



Newsletter

April 2020



Developing Global Citizens

President: Lord Watson of Richmond, CBE.

Chairman: Laurence Smy

Vice Chairman: Antony Frost

www.european-atlantic.org.uk

Registered Charity No 306950

A Message from the Editor

Edward Grey, British Foreign Secretary, on the eve of the Great War in 1914, as our continent then entered into the lockdown of conflict. Deja vu one might say amid SARS-COVID 2 (to give Covid19 its proper name) as we again experience lockdown gripped in conflict, albeit conflict of a different kind.

This viral plague is calling forth that spirit of togetherness that emerged in Britain during World War 11, the Spirit of the Blitz. This crisis reveals Humanity to itself, to paraphrase the words of the Bishop of Rome, Pope Francis. It demonstrates that our lives are woven together and sustained by ordinary people - often forgotten people - but who without doubt are writing the decisive events of our time: nurses, care-givers, doctors, cleaners, supermarket employees, postmen, police, providers of transport, refuse collectors, volunteers and more. Solidarity is the name of the game: "for the growing good of the world is partly dependant on unhistoric acts; and that things are not so ill with you and me as they might have been, is half owing to the number of lives lived faithfully, a hidden life .." George Eliot (Mary Ann Evans) "Middlemarch".



The activities of TEAM Global are also in lockdown having had to cancel or postpone Members' Day 2020, the study tour to Europe, and sixth form conferences. However, the volunteers are active in other ways i.e. through this special edition of TEAMGlobal's newsletter and the TEAM Essay Competition for Year 12 Students. The original essay title has been amended; originally, the theme was centred on the hope of the nation coming together, but now entrants are welcome to either respond to the original question or to incorporate into the essay ideas arising from the situation we now find ourselves in, and to consider whether the current crisis has aided or hindered.

Our thanks to Maureen Ghirelli, member of the TEAM Executive, and the moving spirit behind the competition, who has in the original and the revised essay title given opportunity to excite and challenge the "little grey cells" of Year 12 Students who are all currently confined at home and unable to attend school, and who face the uncertainty of having public exams cancelled.

The viral plagues Ebola, Sars, Mers and Covid 19, scientists are agreed, are all zoonotic, originating in animals before transferring to humans. The link between climate change and these pathogens has been the subject of study by eminent ecologists:

Disease Ecologist, Dr. Thomas Gillespie of Emory University, Atlanta Georgia, believes that by radically shrinking natural habitats and annexing wilderness areas, humanity has been removing the protective barriers between us and the animals that carry these pathogens. In effect, we're removing the buffer zone that kept us safe. Likewise Aaron Bernstein, Director of the University of Harvard's Centre for Climate Health and the Global Environment, links climate change to the rise in zoonotic illnesses. Bernstein argues that human actions that lead to climate change are also behind the recent rise in pandemics: "when we change the rules of the game by drastically changing the climate and life on Earth, we have to expect that it will affect our health".

The 7th. of April 2020 sees the 250th. anniversary of the birth of William Wordsworth,

that titan of the Romantic poets, whose love of the natural environment reminds us, of our connectedness to nature; and we, at our peril, risk Armageddon if we do not respond to the great crisis of our time : CLIMATE CHANGE:

" Therefore am I still
A lover of the meadows and the woods
And mountains; and all that we behold
From this green earth; of all the mighty world
Of eye and ear, both what they half create
And what perceive; well pleased to recognise
In nature and the language of the sense,
*The anchor of my purest thoughts, the nurse
The guide, the guardian of my heart and soul
Of all my moral being.* "
' Lines written above Tintern Abbey' , William Wordsworth.

Hearfelt thanks to our contributors of this special edition of TEAM Global's newsletter, Sophie Lynn of the Ursuline High School, Wimbledon, Jasper Harwood and Josh Grinsell of the University of East Anglia, and Chris Poray, who gives us a record of his experiences as an intern after leaving university.

Kevin McSharry
Editor of TEAM newsletter.



