authors Papp and Y. Jeanette Park, aimed to understand more about how the frequency of payments affected borrowers’ self-reported stress levels. For the study, one group of microfinance clients made the standard weekly payments, while another made larger, monthly instalments. Starting a few months after loan disbursal, team members interviewed clients regarding their state of mind every 48 hours via cell phones distributed specially for the study. The surveys showed that clients who repaid monthly were 51 per cent less likely to report feeling “worried, tense, or anxious” about repaying, were 54 per cent more likely to report feeling confident about repaying, and reported spending less time thinking about their loans than did clients who repaid weekly. Additionally, monthly clients showed that the flexibility encouraged them to use their higher business investment and income, suggesting thinking about their loans than did clients who repaid weekly. We saw that frequent meetings had the same strong positive effects on social networks and repayment, whether or not payments were made during them. Not only did these findings constitute the first experimental evidence on the economic returns from social interaction, but they provided an alternative explanation to peer pressure for the success of the group lending model: the positive force of social networks.

It is important to remember that these are women whose social supports are lost when they marry and move to their husbands’ villages or neighbourhoods, at which point their interactions may be limited to husband, children, and mother-in-law. Meeting in a group setting allowed them to get to know other women in the neighborhood. It looks like in the longer term, they are more willing to risk-share, shown by their willingness to help their peers participate in a lottery, but also as observed by the fact that these women were less likely to default on future loans.

This work continues. Now we are examining whether these insights can also apply to the design of government benefit schemes. Our results so far show that directing women’s earnings directly into their own (rather than a household) bank account can encourage them to shift more of their time into paid labour. If this allows them to begin taking the reins of their financial lives, a number of benefits may follow.

Robin Panda is the Mohammed Kamal Professor of Public Policy at Harvard Kennedy School and co-director of Evidence for Policy Design at Harvard. Erica Field is a Professor of Economics and Global Health at Duke University. For more on the “Access to credit and female labour supply in India” project, see the International Growth Centre website at www.theigc.org/project/access-to-credit-and-female-labour-supply-in-india/
Prestigious LSE award for former Acting Chair of Court and Council

The Distinguished Alumni Award will be conferred on Alan Elias (LLB 1977) in thanks and recognition of his generous long-term support of the School, both as a volunteer and philanthropic donor.

Alan, who was Acting Chair of Court and Council during 2016, stepped down as Vice-Chair of Court over the summer. He has made a profound contribution to LSE as a Governor, ambassador and philanthropic supporter. “It’s a great honour to receive this award 40 years after I graduated from the School in July 1977,” said Alan. “LSE has been an important part of my life ever since, and it has been a privilege to serve as Acting Chair and as Vice-Chair of Court and Council. Although I am now stepping down from the governance of the School, I will continue to support LSE – including as an Ambassador for the Department of Law.”

LSE’s global alumni network

142,483 contactable alumni

35.1% undergraduate
61.0% postgraduate
3.9% other

38.8% graduated pre-2000
61.2% graduated post-2000

July 2017 graduates by citizenship:

67 Africa and the Middle East
63 Latin America and the Caribbean
1,410 Europe (of which 889 UK)
277 North America
946 Asia and the Pacific

Alumni network

190 countries
86 recognised alumni country groups/networks
11 special interest groups

The redevelopment of our Centre Buildings is well on track. Demolition was completed in December 2016 and construction work continues, with a view to finishing the new building in 2019. It will include the LSE Alumni Centre, providing a bespoke space to serve the needs of alumni on campus, whether you are attending events, using the library, or simply visiting the School while in London. Some of the Centre’s key features include wifi access, computer terminals, space for using laptops, facilities for charging devices, daytime left luggage storage, a meeting room and complimentary refreshments and newspapers. Find out more about the project at lse.ac.uk/placeandpurpose

One step closer to first ALUMNI HUB ON CAMPUS

LIFELONG LEARNING: access LSE teaching throughout your adult life

Your LSE experience does not end at graduation. The School offers you a range of opportunities to gain and share insight and advice from LSE faculty and alumni alike.

From peer to peer mentoring to bespoke careers services for alumni up to five years post-graduation, and exclusive networking events, LSE’s alumni programme can support your professional development, further your career ambitions and enhance your knowledge base.

Alumni also receive generous discounts on tuition fees for postgraduate courses, executive education programmes and other lifelong learning opportunities at the School – such as courses offered at the Language Centre or the Summer School.

