European Foreign Policy Unit

REPORT ON THE SYMPOSIUM IN HONOUR OF PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER HILL

By Karen E. Smith, Professor of International Relations, LSE

July 2017

European Foreign Policy Unit
International Relations Department
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE
http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/intrel/EuroFPUnit.html

Report on the symposium in honour of Professor Christopher Hill

Contents

Audience at the symposium

Introduction

By Professor Karen E Smith, LSE

On 12 May 2017, the International Relations Department hosted a symposium in honour of Professor Christopher Hill, a former member of the Department. The symposium brought together dozens of Professor Hill's former students and colleagues, as well as current members and students in the department, to show their appreciation of his numerous contributions to the study of international relations and foreign policy analysis.

Professor Hill taught in the International Relations Department at the LSE for thirty years. He first arrived in the department as a Noel Buxton Fellow in 1973, and in 1974 he became a lecturer. From 1991 to 2004 he was the Montague Burton Professor of International Relations. While at the LSE, he chaired the International Relations Department and served as Vice Chair of the Academic Board, among other achievements. He also founded the European Foreign Policy Unit, which still groups together staff working on various topics related to the study of European foreign policy. Professor Hill supervised 38 successful PhD theses at the LSE, and advised countless students at the undergraduate and masters' levels. In 2004 he moved to the University of Cambridge as Sir Patrick Sheehy Professor of International Relations, and he is currently Emeritus Professor of International Relations at the University of Cambridge and Wilson E Schmidt Distinguished Professor at SAIS Europe in Bologna. In 2007 he was elected a Fellow of the British Academy. In 2015, he received an honorary doctorate from the University of the Peloponnese in Corinth. In May 2017, he was awarded the decoration of 'ufficiale' of the Order of 'Stella d'Italia', for helping to develop the study of International Relations in Italy.

Professor Christopher Hill

Hill is the author or editor of almost twenty books and 120 articles and chapters (so far). His work ranges across international relations, foreign policy analysis, British, French and Italian foreign policy, and European and EU foreign policy, but also includes an edited book on the interaction between academics and practitioners and, intriguingly, the translation of the war diaries of a French peasant (see the selected bibliography at the end of this paper).

Several of his works are classics in the field of European foreign policy and foreign policy analysis. He is one of the founding figures – if not the founding figure – of the study of the modern European international relations system which includes the EU and European states. His 1983 edited book on *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation* launched an entire new field of study, the role of European states in the EU's foreign policy framework. Two successive editions of the book have further shaped the field; the most recent, from 2011, is co-edited with Reuben Wong and is entitled *National and European Foreign Policies: Towards Europeanisation*. The three editions of his co-edited text, *International Relations and the European Union,* have successfully illustrated how the study of International Relations can be linked to the study of the EU. He has also written more broadly on foreign policy, with his book on foreign policy appearing in two editions, the latest was published last year and is entitled *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*. More recently, he is leading the way again with his studies of multiculturalism and foreign policy, as in his book *The National Interest in Question*, which addresses extremely topical questions about the interplay between foreign policy and increasingly diverse domestic societies.

The symposium began with an introduction by Professor Karen E Smith of the International Relations Department, and a series of reflections by Professor Hill. Then Dr Georgios Evangelopoulos, adviser to the President of the Hellenic Republic and one of Professor Hill's former PhD students at the LSE, analysed the role of in Hill's work. Three roundtables discussed Hill's ideas in light of recent developments, under the headings 'capabilities-expectations gap in 2017', 'soft power of the UK and EU' and 'foreign policy after Brexit: populism versus Europeanisation'. Speakers included former PhD students and colleagues: Dr Amnon Aran (City University London); Dr Federica Bicchi (LSE); Dr Elisabetta Brighi (University of Westminster); Dr Patricia Daehnhardt (Portuguese Institute for International Affairs); Dr Ayla Gol (Aberystwyth University); Professor Inderjeet Parmar (City University London); Professor Leticia Pinheiro (State University of Rio de Janeiro's Institute for Social and Political Studies); Dr Ulrich Sedelmeier (LSE); Professor Helene Sjursen (ARENA Centre for European Studies, Oslo); Professor James Tang (Singapore Management University) and Professor Wolfgang Wessels (University of Cologne).

This report on the symposium begins with two of the contributions made by Chris Hill's former PhD students: Georgios Evangelopoulos and Leticia Pinheiro. It also includes Chris' personal reflections on a career in International Relations. A list of some of his most significant publications concludes this report. Enjoy!