NEWSLETTER APRIL 2020

CONTENTS

Student Essay Competition	Maureen Ghirell
Work after University	Chris Poray
Report on 6th Form Conference at Ursuline School	
Report on 6th Form Conference at Gumley House School	
The Rise of Populism in a Globalised World	Sophie Lynn
Aircraft Carrier Strike Groups	Joshua Grinsell
Betrayal in the Labour Party	Jasper Heywood

TEAMGlobal Student Essay Competition

This year TEAMGlobal announced a new initiative, our first student essay competition. We see it as another way of encouraging students - tomorrow's citizens - to think about the democratic process, politics and world affairs.

For the pilot, we're focussing on Year 12 school students. They are approaching the age when they acquire the right and responsibility to vote in elections, but are not yet feeling the full pressure of A-level examinations.

As a new venture, the competition took a lot of work to set up, indeed more than we originally envisaged!

We needed an essay title that would be challenging while also not requiring specialist research or literature that school students couldn't access. We selected the essay title:

**Following the 2019 election, Boris Johnson urged "let the healing begin".
What do you suggest could be done to bring this about?**

Since the competition began we've been experiencing our current health crisis. We decided that it was acceptable if students responded to the original essay question or incorporated the situation we now find ourselves in (and whether the current crisis has aided or hindered this). This is a 'moving feast' and may alter week by week!

We also investigated other essay competitions, and explored various practicalities. For instance, what might be appropriate and motivating prizes, a dedicated email address, how best to communicate with schools and students, and judging criteria.

The competition may also be an opportunity for Year 12 students to keep themselves occupied and indeed challenged. For our winners it could be a great boost to their profile and bank balance. We are receiving essays and application forms up to our closing date of 18th April 2020. Details are on <https://www.dropbox.com/home/TEAMGlobal%20Essay%20Competition>

This initiative has been a learning process for TEAMGlobal, and we are acquiring experience for the future. We are yet to determine what we'll do after this initial year.

Cash prizes and certificates will be awarded to prize winners in early July 2020. The invitation to the TEAMGlobal Annual Members' Day at the House of Lords (including a tour of Parliament) has had to be postponed due to the health crisis.

I'd like to conclude with expressing my gratitude to Christina Stewart-Lockhart (Institute of Economic Affairs) for being able to draw upon her competition experience. Also a huge appreciation to Loredana Roberts (Gumley House School) and Polly Harrison (Ursuline High School) for their support and suggestions on numerous aspects of this competition.

Maureen Ghirelli

Work after University

Chris Poray's Account of his First Year



Throughout my final year at the University of East Anglia, I was the first University Manager for *The Times Final Year Student Survey*, run by *High Fliers Research*. This involved myself hiring and managing a team of student interviewers leading them to a total of 380 interviews during 'Survey Week'. This week was to collect final year undergraduate student's views for the 2019 rankings for *The Top 100 Graduate Employers*. Alongside this I conducted other market research tasks, such as leading research groups and online marketing campaigns.

I was part of a select group of University Managers that were invited to apply for the full-time position of Brand & Promotions Manager for the upcoming year, after several interview processes I was successful. I would then begin my role at *High Fliers Research* before my graduation in early July.

'*The Times Top 100 Graduate Employer Guide* is the definitive annual guide to Britain's most sought-after and prestigious graduate employers'.¹ The guide offers current students an insight into which employers the most recent graduates found offered the best opportunities. Each year final year undergraduate students across the top UK universities are asked 'which employer offers the best opportunities for graduates?'. From there the responses, which are often 19,000+, are compiled into the Top 100 Graduate Employers and published into *The Times Top 100 Graduate Employer Guide*. The guide is then published by High Fliers Publications, sending the guide out to the top 50 UK universities which is then free for all students to use.

The main component of my role was to hire and manage a team of 70 Brand Ambassadors for *The Times Top 100 Graduate Employer Guide* for the start of the university year, September. I hired these ambassadors from the top 34 universities, ranging from Oxford and Cambridge to Queen's Belfast, Leicester and my beloved East Anglia. Ambassadors were tasked with promoting the *Top 100 Guide* as well as the accompanying website, as students are moving towards online resources over physical promotion.

