



**British
Politics
Group** **NEWSLETTER+**

Officers

President

Susan Scarrow, 2002-2004
University of Houston

Executive Committee

David Baker 2003-2005
University of Warwick

Karen Beckwith 2004-2006
College of Wooster

Samuel H. Beer 2004-2006
Harvard University

Sarah Childs 2004-2006
University of Bristol

Justin Fisher, 2003-2005
Brunel University

Wyn Grant, 2003-2005
University of Warwick

Ian McAllister 2004-2006
Australia National University

Terry Royed, 2003-2005
University of Alabama

Graham Wilson 2004-2006
University of Wisconsin

T. P. Wolf, 2003-2005
Indiana University Southeast

Joel Wolfe, 2003-2005
University of Cincinnati

Executive Secretary

Donley Studlar
West Virginia University

Fall 2004, No 118

IN THIS ISSUE

Activities	Page 2
Announcements	Page 4
From the BPG-L	Page 6
Abstracts	Page 9
Book Reviews	
Cole on <i>John Major, Tony Blair and a Conflict of Leadership</i> by Foley	Page 15
Harris on <i>Stone Voices</i> by Ascherson	Page 16
Wolf on <i>Thatcher, Politics and Fantasy</i> by Nunn & <i>The Political Legacy of Margaret Thatcher</i> by Pugliese	Page 17
Wolf on <i>Twentieth Century Anglo-American Relations</i> edited by Hollowell & Kennedy, <i>Macmillan and the</i> <i>Cold War</i> by Ashton	Page 18
Pot Pourri XLI	Page 20
Membership News	Page 21
Tribute to James Douglas	Page 22

Thomas P. Wolf, Newsletter Editor
School of Social Sciences
Indiana University Southeast
New Albany, IN 47150
fax: (812) 941-2591
tpwolf@ius.edu

Web Site:
www.uc.edu/bpg

Donley Studlar, Executive Secretary
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6317
Morgantown, WV
26506-6317
dstudlar@wvu.edu

Publication note: The British Politics Group Newsletter is published quarterly by the British Politics Group (BPG). Inquiries about the content of the Newsletter should be communicated to the Editor – address on the front cover. Dues are: One year - \$20 or £14; two years - \$35 or £25; three years - \$50 or £35; graduate student dues at ½ of these rates. **Lifetime membership:** \$500 or £350. Dues and inquiries about membership in the British Politics Group should be directed to the Executive Secretary – address on the front cover. In addition to the Newsletter, the BPG provides an annual annotated bibliography of books on British politics. The BPG offers the Samuel H. Beer Prize for the best dissertation at a North American university on a British politics subject, the Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Fellowship for dissertation research in the UK by a North American working on a British politics topic, and the James B. Christoph Prize for the Best Paper on British Politics by a graduate student at a professional conference. See further details in Activities section below. Inquiries about the Beer Prize, the Stokes Fellowship, and the Christoph Prize should be made to the Executive Secretary. Periodically, a membership directory is compiled and sent to members.

BPG Electronic Communications – A) Discussion List – Joel Wolfe has created a discussion list for the BPG. The instructions for its use were revised in August 1998 as follows: Send an email to listserv@listserv.uc.edu with this message: subscribe BPG-L, followed by your first name, middle initial and last name. Inquiries about the list serve?

Contact Joel at Joel.Wolfe@uc.edu B) Web Site – Joel has also constructed a home page for the BPG: <http://www.uc.edu/bpg>. We thank the University of Cincinnati for providing these internet links.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT ONE SEARCH FOR EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF BPG