Theory in Christopher Hill's Work

By Dr Georgios Evangelopoulos,
Adviser to the President of the Hellenic Republic

One of Isaiah Berlin's most popular essays with the general public is entitled *The Hedgehog and the Fox*.[1] The title is a reference to a fragment attributed to the Ancient Greek poet Archilochus: πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπηξ, ἀλλ' ἐχῖνος ἓν μέγα. I know that it's all Greek to you, so please let me help you with the translation of this phrase in English, which is "a fox knows many things, but a hedgehog (only) one important thing".

Berlin expands upon this idea to divide writers and thinkers into two categories: *hedgehogs*, who view the world through the lens of a single defining idea, and *foxes*, who draw on a wide variety of experiences and for whom the world cannot be boiled down to a single idea.

According to this categorization, I believe that the intellectual and IR scholar, Christopher Hill, is a fox! If one reads carefully his books, academic papers, even his newspaper articles, one comes to the conclusion that he is not particularly attracted by large-scale or systemic IR theories (the 'one important thing' approach).

This doesn't, however, mean that he ignores or undermines the analytical importance and usefulness of this kind of theory at all. On the contrary, with his observations and critical remarks on the strengths and weaknesses of realism and neorealism, liberalism and neoliberalism, geopolitics and geoeconomics, which are easily traced in many of his meticulous analyses of IR and foreign policy issues, he always tries to achieve one main goal: to provide us with a detailed description, accompanied by a comprehensive analysis, of the political phenomenon under study each time. He highlights subtle differences in the meaning of certain theoretical concepts, he warns of hidden methodological or empirical pitfalls in research, and thus unfolds the complexity of international politics. In his own words, his aim is to "do justice to the greater sophistication of contemporary thinking on the nature of the international system".

In that respect, Hill seems to agree, though for different reasons, with Steven Bernstein, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein and Steven Weber, when they claim that "God Gave Physics the Easy Problems", which, in contradistinction, implies that studying International Relations is rather difficult, because the social world is inherently multivariate, fluid and thus generally impossible to predict.[2]

Hill's attitude toward grand theories is a critical but fair one, and he is willing to accept the complementarity of different approaches when studying international politics. For instance, in his book, *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century* (the title of the second, fully revised edition of his highly-acclaimed *Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*), he emphasizes from the very beginning the importance of the notions of *action* and *change*, and in parallel develops the following argument in defence of the complementarity of those theories for the study of the political, economic and cultural developments that bridge the domestic and the international levels:

---

[1] Berlin, Isaiah, 2013. *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of Politics* (with a Foreword by Michael Ignatieff). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. See also "The hedgehog and the fox" entry in Wikipedia.

[2] Bernstein, Steven, et al., 2000. God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World. *European Journal of International Relations*, 6(1), pp. 43-76.

> The issue of where and by whom change might be effectively dealt with is too often just left hanging in the air by neorealists, globalization theorists and historical sociologists. This is not to diminish the importance of all big-picture analysts. Michael Mann, for example, has produced a formidable and daring overview of the 'history of power' from ancient times to the present using a wealth of empirical detail in four volumes. This is indispensable both for our understanding of the development of human society as a whole, and because it shows how domestic and international trends are inextricably bound together.[3]

IR Theory and History are, so to say, "interlocutors" in the analyses of various IR and Foreign Policy issues Hill embarks upon in his books and academic papers. He has managed to demonstrate it in an exemplary way, by on the one hand emphasizing the need for detailed presentations of historical events and their consequences, while on the other making acute remarks on the meaning of ideas, theoretical concepts and notions as they have developed and frequently changed over time. In other words, Hill brought to the fore the idea that developments in both History and IR Theory are intimately connected.

One could partly attribute this to the fact that Hill holds a first degree in Modern History from Oxford University, although that in itself does not account for his impressive knowledge of English, European, and International History, clearly demonstrated in his published academic work. The importance of History to Hill's work in IR is evident. In his own words,

> […] good history or traditional political science 'explains' in the sense of highlighting key factors and the nature of their interplay on the basis of evidence and analysis that a critical reader finds convincing – that is, they survive the test of the intellectual market.[4]

For instance, in terms of Methodology, in his monograph on *Cabinet decisions on foreign policy – The British experience October 1938 - June 1941*,[5] which is one of the few empirically detailed analyses of top-level foreign policy-making, he does not pose definite hypotheses which are then 'tested'. He explains that this is due to "doubts about the scientific approach it implies, and a desire not to cramp detail and subtlety into a skimpy straitjacket".[6] On the contrary, he raises three different types of questions deriving from, first, political science, second, foreign policy analysis and International Relations, and, third, International History.