Learn more about the benefits, services and discounts available to you at alumni.lse.ac.uk

The redeveloped LSE community

Community
Tackling youth violence, encouraging an uptake of vaccines in developing countries and helping people to connect over a meal are just some of the ways LSE students have been making an impact on the world around them this year.

Temi Mwale, a 21-year-old LSE undergraduate law student at the time of the announcement, was named in Forbes’ 30 under 30 Europe 2017 list for her campaign to tackle youth violence.

The list of 300 of the brightest young entrepreneurs, innovators and game changers is compiled by global media company Forbes.

Temi was included in the Social Entrepreneur category for her work as CEO and founder of The 4Front Project to understand and reduce serious violence among London’s youth.

Having grown up on a Barnet estate where youth crime was rampant, Temi was inspired to found The 4Front Project following the murder of her childhood friend Marvin Henry. Temi, who graduated this year, hopes to continue her work with The 4Front Project full time.

Temi said: “I am humbled to have made the list and to be recognised for making an impact through social entrepreneurship. Everything I do is in the memory of my friend Marvin, but many more young lives have been lost since he was killed.

“I do believe that we can end serious youth violence by addressing its root causes, such as trauma. I want to show young people that anything is possible; don’t let where you come from determine where you are going. I grew up on a council estate just like you.”

Meet’n’Eat allows people to connect members of all nationalities with each other in London, so they can share a meal with someone who speaks their language, or a local Londoner. Oliver said: “London can be a large and lonely city, and the idea is that no-one should ever have to eat alone because they can’t find someone to eat with. I had the idea whilst travelling alone around South Korea and Japan last summer. The only time I really missed English-speaking company was when eating, so as soon as I got back to London I started looking into what became Meet’n’Eat as a way to make people feel welcome, at home and less lonely in London.”

Meet’n’Eat is now available for anyone looking to meet up with like-minded people over a good meal in London.

Mario Jimenez, who is currently studying for an MSc in Health Economics, Policy and Management, was also listed in the Forbes’ 30 under 30 ranking under the Healthcare category for his work with Gavi, The Vaccine Alliance, a public-private global health partnership committed to increasing access to immunisation in low-income countries. With an estimated 1.5 million children dying each year of vaccine preventable diseases, Mario’s work at Gavi supports the accelerated uptake of vaccines in eligible countries within the Latin American, Eastern Mediterranean and Eastern Mediterranean regions.

For more on the next generation of inspiring LSE alumni who are actively transforming their professional fields and reshaping the world, see: www.alumni.lse.ac.uk/s/1623/interior-hybrid.
LSE has long had a close relationship with India and a key moment in this was in 1912 when the LSE Students’ Union elected Nandlal Muzumdar as its first Indian President and Indian businessman and philanthropist, Sir Ratan Tata (1871-1917) gave a generous donation of £1,400 per year for three years to the University of London to fund research into poverty and inequality.

1912 also saw the formation of a new Department of Social Science and Administration with the merger of the School of Sociology, founded in 1903 by the Charity Organisation Society to support the training of welfare workers, and LSE. The staff of the School of Sociology, including its Director, E J Urwick (1897 – 1945) joined LSE and in December 1912 the future Prime Minister, Clement Attlee (1883 – 1967), was appointed to the post of tutor in the new Department of Social Science and Administration with a salary of £75 per annum.

In a parallel development Urwick was working with Leonard Hobhouse (1864-1920), Professor of Sociology, on a proposal for a University of London research foundation. The proposal suggested that investigation into the administration of relief and prevention of destitution “should not be confined to questions of private philanthropy, but should extend to legislative and administrative measures dealing with poverty, pauperism and the causes and effects thereof.” The research would be historical, statistical and international in scope and include research, education and popularisation, employing a senior investigator supported by a research student and a secretary and typist based at LSE. The University sent the proposal to India for the attention of Sir Ratan Tata.

Sir Ratan Tata was the youngest son of Jamsetji Nusserwanji Tata (1839 – 1904), the founder of Tata Group, and with his elder brother, Dorabji, had inherited a large fortune and part of which was devoted to philanthropic works, including founding the Indian Institute of Science in Bangalore. In 1912 LSE’s founders, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, visited India and met Sir Ratan Tata. Beatrice Webb’s diary records that Tata’s offer to fund a school of investigation and research into economics in Bangalore alongside the Indian Institute of Science had been rejected as the Indian government:

“Is so afraid of any intellectual development among the Indians because it finds that intellectual development always leads to a desire for self-government.”