I organised a training session for these ambassadors and coordinated each one coming down to our office in London for our inaugural Top 100 Ambassador training session. The training session consisted of taking them through the ideology and methodology behind *The Times Final Year Student Survey* which ultimately contributes to *The Times Top 100 Graduate Employer Guide*. I then took them through how they should engage with the role, expectations and how to get the most engagement with their peers. As well as setting them up on our systems so they could get paid, one of the most important things in their eyes I'm sure! I also communicated with the Research Director, Managing Director and Owner. I managed to organise them as guest speakers to give the Ambassadors a sense of the national scale we were operating on for this project.

From September 2019 until April 2020, I was solely responsible for the Ambassadors, managing and motivating those Ambassadors remotely from our office in London. I went out to visit some universities such as Oxford, Cambridge, Leicester and Cardiff, something which I valued was seeing the Ambassadors in action approaching their peers and informing and registering them to the Top 100 website. Ambassadors were given the task to reach out to as many students across their university utilising their various networks through departments, societies and sports teams. I supported them as they conducted various marketing campaigns on campus and online. The Ambassadors reached thousands of students, making them aware of the roles and opportunities that were available through *The Top 100 Graduate Employers* in the UK.

Ultimately, the Ambassadors helped promote *The Top 100 Employer Guide*, and the employers that were featured on the latest edition along with their opportunities. This helped students across the country become aware of which sectors and fields they could enter upon graduating. Of course, students in their final year of study would be the ones who'd benefit most from the guide. However, I found that penultimate year



students who were looking for summer internship schemes were often as hungry for opportunities as the final years. I led my team to a total of 8235 registered sign ups, an increase of 147% compared to the previous year, the most online traffic the Times Top 100 has had in its history.

In addition to managing my Student Ambassadors, I took on extra responsibility as a Project Coordinator for London and East Anglia. Supporting the University Manager's at six universities (Imperial College London, King's College London, LSE, Queen Mary London, UCL and UEA) in their survey week, our team collected the second most interviews in Top 100 history, totalling 19,863 face-to-face interviews. These interviews will be compiled into *The Times Top 100 Graduate Employer Guide 2020-2021*. The information is also used by the top graduate employers, informing them on how their graduate marketing campaigns have done throughout the year, thereby discovering whether graduates have taken to their opportunities or they need to redirect their efforts for the following year, in order to attract the brightest graduates from across the country.

I was the first Brand & Promotions Manager *High Fliers Research* have had, therefore there was little guidance or previous experience to draw on. The main attraction for myself to the role was the fact that I would be the first Brand & Promotions Manager, therefore I'd be able to make the role my own, like I had in the University Manager position at UEA. Having responsibility from the start of the role is something that attracted me to work with *High Fliers Research*, an opportunity that graduates often struggle to find within their first few years of graduating.

With the Ambassador project coming to an end, I'm now looking forward to returning to the University of East Anglia beginning my MSc in Economics and International Relations come September.

My experience with *High Fliers Research* has taught me the invaluable skills of time management and self-improvement; the importance of feedback is the only way a recent graduate will be able to build on his or her raw skills.

Chris Poray

Report on Conference at Gumley House School Under 18 – Do I Count?

Gumley House School held its annual sixth form conference on 17 October 2019. This year's topic was on lowering the voting age to 18. Joining Gumley's students were staff and students from Brentford School for Girls, Isleworth & Syon School, and Maria Fidelis FCJ School. The summaries that follow are from the school's website and the Gumley Gazette. <https://www.gumleyhouse.com/News> and https://www.gumleyhouse.com/docs/gumley_gazette/1_Spring_2020.pdf



240 SIXTH FORM STUDENTS FROM 4 SCHOOLS.

Another important discussion addressing the participation of younger people in the political process.

Working in partnership with TEAMGlobal, an education charity, we share their mission to: 'Promote an understanding and discussion of world affairs'.

We would like to thank all of our speakers for their insightful contribution, equipping students with a 360 degree view of the case for & against lowering the UK voting age.

- Jon Narcross, The Electoral Reform Society: Topic: Young people leading the way – the case for votes at 16'
- Ruth Cadbury MP: Topic: 'Labour's position on and substantiation for lowering the voting age'
- Julian Jessop, The Institute of Economic Affairs: Topic: 'Why young people should care about politics'
- Zarina Bell-Gam & Jesse Williams of Debate Mate: Topics: Zarina: 'This House would maintain the voting age of 18' with Jesse taking the opposing position of: 'This House would lower the voting age to 16'.