The interplay between these three fields of knowledge is apparent and has proved decisive in the strong analytical power of his work, so that I should argue that, for the discussion of how top-level foreign-policy decisions are made (especially during a period of crisis in a country's foreign affairs but not only during it), Hill's work on *Cabinet decisions on foreign policy* is by no means second in importance to the widely-discussed book of Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision – Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*.[7]

In order to demonstrate concisely the validity of this argument about the place of theory in Hill's work, I turn to Christopher Hill's recent masterpiece, namely *The National Interest in Question:*

---

[3] Hill, Christopher, 2016. *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 2.
[4] Hill, Christopher, 2016. *op. cit.*, p. 51.
[5] Hill, Christopher, 1991. *Cabinet decisions on foreign policy: The British experience October 1938 – June 1941*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[6] Hill, Christopher, 1991, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
[7] Allison, Graham and Zelikow, Philip, 1999. *Essense of Decision – Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* New York: Addison Wesley – Longman.

Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies.[8] Suffice it to say that in this book the two discussions, of modern society and of foreign policy, are at last intersected, due to the author's insightfulness and intellectual bravery in coming to grips with the study of one of the most challenging current problems of IR Theory and praxis. In this book, Hill's analysis of the interplay between foreign policy and domestic society combines theoretical insights from a wide range of academic literatures with a detailed empirical analysis of key European states. And I strongly believe that the distinction he makes, following Brian Barry, between *multiculturality*, "which refers to the *fact* of cultural diversity, with many groups defining themselves separately from the nation-state – perhaps asserting their right to autonomy and other loyalties, but not necessarily having that right recognized",[9] and *multiculturalism*, "which is an *ideology-cum-project* about the acceptance of diversity and group rights",[10] is crucial for the clarity of the debate which has arisen in this very difficult area.

Furthermore, Christopher Hill has published a good number of academic papers in which the relation between Theory and History is demonstrated with exemplary reasoning and in a clear-cut way. Some of them are anchored in the area of European Foreign Policy Analysis (EFPA) and a detailed discussion about them will probably take place in the roundtables to follow. Therefore, here I will briefly discuss only two thematically relevant pieces that are also of broader relevance to IR and FPA. The first piece has the title, "1939: The Origins of Liberal Realism",[11] and, according to Chris Brown, is "a fine combination of history and theory".[12] I consider that to be an accurate and fair judgement on this paper quite apart from the fact that the final result justifies first Hill's argument "that the events of 1939 are in themselves rather more significant than is sometimes assumed", and second his view of "1939 and the war which then unstoppably unrolled, as having initiated changes which are still being worked out in the nature and quality of international relationships".[13]

In terms of theory, his analysis helps us to put E. H. Carr's classic, *The Twenty Years Crisis*, into its historical context, and thus not to caricature it as a "clarion call for realism".[14] For this reason, Hill calls our attention to Carr's meaningful statement about the ending of a particular historical era which is contained in this very same book:

> The inner meaning of the modern international crisis is the collapse of the whole structure of utopianism based on the concept of the harmony of interests. The present generation will have to rebuild from the foundations.[15]

The second piece which I would like to refer to is Hill's paper with the rather enigmatic title, "'Where are we going?' International Relations and the voice from below".[16] This was instigated by *Marching to Captivity*[17], a book he translated from French; it is a remarkable diary kept by Gustave Folcher, a French peasant who has called up to serve in the French Army in the Second World War, captured by the Germans and put to work on a labour farm inside Germany. In his aforementioned paper, Hill

---

[8] Hill, Christopher, 2013. *The National Interest in Question – Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[9] Hill, Christopher, 2013, op. cit., pp. 8-9.
[10] Hill, Christopher, 2013, op. cit., p. 9.
[11] Hill, Christopher, 1989. 1939: The Origins of Liberal Realism. *Review of International Studies*, 15 (4), pp. 319-328.
[12] Brown, Chris and Kirsten Ainley, Kirsten, 2009. *Understanding International Relations.* London: Palgrave Macmillan, p. 37.
[13] Hill, Christopher, 1989, *op. cit*, p. 319.
[14] Hill, Christopher, 1989, *op. cit*, p. 324.
[15] Carr, Edward H., 2001. *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the study of International Relations.* Second edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave [as it is cited in Christopher Hill, 1989, endnote 12, p. 328].
[16] Hill, Christopher, 1999. 'Where are we going?' International Relations and the voice from below. *Review of International Studies*, 25 (1), pp. 107-122.
[17] Folcher, Gustave, 1996. *Marching to Captivity – The War Diaries of a French Peasant 1939-45*. Translated by Christopher Hill, and edited by Rémy Gazals & Christopher Hill. London – Washington: Brassey's.