The British Politics Group invites applications and inquiries from its members in the United States for the position of Executive Secretary of the BPG, starting September, 2005. This is a voluntary position for one of the largest and most dynamic Related Groups within the APSA umbrella. The Executive Secretary works with the President and Executive Committee in order to further the purposes of the BPG. He/she provides an Annual Report, participates in an annual Executive Committee meeting, and prepares the minutes of that meeting. Applicants need well developed organizational,

management, communications, and diplomatic skills. This person maintains all membership records for the BPG and manages the financial aspects of the organization. He/she communicates regularly with the Editor of BPGN, the Webmaster of BPG-L, and the Program Organizer for the Annual Meeting. In addition, this person manages the nomination process for BPG prizes and elections to the Executive Committee. There is also coordination with British Consulates for receptions and the APSA and other professional organizations as necessary. Support from the host institution for minimal expenses for postage, copying, stationery, telephone, and secretarial assistance is an asset for an applicant. The successful applicant will be at the center of a worldwide network of professional activity and scholarship on British politics. Applicants should prepare a statement including their previous participation in the BPG, how their qualifications and experience meet the above needs, and how they envision the role of Executive Secretary in the BPG. The Selection Committee is composed of Wyn Grant (University of Warwick), Susan Scarrow (University of Houston), Terry Royed (University of Alabama), and Joel Wolfe (University of Cincinnati). Active BPG members in the U.S. interested in the position should contact Wyn Grant at one of the following points.

w.p.grant@warwick.ac.uk

+44-2476-523720

Dept. of Politics and International Studies,

University of Warwick,

Coventry CV4 7AL

UNITED KINGDOM

Cell phone: +44-07973-680599

Fax: +44-02476-524221

ACTIVITIES

Samuel H. Beer Prize of the British Politics Group, 2005

The Samuel H. Beer Dissertation Prize was developed by the British Politics Group to encourage the study of British politics by graduate students and to reward exceptional work in that area of study. The principle criterion for awarding the Prize is the dissertation's contribution to the understanding of British politics, regardless of whether the study is exclusively British or comparative research.

We invite nominations for the 2005 award of \$300 for the best doctoral dissertation in British politics completed during the calendar years 2002, 2003, or 2004. All nominees must have received their Ph.D. from a

department in the U.S. or Canada. Either a supervising professor or a department's director of graduate studies may nominate a dissertation. Either the supervising professor or the dissertation author must be a member of the BPG (can join upon submission). No one person may nominate more than one dissertation. Three (3) loose copies of the nominated dissertation, along with a brief letter of nomination, should be postmarked by March 1, 2005 and sent to:

Donley T. Studlar
Executive Secretary, British Politics Group
Department of Political Science
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6317
Morgantown, WV 26506-6317 USA
Email: dstudlar@wvu.edu
Phone: (304) 293-3811, X5269
Fax: (304) 293-8644

The winner of the award will be announced at the BPG's annual business meeting at the 2005 APSA convention in Washington, DC.

2005 Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Research Fellowship of the British Politics Group

The British Politics Group is pleased to announce the annual Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Research Fellowship, to enable a North American graduate student doing research on British politics for his/her dissertation at a North American University to conduct research in the United Kingdom. The award, in the amount of \$500 U.S., is to be used for Ph.D. dissertation research on British politics, broadly defined, including comparative and historical work as well as approaches more specifically focused on contemporary British politics. Application deadline for the 2005 competition is March 15, 2005. Application should include a prospectus of 3-5 double-spaced typewritten pages which outlines the project and makes clear how the fellowship will aid the research, plus a brief C.V. of no more than three pages. A letter from the Chair of the Dissertation Committee concerning the research is also required. Research should be conducted in the United Kingdom sometime during the period June, 2005 through August, 2005. The successful applicant is required to submit a brief report (3-5 double-spaced pages) on the research financed by the Fellowship by September 30, 2005, including for what purposes expenses were incurred. Applications will be judged by an international committee of British politics scholars. Applicants will be notified of the committee's decision on their application by May 15, 2005. The fellowship honors

Donald E. Stokes, a founding member of the British Politics Group, a member of its first Executive Committee, and co-author of the seminal book, *Political Change in Britain*.