Beatrice Webb’s diary, 8-10 April 1912

Tata had approached the University of London and agreed to give £1,400 a year for three years. He explained:

“But it is not unlikely that much human effort is wasted in the absence of available or obtainable positive information in this direction and that much human sympathy that might be enlisted for the relief of destitution is too disheartened by past results and contradictory present advice to show itself.”

Letter from Sir Ratan Tata to the University of London, 28 March 1912

R H Tawney (1880-1962), later Professor of Economic History, was appointed Director of the Ratan Tata Foundation in January 1913 and began an investigation into minimum standards of remuneration while two students from the new Department of Social Science and Administration investigated the feeding of school children.

The work of the Foundation was interrupted by the First World War. In November 1914 Tawney volunteered for army service and was followed by the tutor Clement Attlee. John St George Heath (1882 – 1918), the Quaker warden of Toynbee Hall was appointed to head the Ratan Tata Foundation but it was difficult to undertake research under war conditions and student numbers fell.

In 1916 the Ratan Tata grant was renewed for a further five years. LSE’s finances were under pressure due to a fall in student numbers. The foundation and department were merged and Sir Ratan Tata requested that the department be transferred to the direct management of the University of London – though it continued to be housed at LSE. The LSE Director, William Pember-Reeves wrote:

“I admit that it is with some regret that I see a department which we have, without question, made very successful, transferred to the University. Still, the needs of the department were greater than funds at the School’s disposal for its benefit and the benefaction of Sir Ratan Tata will make possible developments which I think will result in the establishment of courses of training for social work better than any to be obtained elsewhere in the UK.”

Sir Ratan Tata died in St Ives in 1918 and was buried in the Parsi burial ground in Brookwood Cemetery. His trustees confirmed their continued support for the department and peacetime brought an increased demand for training and research into welfare work. In June 1919 the course was advertised as “designed to prepare students for any form of social work and in connection with it there are special departments under experienced tutors for training for welfare work in factories and for continuation school teaching,” and in 1920 there were 80 students. The Department also signed an agreement with G Bell and Sons for the publication of The Social Service Library edited by Clement Attlee.

In 1921 and 1926 the Ratan Tata trustees confirmed funding for two further five year terms. They suggested the department return to the direct management of LSE believing the University of London to be too distant and lacking understanding of the department’s mission and the Ratan Tata Funding was to be used to support research.

During the 1920s the School frequently liaised with the trustees through Nandlal Muzumdar who was based in Ratan Tata’s offices at 62 New Broad Street in London. The same Nandlal Muzumdar who had graduated from LSE in 1912 with a BSc (Econ) in Public Administration – the first Indian President of the Students’ Union. The trustees were regretfully unable to continue the funding in the 1930s due to economic depression, but the Department of Social Science and Administration continued. Links were maintained and in 1997 the Sir Ratan Tata Post-doctoral Fellowship was established at the LSE in partnership with the Sir Ratan Tata Trust. Fellows are early career researchers engaging in social science research on the themes of Economy and Society in South Asia. This continues LSE’s long term commitment to understanding and mitigating the causes of poverty and inequality across the globe.
Two LSE academics developed the only polling model to correctly predict a hung Parliament in the 8 June 2017 UK general election, where other pollsters and forecasters were predicting a Conservative majority.

Dr Benjamin Lauderdale, Associate Professor in the Department of Methodology, and Dr Jack Blumenau, post-doctoral Research Fellow, worked with Doug Rivers and Delia Bailey of YouGov to build the model after the election was called. Their analysis accurately predicted the disappointing outcome for Theresa May, who decided on a snap election when pollsters pointed to a landslide result.

The forecast of a hung parliament was first posted on the YouGov website nine days before the election and made the front page of The Times, but was greeted with widespread scepticism by politicians, journalists and other experts. Jim Messina, who advised the Conservatives, called it “idiotic” and Iain Dale, the Conservative blogger, ridiculed it on Newsnight. Dr Lauderdale explained how he spent the days running up to the election feeling anxious. “Our findings were very different from everyone else’s and you can never be very confident when everyone else is telling you that you are wrong. The kinder commentators said we were “brave” which was pretty clearly a euphemism for “crazy”. However every euphemism for “crazy”. However every

The kinder commentators said we were ‘brave’ which was pretty clearly a euphemism for ‘crazy’.