aims to draw attention to the importance of accounts offered by the "so-called ordinary people", like Gustave Folcher, to the study of International Relations. In Hill's own words,

> the subject of International Relations no less than the historian or general reader has much to gain from placing the perspective of the pawn alongside those of knights, kings and queens.[18]

Clearly, IR theorists have much to gain from studying this kind of approach which runs counter to the introspection of so much contemporary work within IR Theory. Or as Hill himself has excellently put it:

> The point is, rather, that in the nature of things social science, and especially International Relations, deals in generalizations which all too easily become abstract and remote from the lives of actual people. We need the necessary corrective of understanding what international confrontations mean to those involved at ground level and we should have the humility to listen to their own voices now they are at last beginning to find outlets.[19]

On a more personal note, please let me publicly confess that this is a 'lesson' that Hill has been offering to me through my reading of his multifaceted work in IR and FPA. This started when I was doing my PhD and is continuing up to now. At that time I was 'torturing' both him and Dr. Spyros Economides (my PhD supervisors) with a thesis with the rather frightening title, "Scientific Realism in the Philosophy of Science and International Relations",[20] which may remind you of what Fred Halliday used to call 'meta-theoretical hypochondria'.[21] In the end, Hill took his 'revenge' by showing to me, indirectly and in all modesty, what good IR Theory must grapple with!

I don't know whether I have justified my initial statement that Hill, in his capacity as thinker, belongs to the foxes. Be that as it may, one thing is certain, that Christopher Hill has contributed important ideas to the academic study of crucial problems facing IR and FPA, and thus enriched the relevant discussions about them. The IR community should be deeply grateful to him for this great service and its members should engage in a careful study of the many challenging questions his groundbreaking and meticulous academic work raises.

[18] Hill, Christopher, 1999, *op. cit.*, p. 110.
[19] Hill, Christopher, 1999, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
[20] It can be found here: http://etheses.lse.ac.uk/691/
[21] Halliday, Fred, 2000. International relations theory and the post-Cold War period. *METU Studies in Development* 27 (3-4), pp. 235-63.

Remarks to the symposium

By Professor Leticia Pinheiro,
State University of Rio de Janeiro's Institute for Social and Political Studies

I am very grateful to the International Relations Department of the London School of Economics, as well as to Karen Smith and the other organisers for the invaluable opportunity to participate in this symposium in honour of Professor Christopher Hill. But most of all I would like to thank Professor Chris Hill himself, under whose supervision I had the privilege to work during my PhD at the LSE between 1989 and 1994, for the generosity he showed at all times when sharing his reflections and knowledge in the field of International Relations, of Foreign Policy Analysis in particular, and also for the friendship that, I believe, arose from that academic relationship.

There are many things I could say about the importance of his scholarly output, and the role that it has played in the development of my own reflections on foreign policy in general and on Brazilian foreign policy specifically. However, having to control my urge to start a lively exchange on the subject right now and – I must admit – having also to control my prolixity, I shall limit my focus to one aspect of his work which has accompanied my career in many ways and for a number of years now.

While writing my doctoral thesis in the early 1990s, the papers written by Chris, his lectures and seminars, and the readings he suggested, made me realise that even in the case of a country like Brazil – that is, a country on the periphery of the international system, under an authoritarian regime controlled by the military, and where it was the President's and the Minister of Foreign Affairs' prerogative to define foreign policy guidelines – it was not only possible but strongly recommended, from an analytical point of view, to demonstrate that foreign policy was formulated and implemented as a result of the disputes and agreements among different actors within the inner circle of decision---making. In order to do that, I relied on the 'foreign policy executive' category, coined by Chris Hill in his study of British foreign policy between 1938 and 1941.

Later on, in the first decade of this century, Chris Hill's work provided me once again with research tools that would help me analyse the Brazilian foreign policy of the time. I am referring to the theme of 'horizontal decentralisation' which Chris discussed in his book *The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy*, whose revised second edition has been given the title *Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century*. By pointing out that "many states are now facing what has been termed 'horizontal decentralisation' of their foreign relations, or the foreign ministry's loss of control of many external issues to other parts of state bureaucracy" (p. 82), Chris helped not only to open up many research possibilities, but also to unveil potentialities for practical action in the field of foreign policy.