All materials and/or inquiries should be directed to:

Donley T. Studlar
Executive Secretary, British Politics Group
Department of Political Science
West Virginia University
PO Box 6317
Morgantown, WV 26506-6317 U.S.A.
Telephone (304) 293-3811, ext. 5269
Fax: (304) 293-8644
Email: dstudlar@wvu.edu

The James B. Christoph Prize for the Best Paper on British Politics by a Graduate Student – 2004 (revised terms)

The fourth annual James B. Christoph Award for the Best Paper on British Politics presented by a graduate student will be awarded by the British Politics Group. The paper (or poster) must be presented at a conference during the calendar year 2004. All papers on British politics, whether solely on Britain or comparative, are eligible. The author/presenter must have been a registered graduate student (pre-awarding of Ph.D.) at any institution of higher education in North America at the time of presentation. The prize is \$200, and the decision will be made by a three-person committee of established scholars who are BPG members. Four copies of the paper should be submitted to the Executive Secretary of the British Politics Group at the address below by April 1, 2004 for consideration. The winner will be recognized at the 2004 Business Meeting of the BPG in Chicago. The prize is named in honor of the late James B. Christoph, a leading scholar and former President of the BPG.

Submissions to:

Donley T. Studlar
Executive Secretary, British Politics Group
Department of Political Science
West Virginia University
P.O. Box 6317
Morgantown, WV 26506-6317 USA
Telephone: 304-293-3811; Fax 304-293-8644
Email: dstudlar@wvu.edu

Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, Sept. 4, 2004

The Executive Committee of the British Politics Group met over lunch at noon, September 4, 2004, in the Palmer House Hotel, Chicago. Present were Executive Committee members Susan Scarrow (President), Wyn Grant, Terry Royed, David Baker,

David Farrell, Rachel Gibson, and Joel Wolfe. Donley Studlar (ex officio) attended as Executive Secretary. Copies of the Executive Secretary's report had previously been distributed.

Among topics discussed were the following. Unanimous happiness was expressed with the reception given by the Chicago Consulate for BPG members on Thursday. Wyn Grant was chosen by acclamation as next BPG President. Since he also is part of the PSA executive, he is in a good position to communicate with APSA in conjunction with next year's meeting in Washington, D.C. In view of the reduced applications received for BPG prizes in recent years, especially the Stokes and Christoph prizes, there were suggestions as to how to advertise these more widely. BPG membership remains strong, as are finances. Thanks were expressed to Terry Royed for her excellent panel organizing for 2004, which she will assay again for 2005. With BPG members in charge of two of the regular APSA sections for the 2005 conference, there may be opportunities for co-sponsored panels.

Previously Donley Studlar had announced that the coming year would be his last as BPG Executive Secretary, culminating with the Washington meeting. Considerable discussion ensued about the best procedures to follow in replacing him. Studlar will prepare a job description for distribution to BPG members. The selection committee to receive inquiries and applications will be composed of Wyn Grant, Susan Scarrow, Terry Royed, and Joel Wolfe. It was decided that the BPG Executive Secretary should continue to be resident in the United States.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:30 P.M. Respectfully submitted,
Donley T. Studlar
Executive Secretary
September 8, 2004

Results of Elections for the BPG Executive Committee

Karen Beckwith, College of Wooster
Samuel H. Beer, Harvard University
Sarah Childs, University of Bristol
Ian McAllister, Australian National University
Graham Wilson, University of Wisconsin-Madison

BPG ANNOUNCEMENTS

Stokes Prize - The prize goes to Kelli Moore, Dept. of PS, U. of Florida, for work on her Ph.D. dissertation, "The Effects of Civic Organizations on Ethnic Relations in England and Beyond."

Committee: Rachel Gibson, Australian National U. and U. of Salford (Chair), Terrence Casey, Rose-Hulman, and Jessica Adolino, James Madison U.

Christoph Prize - The committee has decided to recommend the awarding of the Christoph Prize to Amos Zehavi's paper, entitled "The Privatization Age? Privatization Of Service Delivery Across Policy Domains", presented at 2003 APSA. Comment: "Based upon wide ranging research, the paper is an insightful comparison of key variables at work in the privatization process in education as well as mental health, in both England and Massachusetts."