Conference Moderators:

- We were thrilled to have Michael Johnson's superb moderating skills, as he smoothly directed students' questions & challenges to the speakers. Michael is an international trade policy expert with a 35-year career as a UK Government official specialising in trade administration, bilateral & multilateral negotiations and training. He has advised governments of over 20 countries on how to formulate negotiating positions for the purpose of accession to & implementation of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Agreements.
- Additionally, Lucy Russell from Debate Mate brilliantly moderated her organisation's session with Zarina & Jesse.

TEAMGlobal's contribution enables these diverse discussions that challenge and inform our young people.

Report on conference at Ursuline School

Ursuline hosted a conference on November 11th 2019 at which sixth formers from Wimbledon College, Mulberry School, St Philomena's, and Raynes Park High attended. This report that follows is taken from Ursuline's website:

<https://www.ursulinehigh.merton.sch.uk>.



Sixth Form Conference



On Monday 11 November we hosted a conference on **"The Rise of Populism in a Globalised World"** for 125 sixth-formers from the Ursuline, Wimbledon College, Mulberry School, St Philomena's and Raynes Park High.

The conference addressed the challenges globalisation and populism raise and speakers included; Polly Harrison, Director of Extended Learning who lead the session *"What do we mean by Populism and Globalisation"*, Chris Weavers from **NASUWT** who spoke on *"How to maintain reasonable labour standards in a globalised economy"* and some of the issues which global trade presents from a trade union perspective. We discussed the impact

of populism on minority rights and the threat it can pose to a fully-functioning democracy. We also heard from John Wilson from **Team Global** who spoke on *"Populism and Globalisation in a flyover state"* and how it impacted on his American home town of Iowa, which was a key state in the run up to the 2009 Obama election and lastly Dr Eamonn Butler from the **Adam Smith Institute** who spoke on *"The Benefits of Globalisation"* where he discussed how globalisation provides opportunities for greater trade and collaboration between countries. In the light of the December general election we discussed what qualities we look for in

leaders and the question of how politicians should best communicate with the electorate. On choosing the topic of the conference Ms Waters stated; *"Our conference today could not be more timely, with the General Election on the forefront of everyones minds and the debate on Brexit still raging, the question of the UK's place in our globalised world is more pertinent then ever..."*

It was a great day with much debate and a lot for everyone to reflect on.



We are grateful to the charity **TEAMGlobal** and our speakers for their support of the day.

The Rise of Populism in a Globalised World

Firstly, I would like to take a moment to applaud all the speakers who were able to talk about such complex, controversial topics whilst keeping within the status quo of Team Global's unpoliticised nature. All points made by the speakers I found to be very interesting and insightful. The conference definitely broadened my horizons as to what the social implications are as a result of populist influence and how such an ideology is linked to globalization in everyday life.

Populism and globalisation are intrinsically linked due to the threat of fascism, the rising levels of nationalism and a higher amount of extremist groups taking form. Groups or parties whose beliefs are far left leaning or right leaning often are formed electorate in a political crisis or at a time of political, social, economic uncertainty.

For example, the British Nationalist Party had won fifty seats in local government in the 2000's after stressing the 'dangers' of rising immigration. Post 9/11, there has been a soaring increase of people with extremist views surrounding immigration especially. In addition, an ill-informed elector is more likely to vote ignorantly than someone who has done their research. This links into globalisation as populist leaders for example, Donald Trump, want a greater amount of goods to be sourced and bought within their own country and a decrease of good bought internationally. For example, Donald Trump had placed tariffs on Chinese steel and stated that "we will put American steel into the spine of our country."