As regards the field of Brazilian foreign policy studies, this happened at a particularly propitious time because in the early 2000s an important debate was going on about the new contours of the country's foreign policy and the enlargement of its channels of political participation. It was certainly not by chance that the book organised by my colleague Carlos Milani and myself has been given the title *"The Practices of Politics and the Politics of Practices"*. But the influence of Chris' work does not appear simply in the book's title, of course. It is equally, and primarily, in the backbone of the research project which gave rise to this publication that Chris' contribution is most apparent, which leads me to say that his academic DNA is easily detectable in the book.

Symposium in honour of Christopher Hill. L to R: Professor Christopher Hill, Professor Helene Sjursen, Dr Amnon Aran. Professor Leticia Pinheiro. Dr Federica Bicchi

A series of events which have taken place since then have made Chris' contribution very useful in the analysis of Brazilian foreign policy: the liberalisation of the Brazilian political regime; the diversification of the country's agenda; the processes of opening up the economy and intensification of globalisation; and especially the augmented scope of Brazil's international action in the 21st century – see, for instance, the country's new international protagonism and the growing relevance of international technical cooperation projects in its foreign policy agenda. All these factors have made the concept of horizontal bureaucratic decentralisation fit like a glove with my own research interests on Brazilian foreign policy during the Lula government. If we remind ourselves that the Brazilian political system is characterised by what has come to be called 'coalitional presidentialism', in which the President, in order to maintain effective governance, needs to build a support base picked from among the parties and to choose the ministers from this same base, it becomes quite clear that the horizontal decentralisation of decision---making has been responsible for fostering an inter---institutional dialogue as well as increasing the room and ability to respond to society's demands in the foreign policy realm.

Moreover, these characteristics have not only allowed us to widen our analytic scope in the understanding of foreign policy but also to explore the possibility of enlarging democratic participation in its formulation. If we recognise that today the practices of foreign policy are closer to everyday life, that choices are related to ever more diverse and more dispersed interests, that foreign policy is not the expression of a self---evident national interest but rather the result of competition, we are by extension starting the fundamental discussion about the subjection of foreign policy to the controls and rules of a democratic regime, which nowadays in my country seems to be more urgent than ever.

Finally, I could not close these remarks without saying a few words about the great memories I have of Chris courses. These were, without any doubt, moments of positive and enjoyable learning. One Brazilian historian used to say: "It is not possible to acquire knowledge in the social and political disciplines without comparison and contrast; or without history". I was definitely able to confirm this claim during Chris' classes, when his knowledge of history transported us like eyewitnesses to scenarios in which foreign policy models and analytical perspectives were presented to us. His narratives were so captivating and intense that once, during one of his lectures, we thought we could just ignore the shrill, continuously sounding fire alarm telling us to leave the Old Building due to a suspected bomb (which in the end proved to be a false alarm), so we could carry on with our foreign policy class. Similarly, in a universe where some PhD colleagues described the relationship with their respective supervisors with a mixture of awe and fear, I would like to say for the record that I, and those whom I exchanged impressions with at the time, spoke of our relationship with Chris as exciting, collaborative, and --- due to his refined sense of humour extremely challenging and fun.

Reflections on a career in International Relations

By Professor Christopher Hill

I began a career teaching International Relations (IR) more or less at the point that I started to be aware of what it entailed. Rather like Molière's M. Jourdain I had been engaged in the subject all unawares for several years, in my case through work for an Oxford D.Phil. on foreign policy decision-making. Oxford had hardly any IR specialists and my training was in political sociology and comparative politics, in the Faculty of Social Studies. Despite not having finished the degree I managed at the end of my grant to obtain the one year Noel Buxton research studentship at LSE, which enabled me to get on top of what was beginning to be called Foreign Policy Analysis (FPA), and to get my first article on the subject published in *Millennium* (Autumn 1974). This year in a proper IR department meant that I got to know fellow researchers who were actually students who had actually followed courses in IR, including Andy Linklater, whose originality was evident from day one. At the end of the studentship, rather to my surprise, I succeeded in being appointed to a Lecturership in the Department.