Committee: William Messmer, Drew University (Chair)
Sydney Van Morgan (SUNY-Oswego), William Field (Georgian Court College)

NEW JOURNALS OR SPECIAL ISSUES OF JOURNALS

Reflections on British Parliamentary Democracy
- A 60th Anniversary Special Issue of Parliamentary Affairs (Volume 57 Number 4, October 2004)

This special issue of Parliamentary Affairs focuses on the United Kingdom, examining the health of democracy from the perspective of the Westminster Parliament, looking at topics including the changing composition of MPs, the future of the Lords, the impact of constitutional change and the prospects for parliamentary reform in general. It brings together a variety of notable authors including a former Lord Chancellor, sitting MPs and peers, political commentators, civil servants, and distinguished academics.

This special issue also commemorates the diamond jubilee of the Hansard Society, which was founded in 1944 by Stephen King-Hall, and has published this journal since 1947. The Society was created to promote parliamentary democracy throughout the world, a theme which is reflected in the pages of Parliamentary Affairs. In part a reflection on UK parliamentary democracy over the last 60 years, the special issue is also a look ahead to the prospects for reform of the way we govern ourselves – the cardinal objective of the Hansard Society.

Table of Contents:

Lord Holme of Cheltenham Introduction
Vernon Bogdanor Constitution and the Party System in the 20th Century
David Butler Electoral Reform
Lord Irvine of Lairg QC The Human Rights Act: Principle and Practice
Dawn Oliver Constitutionalism and the Office of Lord Chancellor
Matthew Flinders MPs and Icebergs: Parliament and Delegated Governance

Lord Norton of Louth Regulating the Regulatory State
Kate Jenkins Parliament, Government and the Civil Service
Peter Riddell Prime Minister and Parliament
Peter Kellner Britain's Culture of Detachment
Theresa May Female Representation in Westminster
Donald Shell Future of the Second Chamber
Tony Wright Prospects for Parliamentary Reform
Malcolm Shaw British Parliament in International Perspective

New Journal from the International Studies Association

Foreign Policy Analysis provides a peer-reviewed outlet for the highest quality academic research into the processes, outcomes and theories of foreign policy. Reflecting the diverse, comparative and multidisciplinary nature of the field, Foreign Policy Analysis provides an open forum for research publication that enhances the communication of concepts and ideas across theoretical, methodological, geographical and disciplinary boundaries. By emphasizing accessibility of content for scholars of all perspectives and approaches in the editorial and review process, Foreign Policy Analysis serves as a source for efforts at theoretical and methodological integration and deepening the conceptual debates throughout this rich and complex research tradition.

Foreign policy analysis, as a field of study, is characterized by its actor-specific focus. The underlying, often implicit argument is that the source of international politics and change in international politics is human beings, acting individually or in groups. In the simplest terms, foreign policy analysis is the study of the process, effects, causes or outputs of foreign policy decision-making in either a comparative or case-specific manner.

Foreign Policy Analysis is distributed to all members of the International Studies Association, as well as several thousand institutional and library subscribers. As a result, the review guidelines are intended not only to insure the highest quality in the research published, but also to provide value to such a large and diverse audience. Authors are asked to insure that their articles are written to be accessible to all researchers in international studies. Submissions are open to all and all submissions will be evaluated on the quality of their content with the additional consideration of broad accessibility. Electronic submissions are preferred.

Current details are available at <http://fpa.tamu.edu>

Special Offer: GOVERNMENT AND OPPOSITION: An International Journal of Comparative Politics

From: Warne Verity
[Verity.Warne@oxon.blackwellpublishing.com]

Below are some instructions for accessing a free 30 day online trial to Government and Opposition.

FREE ONLINE ACCESS FOR 30 DAYS

Government and Opposition has been a leading international journal of comparative politics for over 30 years. *Government and Opposition's* interests include:

- * developments in the theory and practice of democracy, including significant elections
- * the evolution of political parties and the consequences of the political challenges for governments and oppositions
- * the governance of the global economy and the implications of interdependence
- * worldwide politics, including the politics of the European Union
- * major issues of public policy, especially from a comparative perspective
- * theoretical and ethical dimensions of political issues and policy.