Donald Trump is one of many leaders that are seen as populist, but there is much more press coverage and media coverage surrounding right-wing populism than left leaning populists. Trump may be seen as a populist leader although many of his decisions have favoured right-wing elites, but the conference highlighted that populism outside the US and Europe tends to be left-wing, with many left-wing populists giving the rich less money and power and giving more to the poorer, working classes (in Robin Hood style). This kind of left-wing populist approach can, just as with right-wing populism, be very dangerous, as especially in the UK, it would undermine our belief in the idea of a meritocratic society. Meritocracy may be defined as the natural social system where people will do better and achieve more in their lives than others if they work hard and achieve their goals and aspirations. Meritocracy also gives people the opportunity to work harder and provides an incentive to do better. In contrast, arguably, left-wing populist ideology can be very damaging to the motivational social order that we have lived with for so long in the UK. Unemployment has always been higher in the UK at the end of a leftist or centralist left government than it was at the start. This shows that higher taxes and less money going into the economy can have a detrimental effect on globalisation and the fluctuation of goods within countries.

Although we live in a representative democracy, it can be argued that it is almost impossible to represent everybody. There are so many sections of society from class to age to race or ability. Therefore, populism is prevalent in most nations. Decisions made by the government may be favoured to the elites or show to have a disdain for elites.

Nonetheless, populism actively contradicts the concept of globalisation, and an avarice for power in particular nations with leaders claiming to speak 'for the people' or to have 'one voice' as a result a longing for a perceived 'equality.'

Sophie Lynn

Aircraft Carrier Strike Groups



For many years, grand strategy has preoccupied itself with dominance of the seas. The Royal Navy, once the largest in the world, had bases at critical chokepoints for maritime trade, and most great powers or aspiring great powers have emphasised expansion of their naval forces as a means to exert influence abroad. However, one of the most potent and foreboding warships, the aircraft carrier, is a relatively-recent development in naval warfare, having evolved from primitive origins into the first “flat-top” HMS Argus in 1918, and only came to be considered a core part of the fleet following their prolific use in the naval clashes out in the Pacific during the Second World War. Since then, the deployment of an aircraft carrier has become a strong deterrent and indication of a nation’s interest in the affairs of any region in which one is deployed, particularly in the case of the United States Navy. As expeditionary warfare increasingly becomes a tool of the great powers, the aircraft carrier will continue to play a critical role in the realms of diplomacy and warfare for years to come.

One question on some strategists’ minds is to question why continue to use aircraft carriers in an era of air-to-air refuelling and detachable fuel tanks, thus allowing for aircraft to operate much further afield from fixed land airfields? It has been achieved in the past, most notably during the 1986 US air strikes against Libya, where US strike aircraft operating out of the U.K. flew around Iberia and back in a gruelling

6,000 mile round trip, as carrier-based aircraft in the Mediterranean lacked the payloads necessary to strike all their targets. The limitations of carrier-based aircraft have been highlighted more recently with the F-35 Lightning II, where the carrier variants lack an internal cannon compared to the land-based variant, and the B model possesses a smaller fuel tank in order to accommodate the vertical takeoff and landing capabilities that allow it to operate from carriers lacking a catapult launch system, as is the case with the Royal Navy's Queen Elizabeth-class carriers. However, carriers were still used in Libya in 1986 to soften up Libyan air defences ahead of the land-based aircraft, indicating that they remained useful to the operation, and provided the capacity for a swift response to any further action. Furthermore, the reason why the land-based aircraft undertook such a long trip was owed to the fact that France had refused overflight rights to American aircraft striking Libya or for US aircraft based in Spain to conduct the mission, meaning that if these aircraft were unavailable or impractical, carrier-borne strikes would have been a more practical and politically-safe alternative.



British F-35Bs land on HMS Queen Elizabeth (Picture: MOD).

So what makes aircraft carriers useful enough that navies would continue to purchase and maintain them? One advantage that they have over land-based airfields is that they are able to move around, thus making it harder for enemies to target them and thereby increase the survivability of the air wing. Furthermore, with this increased room for manoeuvre, military leaders are able to deploy 30 or more combat-capable aircraft into regions where they lack presence and threaten enemy positions at any time. The threat that a carrier strike group can pose is formidable,

and has forced those threatening the host nation's allies or assets to back down more than once, most notably during multiple crises in the Formosa Strait during the Cold War. Additionally, when combined with a naval infantry capacity, like the Spanish assault ship Juan Carlos I, an expeditionary ground element can be deployed ahead of a larger force, further maximising the vessel's offensive capacity.