I spent the next four years teaching FPA, international institutions and international politics only a few steps ahead of the excellent LSE students, from whom I learned a great deal, as I did from serving as staff representative on *Millennium*'s editorial board. I was the youngest member of staff, with only Paul Taylor within generational reach. Soon after my appointment the financial sky clouded over, with the result that we had to wait until 1980 for someone younger to arrive, in the person of Christopher Coker. I thus had to adapt both to teaching new subjects and to getting to know a formidable group of older colleagues. Still, I was shown considerable kindness, not just by Paul but also by Michael Banks, Michael Donelan, Michael Leifer, Nicholas Sims, Michael Yahuda and my neighbour on the East Building's fifth floor, James Mayall. The professors in the Department were Geoffrey Goodwin and Fred Northedge, two very different characters who did not always see eye to eye. But each of them took the trouble to encourage me - not least because all three of us were professionally concerned with British foreign policy.

Eventually this transition period came to an end, symbolised by finally submitting the D.Phil. thesis in 1978, four months before our first child arrived. By this time Geoffrey Goodwin had got me interested in the new phenomenon of European foreign policy cooperation, which has been a consistent thread in my work ever since. That soon led to a year's leave at Chatham House, thanks to a grant secured by William Wallace, where I met John Vincent, with whom I hit it off straightaway. It also led to my first (edited) book. Yet a tendency to spread myself too thinly meant at that point I failed to make the best of the large amount of original research I had done for my doctorate, putting it on one side for too long. If I have one piece of advice for any new doctoral graduate it would be to focus immediately on seeing what publications can be got out of all that work - if you let things slide it can prove very difficult to resuscitate interest in the project later, both your own and that of others.

Time goes by quickly when you are working hard, sharing in the bringing up of a young family - and enjoying yourself. I certainly was, at home and at work, where the Department was proving to be a vibrant environment. Apart from the names already mentioned it contained a notable cluster of thinkers about strategy consisting of Philip Windsor, Adam Roberts and Hugh Macdonald, while the ebullient (and musically talented) Geoffrey Stern struck sparks in every area of the subject. Eventually others started coming through the door, and the Department began to grow significantly in the 1980s. The names of Fred Halliday, Mike Hodges, Margot Light Susan Strange, John Vincent

were internationally recognised. It was a terrific time to be developing courses, exchanging ideas and - at times - crossing swords.

My career came to a juddering halt at the end of 1987 with an unexpected mid-life crisis, as I came to realise that I had not built on my D. Phil thesis and was struggling to manage the competing demands on my time effectively. There were, as ever in such cases, also some personal issues to be resolved. These days we are able to talk more openly about mental health, but at that time significant taboos still got in the way of recognising a problem and seeking help for it. I was fortunate in that I had close colleagues who had no time for the stiff upper lip approach. Fred Halliday, as my head of department, was particularly sympathetic and constructive. As a result I came through a difficult time after needing only a short time out of the firing line. I was soon able to take two terms sabbatical, enabling me to return to my doctoral subject, do more research and write up the manuscript faster than I would ever before have thought possible. This first monograph was published in 1991, and gave me the confidence to go forward in a number of different directions. Indeed, by that time my life had taken another sudden turn. To the horror and sadness of us all, John Vincent, the newly arrived Montague Burton professor, died suddenly in November 1990. This was a great personal blow given our friendship (and plans to write a book together) although as nothing compared to the impact on his wife and young sons, only just arrived for a new life in London.

In due course we had to consider the issue of John's successor. Having been encouraged by some colleagues to apply I put my name forward with much ambivalence, and was honoured to be trusted with the appointment. From that point on my time at LSE was spent as Montague Burton Professor, leading to responsibilities first as Head of Department and then as Vice Chair of the Academic Board. If John had not died these things could not have happened for many years. Internal promotion was (and remains) an arduous process.

Eventually the Department recovered from this sad period, helped by the energy of a new generation of colleagues such as Chris Alden, Katerina Dalacoura, Spyros Economides, Dominique Jacquin-Berdal and Karen Smith. The arrival of Chris Brown in 1999, when he was Chair of BISA, was critical in strengthening leadership in the Department and our links to the wider profession.

What of my students, with whom I spent so many enjoyable and stimulating years? The LSE gives an academic the chance to teach at all levels - undergraduate, Masters and PhD - people of a very high level of ability. Many of the hundreds I taught I can still recall; I have never been able to bring myself to throw out the files of those I individually supervised. My ex-students, typically of LSE, have gone on to distinction in a wide range of fields, from Hong Kong politics to TV war correspondent, from prize-winning professors to a US Senator's chief of staff. Nicholas Sims' splendid account of his long career in the Department gives a vivid sense of the joys and challenges of engaging with such an able, cosmopolitan and diverse group.[22]