The overall feeling is still one of relief.”

The Autism Dividend: Reaping the Rewards of Better Investment

A major report authored by LSE researchers has been launched in the House of Lords to address the £32 billion annual cost of failing to support autistic people adequately in the UK. The report, titled The Autism Dividend: Reaping the Rewards of Better Investment, identifies major weaknesses in current policy and practices to support autistic individuals and improve their lives. Key recommendations include: the need to improve diagnosis of autistic individuals; the importance of tackling environmental and other stressors; more focus on fighting stigma and discrimination against autistic individuals; greater investment in research to provide more evidence-based practice.

Research funding for autism lags far behind the amount spent on heart disease, stroke and cancer, according to the report. Just £4 million is allocated each year for autism research, equivalent to only £6 for each of the estimated 700,000 autistic people in the UK. The high economic impact of autism in the UK has been known for a decade and while some of the costs are justified, a portion is due to inappropriate use of scarce resources, inadequate training, lack of knowledge, missed opportunities, avoidable crises, poor co-ordination of services and desperate attempts to remedy past failures of care.

Professor Martin Knapp, who co-led the study, said: “Research evidence is just one of the ingredients needed to improve services and open up opportunities for autistic people. When preparing the report we were disappointed to find so little good quality research. In an increasingly tough economic context we urgently need robust evidence on how to achieve this.”

For more research highlights see lse.ac.uk/research.

“BORING CITIES” more likely to nurture INNOVATION

Creative buzz and big ideas have long been associated with innovation, but new research shows that simple hard work is the most important factor to successful innovation. A study by Dr Neil Lee from LSE reveals that “boring cities with conscientious, focused residents” may outperform more exciting places which attract ambitious, outgoing personalities. Using data from 400,000 people surveyed in a BBC personality test, Dr Lee shows how the local personality traits can influence innovation. While most people associate innovation with creativity and openness to new ideas, Dr Lee’s research shows that places which score highly on the personality trait of conscientiousness – associated with hard work, task completion and being organised – have higher rates of patenting. This includes towns and cities such as Newbury, Oxford, Reading and Cambridge. While creativity is normally seen as vital for innovation, it is often more important to have a conscientious attitude, an organised mind and the ability to complete tasks, Dr Lee finds.
PILOT FATIGUE could jeopardise passenger safety

Half of airline pilots have reported that fatigue is not taken seriously by airlines, in the first large-scale survey of pilots’ perceptions of safety within the European aviation industry. The survey was conducted by LSE and EUROCONTROL, an intergovernmental organisation committed to delivering safe and efficient air traffic management performance.

New study exposes major flaws in DRUG APPROVALS

A study by researchers from LSE and the United States has exposed major flaws in the fast-tracking of some drugs available to the American public without any stringent clinical evidence of their benefits. The findings, published in The Milbank Quarterly, relate to drugs given “accelerated approval” by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) without any strong clinical evaluation. The researchers say that many US patients with serious illnesses are being treated by drugs which have questionable data.

The study assessed 37 new drugs given accelerated approval by the FDA between 2000 and 2013. Drugs eligible for accelerated approval are assessed as “reasonably likely” to provide clinical benefits but the bar for their market entry is far lower than those receiving regular approval, according to Dr Huseyin Naci, an LSE health policy researcher.

Dr Naci said: “FDA’s accelerated approval pathway allows potentially promising drugs to receive marketing authorisation on the basis of surrogate measures that are easy to obtain, rather than clinically meaningful outcomes. The evidence ultimately accrued on these drugs has major flaws and is inadequate to address the information needs of patients and doctors.”

George Jones was a stalwart of the Department of Government for over 50 years, having arrived at LSE as a lecturer from the University of Leeds in 1966, and remaining active at the School until the week of his death. His work concentrated on the office of Prime Minister, the Cabinet and, particularly, local government. He believed in intellectual integrity and the straightforward expression of ideas – he would, on occasion, describe someone as a “simplifier” of a particular complex field. He was such a simplifier himself. In 2009, he was made an Honorary Fellow of the School. George’s intense interest in politics and the interaction between the personal and the political led him to write many publications, including Herbert Morrison: Portrait of a Politician (with Bernard Donskoghui) At the Centre of Whitehall and (with Andrew Blick) At Power’s Elbow: Aides to the Prime Minister from Robert Walpole to David Cameron. His final book, written with Steve Leach and John Stewart, Centralisation, Devolution and the Future of Local Government in England, will be published this summer.