Therefore, the continued deployment of aircraft carriers remains critical to the great powers as a means of projecting influence and power beyond their shores, particularly in areas where their presence may be limited to non-existent, and they will continue to head up fleets sailing into battle for years to come.

Joshua Grinsell MA International Security
University of East Anglia

Betrayal in the Labour Party: irrelevant divisions and silent debates

An exploration of emotive policy change and its implications in regards to the British Labour Party

TRUST AND BETRAYAL

An Emotive Party:

It is essential to deconstruct the process of change within the Labour Party. This is grounded in trust, a sparse yet essential political commodity. According to IPSOS MORI, only 14% of the public surveyed have trust in politicians, leaving the profession firmly at the bottom of the 2019 veracity index ([ipsos.com](https://www.ipsos.com) 2019). Yukl rationalises that trust is forged in the consistency between promise and behaviour. When a political promise is achieved, trust is formed; though, when a promise is ignored, trust is lost. Whilst this interpretation contains truth, it overlooks the extent to which trust is a 'human need' that can actively stimulate change. Indeed, it generally assumes that the absence of trust makes the likelihood of political change harder, as the electorate are assumed to be disenfranchised and apathetic. However, as Balkin's logocentric analyses demonstrates, trust is a fusion of the intangible and the emotive. When broken, it evokes irrational responses akin to an 'axe' that the electorate need to grind. Simply put, when trust is lost, a feeling of betrayal actively stimulates political actors to seek change.



This was illustrated by Labour Party members across Norfolk in a recent survey. 79% of respondents agreed that the failure of the party leadership at a certain point during their membership led to a loss of trust and evoked betrayal. Those who were critical of Corbyn keenly reported how hostility to Labour's 'broad church' had left them betrayed and unable to trust the current leadership. Likewise, those who were more positive towards Corbyn consistently referred to Blair's 2003 invasion of Iraq and flexible use of the private sector in healthcare as clear instances of betrayal. Crucially, these respondents demonstrate how a loss of trust can stimulate change. For some, actively supporting Corbyn for leadership was considered an act of retribution, whilst those currently feeling betrayed confirmed their intention to vote for the anti-Corbyn candidate in future leadership elections.

This process is not problematic in and of itself. However, when considered alongside the unique contextual development of the Labour Party, it has the potential to consolidate two distinct policy narratives whilst limiting the emergence of alternative ideas.

CONTESTED AIMS

The Labour Party is underpinned by a variety of ideological positions that have 'no counterpart' within any other party. This is best expressed in the contestation over Clause IV of the Labour Party's constitution. A 'rallying cry', for Fielding, it is the closest the party has come to a defined set of aims. However, this clause does not equate to a uniformity in regards to the party's aims.

On the contrary, the specificity of the party's aims have been marred by debates between those who seek revolutionary change, and those who accept our 'un-revolutionary' society. This debate is best illustrated with reference to contested interpretations over the party's past electoral successes. These expose a core diametric conflict. For instance, some within the party celebrate Clement Attlee's Socialist 'overhaul' of society. In contrast, others draw attention to the Attlee government's pragmatic acknowledgment of private ownership. Similarly, theorists like Richards comparatively analyse Blair's pragmatic 1997 manifesto with Harold Wilson's in 1966, though Blair argued that the latter lacked 'verve' and betrayed the Labour movement's tradition of globalisation. Whilst there is contestation, the literature clearly distills these disparate ideological positions into a core tension between fundamentalists and moderates. Indeed, a familiar conflict emerges between traditional socialists and social democrats. Essentially, the importance of this conflict is that away from abstract notions of social justice, there is clearly little agreement on the scope of the party's aims when in government with two defined, yet distinct, interpretations emerging.

As demonstrated, the members of the Labour Party hold great sway over the party's future direction. However, clearly members are both emotively driven and divided over the party's fundamental aims. In this unique context, the process of changing leader becomes an opportunity to enact retribution, impelled by lack a trust and dictated by an overwhelming sense of betrayal. When combined, the party's contestation of its aims and the centrality of retribution to membership consolidate the disparate ideological views into a core diametric. Ultimately, this limits the extent of alternative policy narratives.