Of course teaching at any level is hard work, whatever the popular preconceptions. It is a giving profession, and done well can take a lot out of you emotionally. There is also a huge amount of preparation, to say nothing of the exam setting, marking and paperwork associated with keeping records, writing references for students and creating detailed booklists - a labour-intensive exercise in the days before digital data-bases and teaching assistants. But it is also immensely satisfying when you have responsive students, as ours usually were. I had to learn a huge amount just to teach, but also absorbed things constantly from the students in return, from their own readings and their individual backgrounds. Perhaps the single most memorable experience in this context was the arrival in the late 1970s of the first ever cohort of students from the People's Republic of China. They

[22] Available at: http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/internationalrelations/2010/09/28/reflections-on-42-years-in-the-international-relations-department/

were intellectually la crème de la crème, but in those early post-Cultural Revolution days they were naturally cautious - and still dressed in Mao suits. They were delighted to visit our family home, and returned the favour by inviting us, including our young baby, to food and Chinese opera at the embassy, where they were surprisingly relaxed. It was fascinating many years later to learn from Michael Yahuda that many of them had attained high office in China's diplomatic system.

It is with PhD students, however, that an academic forms the closest ties. It could not be otherwise given the length of the working relationship - a minimum of three years and often much longer - and the support needed by anyone brave enough to take on a doctoral thesis. A supervisor bears heavy responsibilities, not just for getting students to the finishing line but in helping them to fashion a career thereafter. In some cases this goes badly wrong, as in my own, but for the most part it produces real friendships. I have much enjoyed seeing the lives of my 40+ research students develop after graduation, especially when I have been able to collaborate with them on joint projects or to visit them in their new environments. Yet it is worth noting that friendship can only develop once the degree is obtained. Up to that point the supervisor needs to be free to make criticisms which may prove painful to hear, or to refuse requests which one might reasonably make of a friend. Conversely a student needs to be free to project frustrations onto the supervisor, who will at times inevitably appear to be wholly unreasonable!

Supervisors in the social sciences have to be able to take on doctoral students whose specialised subjects may be at the very margins of their own interests or expertise. But this need be no impediment to a successful outcome, I have had my knowledge and horizons greatly widened by supervising on topics such as 'the foreign policy of Kenya' or 'Commonwealth Caribbean Offshore financial centres and tax competition'. For their part I do not believe that students suffer much from outstripping the particular expertise of their supervisor, which they must indeed do at some point or other. In fact they gain confidence from becoming the expert, needing help then more with research design, writing skills and confidence-building than with the substance of the topic. Be that as it may both sides profit from working with others who have the same research interests. One of the very best experiences of my whole career was the 'foreign policy workshop' for PhDs, staff and post-docs which I ran at LSE and started in a different form at Cambridge. The bilateral student-supervisor relationship works best when embedded in a multilateral one, not least because research in the human sciences can be a lonely and claustrophobic business.

Administration, on the other hand, is never a lonely affair, even if it is claustrophobic in a different way. It is usual for academics to bemoan administrative tasks as boring obstacles to their primary task of research (some also think that of teaching but are too politic to say so). Yet I have found some real satisfactions in helping a department to run well, in attempting to reconcile leadership with democracy, in facilitating colleagues' career development and in conducting diplomacy with the wider university. Given a personal interest in architecture and the visual arts I have particularly enjoyed having a role in the development of our physical environment, whether the British Library of Political and Science's move to its current site, IR's move into Clement House, or - at Cambridge - the move of my department into a newly designed building on West Road. In contrast, what is truly dispiriting is having to cope with the tide of managerialism flowing from central government and its quangos, with its obsessive concern with measurement and performance indicators. Trying to mitigate the impact of this has cost all of us countless hours in which we could have been pursuing our academic vocation.

I left the LSE for Cambridge in 2004. I had been perfectly happy and was not looking to move. But when the opportunity arose I realised that, just as a year's leave at the EUI in Florence in 1992-93 had proved a life-changing experience, so it might be stimulating to have one further career move before retiring. I must admit that, despite being a Londoner and all too aware of Dr. Johnson's

warning, I was also becoming a little tired of the increasingly frenetic nature of London life and the lack of community caused by the geographical dispersal of staff across a huge and expensive conurbation. The idle calculation that in 32 years I had spent at least 2,300 hours in the Tube, or 13 whole weeks of my life, did not help. Thus I followed in James Mayall's footsteps as Director of the Centre of International Studies at Cambridge where in due course and in cooperation with Andrew Gamble, himself just arrived from Sheffield, had the satisfaction of creating Cambridge's first Department of Politics and International Studies, and the privilege of being the first person in the University's long history to teach a course on IR to its undergraduates.

