RESEARCH SEMINAR SERIES 2022-23
Criminology, Sociology, Politics and International Relations

All academics and students welcome!

Please direct queries to Angelos Chryssogelos a.chryssogelos@londonmet.ac.uk or Craig Lundy c.lundy@londonmet.ac.uk

AUTUMN SEMESTER

Tue Oct 11th - Robin West
Title: *Refractions/Reverberations: The Life and Afterlife of Atrocity*
Location: BEL 2-13
Time: 4-5pm

Abstract:
This paper addresses the intersections of dark tourism, the moral and affective implications of secondary witnessing in cases of atrocity-related trauma, and active struggles to highlight the persistence of state violence though the medium of historical injustice. Taking as a case study the contemporary memorialisation and representations of the 1947-54 Jeju Island 'incident' in which an estimated 30,000 South Korean civilians were massacred by state-backed forces, the paper poses two related questions. First, how are the discourses of victim and perpetrator (re)constructed through the multiple 'refractions' of the memorialisation process? Second, how does the spectral presence of distant suffering and political violence constructively speak to human rights abuses played out on the world stage today?

Thu Nov 10th - Gordana Uzelac
Title: *"ALL YOU NEED IS TRUST": THE IMPACT OF INSTITUTIONAL TRUST ON COVID-19 VACCINATION ATTITUDES*
Time: 4-5pm
Location: BEL 1-12

Abstract:
This paper asks whether the public's willingness to take a new vaccine depends on their trust in public institutions and, particularly, what is the effect of trust in science and trust in government on that decision. The data for this paper comes from the project *World Problems, National Solutions* which surveyed 7000 respondents in England, Germany, Ireland, Serbia, and Sweden in the period of March-June 2021. While the literature on this topic mostly claims a direct causal relationship between trust in government and science and willingness to be vaccinated, a comparative analysis between five countries shows that there are no simple and holistic answers to those questions. This research demonstrates that public willingness to take a new vaccine is dependent on the perception of the trustworthiness of science, but the effect of trust in government varies from country to country and does not have a single trajectory.
4-5pm

Tue Nov 22nd - Angelos Chryssogelos
Seminar title: *Conservatives going rogue: The populist mutation of conservative parties in historical and comparative perspective*

Time: 4-5pm
Location: BEL 2-13

Abstract:
Liberal democracies have been shaken in recent years by right-wing populism. But while much attention has been paid to it as an outgrowth of the extreme right, there is little effort to understand why populism emerges also from within formerly mainstream conservative parties. This paper aims to take the first steps in untangling the ideological and political overlaps between conservatism and populism, two phenomena that in theory are largely incompatible yet in practice can become comfortable bedfellows. Why is populism an attractive choice for many conservatives? When do conservative parties turn to populism? And what are the implications of this for liberal democracy?

Tue Dec 12th - Craig Lundy
Title: *After Progress: Revaluing Life Amidst Catastrophe*
Time: 4-5pm
Location: BEL 2-12 Avocor, green zone

Abstract: Progress is one of the most influential ideas in history. It is invariably appealed to when reflecting on the course of social groups and individual lives. But as the threat of ecological devastation and Covid-19 have brought into sharp relief, if the pursuit of progress leads to the imperilment of the Earth and life as we know it, then what does this idea really mean and how do we go beyond it? By cross-pollinating developments in 'process philosophy', 'complexity sciences' and experiments in pursuing life 'after progress', this research aims to explore and articulate promising possibilities for revaluing life amidst catastrophe.

SPRING SEMESTER

Tue Jan 31st - Shaun Yates
Title: *The Tyranny of Efficiency: A revised framework for efficiency-oriented criminal justice reform research*
Time: 4:00pm-5:30pm
Location: BR 1-06, green zone