CLAUSE 4

"The Labour Party is a democratic socialist Party. It believes that by the strength of our common endeavour we achieve more than we achieve alone, so as to create for each of us the means to realise our true potential and for all of us a community in which power, wealth and opportunity are in the hands of the many not the few; where the rights we enjoy reflect the duties we owe and where we live together freely, in a spirit of solidarity, tolerance and respect." (Labour Party Rulebook 2019, p.3)

Q1 Consolidating a diametric

Indeed, when combined in the context of a leadership election, reason gives way to retribution. The issues with this are twofold. Firstly, this process of change reinforces the twin tenets of views that have dominated the Labour Party's history, creating a culture of sectarianism. In such a context, retribution means that leadership elections are less about supporting alternative policy agendas, but increasingly concerned with depriving competitors of power. Indeed, referring back to the survey of members across Norfolk, Traditional Socialist respondents were motivated more by their distrust of social democrats than by the desire for a radical policy alternative. For example, one respondent detailed how the lack of commitment to common ownership and the adoption of 'privatisation' under Andy Burnham, the then Secretary of State for Health, left them so betrayed they consciously 'did not vote for him in the leadership contest'. Indeed, the respondents who voted for Corbyn in the 2015 leadership election claimed that his appeal lay in his grassroots approach, in response to the increasing centralisation of the party under Blair. Similarly, Social Democrats expressed a desire for the anyone-but-Corbyn candidate, opting for the tried-and-tested proponents of New Labour instead of seeking a genuinely new approach for Labour. A 16 year old member indicated their unhappiness with Corbyn's 'anti-semitic associations', whilst a 24 year old member indicated their desire to 'defeat the hard left' at the next leadership election in response to feeling 'disgusted' with the party's handling of the issue. Evidently,

decisions over leadership have less to do with the likelihood of winning power for the party, and more to do with who can establish power within the party. The outcome of this is that party engages in a perpetual disagreement over its aims, and results in a tyranny of the majority. In essence, changes of leadership are a reaction against the past, not a response to the future.

Q2: Retribution over policy

Secondly, this distills the breadth of views into a distinct diametric that excludes alternative policy narratives. This is clearly happening. Lisa Nandy, whose interest in towns presents arguably the most nuanced campaign, has been overshadowed, whilst the most experienced candidate, Emily Thornberry has failed to secure a place on the ballot, with the election becoming a 'monolithic' battle between the moderate Keir Starmer and continuity candidate Rebecca Long-Bailey (<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-51390672>). Clearly, an overt concern with retribution is inhibiting the intellectual and ideological development of alternative policy positions, limiting the options to a contest between moderates versus fundamentalists. Outside of these positions, narratives that lack an ideological legacy, similar to Miliband's *One Nation Labour*, have great difficulty breaking the stranglehold of 'old' versus 'new'. The result: a party that swings between two defined positions, unable to respond to future issues, and destined to languish in opposition.

Q3: Impacts

In regards to the impacts of this emotively driven decision making, the researcher noted a considerable number of references to hostility as being the outcome of betrayal and retribution. This hostility was split into two dominant areas. This partially drew on the 'ideologically pure' attitudes of Corbyn supporters, and their 'inflexible' and 'upsetting' intolerance of the broad church. Going further, a respondent specifically referred to the attitude of 'calling people Blairites' and 'traitors' as 'reminiscent of abusive relationships' that ultimately impacted upon their mental health. As an indication that this member sought retribution, they admit that this atmosphere led them to vote for Owen Smith in the 2016 leadership challenge. This provides further evidence of the underlying motivation for retribution that guides party members. The researcher experienced this hostility first hand whilst conducting an interview with a self-identified traditional socialist. Requesting anonymity, they characterised Blair as a 'lapping poodle' with a 'disgusting grin', supported by 'lickspittle reporters'. Keen to criticise social democracy personally, the respondent was limited on detailed explanations, whilst another simply wrote of New Labour, 'the B-liar government', again failing to pinpoint an exact failure to meet expectations. On the contrary, a keen advocate of social democracy was equally critical of traditional socialism though referred only to its perceived policy failures