The research dimension of an academic career is easily visible, and too easily judged, in a person's publications, both number and quality. For what it is worth I have written three monographs, edited or jointly produced eleven other books, and published about 120 articles. In quantitative terms this does not seem too bad, although looking back I seem always to have felt that I was moving too slowly, especially in comparison with those who seem capable of publishing a book every second year. Paradoxically I both love writing and find it a struggle. From early schooldays I was encouraged to scribble away. My first publication, while in the sixth form, presaged my future career by combining history and political science, although the latter meant nothing to me then. With a friend I was given the chance to explore the local county records, in which we discovered some early polling returns, no doubt for a pretty rotten borough. This led to an article on 'The Bye-Election of 1805' in *Hertfordshire Past and Present*. Unfortunately this did not lead to fame as a TV psephologist, but it did alert me to the pleasures of working with primary sources and to the need to ask questions of raw data. Both have stood me in good stead ever since.

Anyone half-familiar with my work will know that my main concern has been with trying to make sense of the drivers of foreign policy behaviour, domestic and international. I have been fascinated by the nature of decision-making, by its capacity for foul-ups and by its uneasy relationship with the public it is supposed to be serving. A concern with how foreign policy impacts upon the citizenry has led me into seeming byways such as work on a French prisoner of war in Nazi Saxony, and the connections between multicultural societies and international politics. Currently this is generating some work on the foreign policy dimensions of migration, and of populism.

I was drawn into studying international relations through the effects of war on my family - not that our experience was at all remarkable. I continue to believe that IR is one of the most important subjects possible for the future of humanity, but also one of the most difficult to provide a truthful account of given the competition of interests and values which continues to rage across the globe. Our duty is to aim to be as well-informed and as dispassionate as possible, without forgetting what is at stake for the millions who bear the consequences of foreign policy decisions. It is often difficult to believe that what we write and teach makes any difference at all to the civility of the world. Still, we cannot abandon the field to the demagogues, the fanatically self-righteous and the mere seekers of profit. That really would be a *trahison des clercs.*

2 July 2017

Selected bibliography: Christopher Hill

Books

Editor, *National Foreign Policies and European Political Cooperation* (London: Allen & Unwin for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1983).

Cabinet Decisions on Foreign Policy: the British Experience October 1938 - June 1941 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, for the Centre for International Studies, London School of Economics and Political Science, 1991).

Editor, with Pamela Beshoff, *Two Worlds of International Relations: Academics, Practitioners and the Trade in Ideas* (London: Routledge, 1994).

Editor, with Stelios Stavridis, *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy: West European Reactions to the Falklands Conflict* (Oxford: Berg, 1996).

Editor, *The Actors in Europe's Foreign Policy* (London: Routledge, 1996).

Translator and editor of English version of *Marching to Captivity: the War Diaries of a French Peasant 1939-1945 - Gustave Folcher* (London: Brasseys, 1996).

Editor, with Karen E. Smith, *European Foreign Policy: Key Documents* (London: Routledge, 2000).

The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy (London: Palgrave, 2003).

Editor with Michael Smith, *International Relations and the European Union* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). Second edition, OUP, 2011. Third Edition, OUP, 2017.

Editor, with Reuben Wong, National and European Foreign Policies: towards Europeanization (London: Routledge, 2011).

The National Interest in Question: Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013).
with Sarah Beadle, *The Art of Attraction: Soft Power and the UK's Role in the World* (London, British Academy, 2014)

Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century (second, revised, edition of The Changing Politics of Foreign Policy, London: Palgrave Macmillan 2016).

Europe's Troublemakers: the Populist Challenge to Foreign Policy (with Rosa Balfour and nine other colleagues at the European Policy Centre, Brussels, 2016).

Articles

'The Capability-Expectations Gap, or Conceptualising Europe's International Role', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31,3, September 1993.

‘”Where are we going?” International Relations and the Voice from Below’, *Review of International Studies*, 25,1, January 1999.

‘What is to be Done? Foreign Policy as a Site for Political Action’, *International Affairs* 79, 2, March 2003.

‘Renationalising or Regrouping? EU Foreign Policy since 11 September 2001’, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 42, 1, March 2004.

‘Bringing War Home: Making Foreign Policy in Multicultural Societies’, *International Relations,* 21,3, September 2007.

'Powers of a kind: the anomalous positions of Britain and France in world politics', *International Affairs*, 92, 2, March 2016.