George was a critical friend to the UK’s traditional Westminster system, believing in two-party politics, vigorous Parliamentary debate, and offering voters clear choices. But he was a dogged critic too of uncorrected defects in the model, especially the chronic over-centralisation of powers in Whitehall, the decline of Cabinet government and collective responsibility, and Labour’s periodic lurches into uncompetitive policy stances.

A mentor to younger colleagues, George was never distant or grand. His teaching style was clear, authoritative and even combative and he provided an objective analysis of aspects of British government, but made it clear where his personal sympathies lay. Throughout his long career at LSE, he was responsible for sustaining the School’s study of London, having spent many hours in Monday afternoon seminars led by the Group’s founder, Professor William Robson. Robson was a protégé of Sidney and Beatrice Webb – thus, George was one of those colleagues who embodied a linear connection with the School’s founders. He was also much involved with other academic institutions at home and abroad, notably the Institute of Local Government Studies at the University of Birmingham. Beyond universities, he sat on a number of committees and boards, including on the executive committee of the Royal Institute of Public Administration, and received an OBE for his work on the National Consumer Council.

Outside work, he loved the cinema – Laurel and Hardy were a favourite – was an expert on American film noir and Westerns, and kept a methodical record of films seen and his reviews of them. George’s presence at LSE seminars, in the SDR and at reunions will be much missed.

A tribute by Professor Tony Travers, Director LSE London. (With acknowledgements to Patrick Dunleavy and Brendan O’Leary)

He believed in intellectual integrity and the straightforward expression of ideas

George Jones
4 February 1938 – 14 April 2017
Dark chapter

Seven years after being sexually assaulted in a Belfast park, Winnie M Li (pictured) embarked on a PhD at LSE to investigate how social media can help rape survivors heal. In June, her debut novel *Dark Chapter* was published to widespread critical acclaim. While re-living the experience has been painful, Winnie’s studies and the resulting novel are helping to foster more open conversations about sexual assault.

Within a week of being published, *Dark Chapter* was Amazon's No. 1 bestselling title for “Northern Irish Crime”, prompting a flurry of media interviews and speaking engagements.

**How has writing *Dark Chapter* helped you in your healing process?**

To be honest, I first had to heal from the trauma of the assault before I could be in the right place to explore this event through fiction. So while I had done most of my immediate "healing" in the five years between the assault and starting to write the novel, I would say that writing *Dark Chapter* helped me build upon the trauma of the rape and its aftermath. It's given me a deeper, more neutral understanding of the human experience for both perpetrator and victim.

**How difficult has it been to weave an intensely personal and raw experience into an academic study?**

This has actually been more difficult than weaving it into a creative work of fiction. I find the nature of academic work does not allow much room for emotions – and this is even more challenging when you personally have so much invested in an issue like rape. It's quite common for academic researchers to develop secondary transferred depression as a result of their work on difficult subjects, and this certainly happened to me. At the same time, I do think that survivor-led discourse and research is vitally important – so I've learned to build self-care into my research design.

The book is unusual in that it also provides a perspective from the attacker – what were your reasons for doing this? I felt it was important to understand a perpetrator as another human being, whose life experience and other factors somehow contributed to his predatory behaviour. If we aren't willing to consider where perpetrators are coming from, we won't be any closer to preventing crimes like this from taking place in the future.

**What message would you like people to take away from this book?**

That crimes like rape leave an indelible, often lifelong impact on victims, which is hardly ever spoken about. Yet at the same time, it shouldn't always be seen as a story of weakness and ruined lives – if anything, there is great strength and resilience in survivors. And there are a great many more survivors in our society than we probably imagine.

**What’s next for you on the horizon?**

Finishing my PhD! (I've had to interrupt my studies to promote the novel.) Of course I also have ideas for the next three novels I’d like to write...
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WITH LSE AND YOUR GLOBAL NETWORK

Your relationship with LSE should benefit you throughout your life and career after graduation.

We want to enhance the value of your LSE education and encourage you to maintain an enduring relationship with the School. By staying connected with LSE you can access a range of benefits, lifelong learning resources and networking opportunities – and keep abreast of School news and events through our tailored communications.