and approach to Labour's broad church, suggesting the party was in 'terminal decline'. This is not the only example, with a female member reporting claims of personal sexism at branch meetings that according to her, 'would have made union blokes blush'. Further responses from North Norfolk continue this trend. A former Labour Chairman of North Norfolk District Council reported feeling increasing 'disaffected, unwanted, unappreciated' in the local party, specifically blaming a clique of Corbyn supporters. He confirmed that in the likelihood of another leadership election, he would seek retribution by voting for the 'person would stop me being disaffected [...] and feeling the way I am now'. Overall, this demonstrates that the reliance on long-held values has created a culture of sectarianism within the LP, confirming Hayter's (2005, p.4) assessment suggesting that betrayal is no longer defined by specific policy outcomes or failed expectations, but instead by personal hostilities.

This has consequences for the future of the Labour Party. Indeed, in such a context, leadership elections are still seen as a way to enact retribution, but this is less about supporting alternative policy agendas, and increasingly concerned with depriving competitors of power thereby preventing compromise. As such, given the dominance of these factions, and their concern only with exerting power within the party, alternative debates that seek to develop policy in response to perceived failures may be unable to develop. On a broad level, this alludes to the difficulties that non-established positions within the party have in terms of establishing their intellectual and ideological development.

Q4: Possible changes

Firstly, greater research needs to be conducted into the possible intergenerational discord of Labour Party members. The research conducted for this article hinted at how for younger members, the established diametric of views is increasingly irrelevant. This gives some hope for the emergence of an alternative policy narrative as either New Labour nor Old Labour holds the answers to the questions young people prioritise. Any potential leadership candidate must consider issues with fresh thinking and approach them with big ideas.

Secondly, party members need to understand the value of compromise. Often in politics, compromise is regarded as failure and a betrayal. Changing the narrative around policy promises and policy outcomes is an essential first step in softening the language around compromise. Public Policy research often highlights the benefits of compromise, with theories like Rational Choice Institutionalism positing this as the end-goal. In answer to one respondent in North Norfolk, there is no 'winner-takes-all' theory of change. Understanding that lesson should encourage members to stop seeking retribution and instead use their power to promote alternative ideas. Alongside this, any leadership candidate must forgo the tendency

to promote ideological purity. A potential starting point is to publicly re-evaluate the National Health Service. Far from a socialist achievement, the NHS should be celebrated as a compromise between pragmatic Social Democrats and Modern Liberals in response to a clear societal issue.

Thirdly, the Labour Party needs to define and redefine what it stands for. In any context, external actors such as historians and theorists will continue debate outcomes and achievements - and this should be celebrated. However, as is clear, until internal actors move beyond the contested accounts of the party's past, these will continue to overwhelmingly determine future policy. Instead of learning from the past, the party will be limited to offering a simple diametric of 'Old' or 'New'. At the core of the issue is the party's Clause IV. This is undoubtedly a crucial statement of the party's aims and values. However, it was last revised in 1994 - a world different to our own. One suggestion would be for special conferences of party members and officials held on a periodic basis to debate and rewrite the clause. This would ensure the party's fundamental aims were responsive, and would reduce any temptation to use the clause as a marker of historical precedent in such a way as to bind the hands of future leaders. Without prior agreement over what the party stands for, Labour will be destined to react only to its membership, and not respond to the needs of the wider electorate.

CONCLUSION

What is clear is that historic changes in the Labour Party, in regards to its direction and leadership, can be attributed to betrayal of values and a resultant retribution through supporting alternative candidates. Secondly, the Labour Party is divided between two prominent factions: social democrats and traditional socialists. Such a diametric relies heavily on identity and long-held values. Indeed, the expected aims of these factions have evolved from divergent interpretations of Clause VI, and a failure to outline a clear doctrine. Ultimately, after establishing a new narrative in 2010, Ed Miliband's *One Nation Labour* failed to integrate itself into the party owing to its lack of ideological character. Indeed, whilst the current diametric of views may be resilient, it is ultimately preventing alternative narratives from emerging. In reflection of the party's recent electoral performance, any leadership candidate must attempt to break the diametric to actively respond to the societal issues facing the country. Ultimately, the issue is not with the direction that the Labour Party chooses, but instead the motivations of those who are pushing the Labour Party in that given direction.

Jasper Heywood