Abstract:
Building from the work of Chase (1932), Packer (1968) and MacDonald (2008), this article presents a revised conceptual framework to aid socio-legal and criminological thinkers when navigating the efficiency-oriented criminal justice reform literature. This article offers this revised framework after arguing that the literature provides accounts of efficiency that are often ambiguous and conflictual, which can make it difficult to understand what efficiency advocates are advocating for and what efficiency critics are critical of. This paper focuses its discussion on the influential reform-oriented reports of Le Vay (1989), Auld (2001) and Leveson (2015) within the wider context of neoliberalism and New Public Management changes. This revised framework distinguishes between 4 typologies of efficiency: referent-based constructions, normative constructions, ideal-type constructions and high-order abstractions. This framework emphasises the merits of the first three typologies of efficiency whilst arguing that policy reform researchers should avoid conceptualisations of efficiency that match the fourth typology, high-order abstractions. It is this paper's claim that high-order abstractions are too ambiguous and/or too

dissociated from practical matters to effectively describe or prescribe real-world change. Indeed, given that real-world change is the focus of policy reform researchers, high-order abstractions are undesirable. Whilst the present paper refers to the lower criminal courts and different interpretations of efficiency, future researchers could adapt this framework for social value-based policy reform more broadly, in a range of other disciplines and subject areas.

Tue March 7th - Antia Mato Bouzas
Seminar title: *Transnationalism without a nation? The relationship between migration, development and conflict in north-eastern Pakistan*
Time: 4.00-5:30pm
Location: BR 1-06, green zone

Abstract: This talk addresses issues of territorialisation and nation building in the disputed Kashmir region. The Kashmir dispute encompasses the territories which are administered at present by India and Pakistan and that were part of the formerly princely state of Jammu and Kashmir before the partition of the Indian subcontinent in 1947. All these territories are administered under exceptional rules that have created distinct socio-political contexts in each of them. The talk focuses on the case of the autonomous region of Gilgit-Baltistan, which is administered by Pakistan but not integrated in the Pakistani state because of Pakistan's position on Kashmir. It examines a transnational space, between the southern administrative division of Baltistan and the Gulf region, formed by migrants and religious leaders from Baltistan, and members of the merchant class in Kuwait. The analysis of the transnational space helps to understand the 'politics of place', that is, it sheds light on the political context in Baltistan and Gilgit-Baltistan's relation with Pakistan.

Tue March 14th - William Hughes
Seminar title: *Informed consent or avoidance of harm: rethinking ethical practice in research. Considering researcher disclosure in researching intervention groups for violent men*
Time: 4.00-5:30pm
Location: BR 1-06, green zone

Abstract:
This paper has its origins in a participant observation of group based intervention programmes for men with histories of violence towards intimate partners. This involved simultaneously occupying the roles of group facilitator and researcher. Contentiously, the decision was made not to disclose to the participants that research was being undertaken.
There has been a broad consensus that ethically informed practice is underpinned by informed consent. It is argued that while important, the principle of 'informed consent' requires scrutiny. It has significant limitations, both practically and ethically. This paper puts forward the case that the principle of 'avoidance of harm' can be employed as an alternative principle to guide research practice, and argues this is a more fundamental and nuanced basis for ethical research.

Thu Apr 20th - Sukhwant Dhaliwal
Seminar title: *'Gender terrorism', 'misogyny' and 'toxic masculinity' as frames for an effective state response to fundamentalist violence*
Time: 4.00pm-5:30pm

Location: BR 1-06, green zone

Abstract: The most recent waves of terrorist violence in the UK and the USA have drawn attention to the potential links between public violence and intimate partner / domestic violence. Consequently, feminist-inspired concepts like 'gender terrorism', 'toxic masculinity' and 'misogyny' have been adopted to diagnose and craft a response to racial and religious supremacist violence and act as potential 'flags' for radicalisation. This presentation considers the possibilities these terms offer for elucidating our understanding of fundamentalism (religious supremacism) and as frameworks for the British government's response to fundamentalist violence. I argue that while these framings are significant for drawing attention to the relationship between gender and fundamentalism, they tend to reduce fundamentalist violence to male violence against women and girls, thereby pushing out of view a range of other targets - politicians, revellers, religious minorities, non-believers, secularism, equality, political and religious dissent – and the strength of commitment to religious belief and fundamentalist ideology. Moreover, they reinforce rather than challenge the nationalist and neo liberal tendencies of the state's current response. There also also concerns that 'gender terrorism' will securitise the violence against women sector rather than address the fundamentalist threat to women's security. The misogyny frame relies on individualising and pathologizing notions of hate and the tools of neo liberal governance and incorrectly diagnoses violence against women as the effect of an extreme emotion rather than the cause and consequence of gender inequality. Conversations on toxic masculinity attempt to address the under-theorisation of masculinity within discussions of fundamentalism but end up shifting the attention away from fundamentalist ideologies. None of these offers an intersectional feminist analysis of the manifold dimensions of fundamentalist activity.