How to activate your FREE ONLINE TRIAL to *Government and Opposition*:

To read article abstracts and order a copy of Reflections on British Parliamentary Democracy please visit the website and click on the banner advertisement for this special issue at: www.pa.oupjournals.org

Step 1: Go to www.blackwell-synergy.com to set up your trial access before 31st December 2004.

Step 2: Click on Register at the top of the page and complete the form. Make a note of your Username and Password for future use

Step 3: Click on the My Synergy tab at the top of the screen, then click on the Access tab.

Step 4: Enter the following code in the Access Token field exactly as it appears here:

G&O Trial 2004

Step 5: Click on Continue

Step 6: You now have full access to the articles in *Government and Opposition* for 30 days

Next time you want to read articles in **Government and Opposition** simply go to www.blackwell-synergy.com Enter your user name and password and then click Login

If you have any problems accessing your free trial please contact e-help@blackwellpublishing.com quoting your username

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT ONE

Obituary – [Although Paul Foot was never a BPG member, many of us knew him and/or his work. To the bibliography that Zig mentions below, I would add these: *Ireland: Why Britain must get out* (1960), *Immigration and Race in British Politics* (1965), *Enoch Powell's Attitude to Immigration and Race* (1969), which was also published as *The Rise of Enoch Powell: An Examination of Enoch Powell's Attitude to Immigration and Race*, *The Politics of Harold Wilson* (1968). His writings on race were particularly influential, at least among academics. The Editor]

Paul Foot - Paul Foot was an outstanding journalist, noted for his incisive intellect, and a dedicated campaigner for justice and socialism. He will be remembered most for his crusades on behalf of those he felt were the victims of miscarriages of justice and state oppression. His campaigns on behalf of James Hanratty, Helen Smith, Carl Bridgewater, Helen Morrell and Colin Wallace bear witness to his huge efforts to remedy such injustices. The books he wrote as part of these campaigns were powerful polemics: notable among these were *Who Killed Hanratty* (1971), *The Helen Smith Story* (1963), *Murder at the Farm: Who Killed Carl Bridgewater* (1986) and *Who Framed Colin Wallace* (1989).

Paul Foot was also a vigorous campaigner for Socialism, as shown by his long association with the *Socialist Worker*, of which he was editor from 1974 to 1975. He wrote widely for many newspapers as an investigative journalist, most notably the *Daily Mirror*, but also for the *Daily Record*, the *Sun*, the *Sunday Telegraph* and *Private Eye*. In 2000 he was named in the *What the Papers Say Awards* as *Journalist of the Decade*.

Less well known but no less significant was his interest in immigration and ethnic relations. His excellent Penguin publication, *Immigration and Race in British Politics* (1965), which focused on the Smethwick campaigns in the general election of 1964, was the first significant book on 'race' and politics. This book and his subsequent work *The Rise of Enoch Powell* (1969) inspired a generation of younger scholars. More recently, it was exciting to debate with him the rise and fall of Pauline Hanson on the Australian equivalent of the *Today* programme.

Paul Foot's last book, *The Vote*, on the struggle for universal suffrage, will be published by Penguin in February 2005. Zig Layton-Henry

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT TWO

Peter Bluff, who went into television 30 years ago from Strathclyde, is available to give a talk to American students spending study time in London on *The Changing World of Political Television: A View from the Cutting Room Floor*.

After working in British TV he joined The MacNeil-Lehrer Report at PBS eventually returning to Channel 4 News and now produces European and Middle East programmes from a CBS London base with a beat that runs from Belfast to Baghdad. Contact via pjb@cbsnewsRR.com.

(Thanks to Richard Rose for this information. Richard said that Bluff does not want a fee for his talk.)

FROM THE BPG-LIST SERVE

Call for Papers -2005 British Politics Group Panels at the APSA Annual Meeting

The BPG deadline for submitting proposals for talks, papers, panels and roundtables is December 1, 2004 (note that this is slightly later than the deadline for submitting proposals for APSA sections). Panel topics are not set in advance; proposals on all aspects of British politics, including research that considers Britain comparatively, are welcome. Note that with panel proposals, the organizer may choose to accept individual paper without accepting the entire panel.