Find out more at alumni.lse.ac.uk/stayconnected

Your data
LSE Advancement is the School’s division to serve alumni and promote supporter engagement. We want to ensure you only receive contact from LSE that is appropriate and relevant to you and your interests, via your preferred communication channels. We also seek to further the strategic aims and legitimate interests of the School by encouraging volunteer and philanthropic support for agreed School priorities. As such, we use your data in a range of ways to help tailor our engagement and communications with you. We are committed to the safety and security of your personal data and to compliance with the Data Protection Act of 1998.

You can find LSE Advancement’s full privacy statement, which details the information we collect and how we use it, at alumni.lse.ac.uk/yourdata

Your choice – now and in the future
We hope that you will want to stay connected with LSE. However, you have the right to change your contact preferences or unsubscribe from any or all of our channels – including post, email, telephone – at any time. You can do this by writing to us at:

Systems and Data
LSE Advancement
Houghton Street
London
WC2A 2AE

Alternatively, you can email us at advancement, yourdata@lse.ac.uk with your request to opt out of communications by post, email or phone.
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Price £75* available from www.lseshop.com

New for 2017: A version of this product to take your LSE degree certificate is now available, priced at £95*
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Vacations
LSE residences offer good quality, centrally located bed and breakfast accommodation to all during the winter, spring and summer vacations! Ideal for an affordable stay in London, whatever your reason for visiting.
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Also available
A range of high quality and superior rooms, studios and apartments all year round
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Centre Language
LSE Language Centre provides a range of language programmes for students, academic staff, alumni and the general public. Over 2,000 people take a course with us every year. We offer:

- English for Academic Purposes – pre-sessional and tailor-made programmes
- English for Business – summer school and tailor-made programmes
- Degree options in: French, German, Linguistics, Literature, Mandarin, Russian, and Spanish
- Certificate courses in: Arabic, Catalan, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mandarin, Portuguese, Russian and Spanish – including business options in selected languages
- Tandem Learning – find a buddy, exchange your languages, attend language events

If you would like further information, contact languages@lse.ac.uk or go to our website www.lse.ac.uk/languages

WE BELIEVE BUSINESS CAN CHANGE THE WORLD

Executive MSc Social Business and Entrepreneurship
THE NEW SOCIALLY-FOCUSED ALTERNATIVE TO AN MBA

lse.ac.uk/emsbe

GREAT LEADERS THINK DIFFERENTLY
Executive Education Courses
Intensive programmes for visionary thinkers

Central London

30 Oct – 3 Nov 2017
4 – 15 June 2018

Executive Education Courses

Leadership | Management | Economics | Finance | Global Public Policy

lse.ac.uk/exec  +44 (0)20 7955 6803 to speak with one of the team

HOLD YOUR EVENT AT LSE
From small meeting rooms for eight, through to the 1,000 seat Peacock Theatre, LSE offers a wide choice of centrally located conference facilities, available to hire for events, meetings, lectures and larger conferences.

For further details or enquiries please contact LSE Event Services, +44 (0)20 7955 7087, event.services@lse.ac.uk or lse.ac.uk/lseeventservices

15% discount for LSE Alumni

EXECUTIVE LLM PROGRAMME FOR WORKING PROFESSIONALS
As innovative and intellectually exciting part-time degree programme designed for working professionals

Study for the LLM by taking a set of intensive modules over a period of three to four years.

For further information, please visit: lse.ac.uk/ellm

SUMMER SCHOOL BEIJING, CHINA
AUGUST 2018

Innovative courses for students and professionals | lse.ac.uk/lsepkuprogramme

SUMMER SCHOOL CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA
JULY 2018

Find out why 99% of attendees would recommend us to a friend or colleague | lse.ac.uk/lseuctjulyschool

10% discount for LSE Alumni
Make the most of your global network

You are part of a global network of more than 142,000 LSE alumni. Stay connected with LSE to access a range of benefits, lifelong learning resources and networking opportunities – and receive alumni-targeted communications – developed exclusively for you.

- The latest LSE news and ground-breaking research
- Professional networking forums and social activities
- Talks and debates that connect you with the world’s thought leaders
- Alumni groups to stay in touch with the LSE community wherever you are
- Lifelong learning opportunities to advance your professional career
- Generous discounts on LSE courses, merchandise and more
- Volunteering opportunities to share your knowledge and expertise
- Giving options to support current students and invest in the School’s future

LSE Alumni Relations
W: alumni.lse.ac.uk/stayconnected
E: alumni@lse.ac.uk
T: +44 (0)20 7955 7361