Send proposals and inquiries to the 2005 BPG Program

Organizer: Terry J. Royed
Department of Political Science,
University of Alabama
Box 870213,
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487-0213, USA
Phone: 205-348-3801
Fax: 205-348-5248

E-mail proposals encouraged. Every effort will be made to acknowledge proposals within three weeks of receipt.

CALL FOR PAPERS Conference on Migration, religion and secularism: A comparative approach (Europe and North America) Paris, June 17 -18, 2005, University of Paris 1 * Sorbonne and Ecole Normale Supérieure

The University of Paris 1 * Sorbonne and the Ecole Normale Supérieure are presently pursuing a comparative study on the impact of 'new' migration on the 'old' models and practices of secularization in Europe and North America. The project will end with a conference in Paris, on June 17 * 18, 2005 on the Centennial of the French Law of 1905 instituting the separation of the Church and State.

Over the last two centuries, a general process of secularization marked the West and beyond. This process produced a certain separation between the State and religion, pushing the latter into a private or "social" sphere, distinct from public affairs. Yet the

principle of separation took on different forms: the “separation of the Church and State” in France, German “secularization,” American “civil religion,” which are strongly embedded in nations’ identities. Today, these forms are increasingly challenged, in their daily practices if not in their theoretical foundations, by other models of religious practices and conduct.

What are those models and how do they differ in the way they set up the relationship between the State, religious groups and the individual? How do national “models” and practices interact, when the need arises, with the religious or cultural claims of new citizens? These questions are not only relevant for the engagement with the large Muslim communities that have developed in almost all western countries, but also for new Catholic populations in the United States, and Jews and Buddhists in Europe.

In addition to an analysis of the current situation, the study of past practices seems important. For example, a re-examination of the place given to Jewish and Christian immigrants before the Second World War - in Europe and in North America * in order to compare their cases to the contemporary situation of “Latinos” in the United States and Russian Jews in Germany. How did ‘old’ countries of immigration manage to integrate new religions and identities in the past? What can be learned from the implementation of secularization models in former colonies, for example, Algeria in the case of France?

Finally, an investigation into the different traditions and practices concerning the relationship of State and religion in the migrants’ home countries (Morocco, Turkey, Mexico, or Senegal for example) is relevant.

The conference is organized by Jean-Claude Monod (CNRS-Ecole Normale Supérieure) and Patrick Weil (CNRS-University of Paris 1-Sorbonne) with Nilufer Gole (EHESS), Baptiste Coulmont (University of Paris 8) and Romain Garbaye (University of Paris 4). It will be a workshop format, with papers distributed in advance. Sessions will begin with brief presentations by the papers’ authors and will focus on discussion. A selection of papers from each panel will also be prepared for publication.

For the conference, we invite paper proposals in English or French from scholars of all disciplines. Proposals should include a title, 1-2 page description of the proposed paper, and a curriculum vitae. We request one printed copy of all materials to be sent to one of the postal addresses below and an email attachment containing your materials to the following email address: secularization@hotmail.com

. The deadline for the material is December 1, 2004.

CALL FOR PAPERS: Centre for Contemporary British History, Institute of Historical Research, University of London, UK

Summer Conference 29 June – 1 July 2005, University of London, Senate House, University of London, Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HU

The theme of the 2005 conference will be the history of the media in Britain during the twentieth century. The proliferation and growing popularity of mass media forms has had a profound effect on political, economic, social and cultural activity over the past hundred years. Historians of all kinds have been forced to consider the impact of the media on their field of study; many have used the media as a source of evidence or illustration. Despite impinging on a wide variety of research topics, however, media institutions, texts and consumption have often escaped rigorous historical analysis. Many assumptions about the content and ‘influence’ of the media are rarely subjected to proper scrutiny. Although the discipline of media studies has boomed in recent decades, its practitioners are often reluctant to provide a historical dimension to their work, and the research of historians in the area is fragmented and diffuse. This conference aims to bring together those interested in the history of the media in order to assess the significance of the changes of the past century. We welcome offers of papers from all disciplinary perspectives on the history of all media forms in Britain, including newspapers, magazines, radio and television broadcasting, films, recorded music, the internet and digital media. Suggestions for topics include:

- The changing patterns of media ownership and control
- The institutions and cultures of media production
- The impact of technological innovation
- The influence of advertising
- The role of public service broadcasting
- Forms of media regulation and censorship
- The media and the state
- The changing patterns of media content
- The coverage of politics
- The treatment of class, gender, race, ethnic and age differences
- The portrayal of Britain’s relationship with the wider world
- ‘Permissiveness’: changing attitudes to sex and violence
- Privacy and intrusion
- History in the media
- The changing patterns of media consumption
- Mobilising audiences: the effectiveness of media crusades
- Public perceptions of the media and its producers
- Methodology: using the media as a historical source

The conference will consist of plenary sessions on broad themes concerning the history of the media, plus a range of shorter papers (c. 20 minutes) on specific aspects of the topic. Offers of papers should be sent by 10 January 2005 to Dr Adrian Bingham, Centre for Contemporary British History, Institute of Historical Research, University of London, Senate House, London, WC1E 7HU, adrian.bingham@sas.ac.uk They should preferably be sent by email attachment.

SILVER FOR BRITISH POLITICAL SCIENCE: NEW GLOBAL RANKING OF POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENTS

Political Studies Review, September 2004
(Forwarded by Joel Wolfe)

British political science is rated number two in the world according to new research published in the latest issue of Political Studies Review. The research, conducted by Simon Hix of the LSE, involves the creation of an entirely new method for ranking departments in the political science field.

Rankings of academic institutions are key information tools for universities, funding agencies, students and staff. According to Hix the main method currently used for ranking departments in political science - peer evaluation - is subjective, biased towards established institutions and costly in terms of time and money.

Hix offers an alternative method, based on the more 'objective' measures of outputs in scientific journals. In his paper, he proposes a ranking methodology based on the quantity and impact of publications in the main political science journals in a given five-year period.

The implementation of this system necessarily involves controversial decisions about defining the "main" political science journals. Using data from the Social Science Citation Index, Hix compiled a list of 63 'top' journals based on criteria including the level of impact on the political science discipline.

The result is a series of global and easily updatable rankings that compare well with results produced by applying a similar method in economics.

Although global, the US dominates the rankings: the table of top political science departments in 1998–2002 includes just one department outside the US in the top 10 and 14 in the top 50. Columbia, Harvard and Stanford dominate the top 3 positions throughout the 10-year period studied. But, UK departments at Birmingham, Cambridge, Essex, LSE and Oxford also feature prominently putting Britain in the 'silver medal position' in the worldwide rankings.

OTHER CALLS FOR PAPERS OR PARTICIPANTS

Call for Papers/Abstracts/Submissions

4th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences June 13 - 16, 2005, Waikiki Beach Marriott Hotel, Honolulu Hawaii, USA

Submission Deadline: February 1, 2005

Sponsored by:

East West Council for Education

Asia-Pacific Research Institute of Peking University

University of Louisville - Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods

Web address: <http://www.hicsocial.org>

Email address: social@hicsocial.org

Topic Areas (All Areas of Social Sciences are invited):

*Anthropology, *Area Studies (African, American, Asian, European, Hispanic, Islamic, Jewish, Middle Eastern, Russian, Women's and all other cultural and ethnic studies), *Communication, *Economics, *Education, *Energy Alternatives, *Ethnic Studies/International Studies, *Geography, *History, *International Relations, *Journalism, *New Urbanism, *Political Science, *Preservation and Green Urbanism, *Psychology, *Public Administration, *Sociology, *Sustainable Development, *Urban and Regional Planning, *Women's studies, *Other Areas of Social Science, *Cross-disciplinary areas of the above related to each other or other areas

The Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences encourages the following types of papers/abstracts/submissions for any of the listed areas:

Research Papers - Completed papers.

Abstracts - Abstracts of completed or proposed research.

Student Papers - Research by students.

Work-in-Progress Reports or Proposals for future projects.

Reports on issues related to teaching.

For more information about submissions see: http://www.hicsocial.org/cfp_ss.htm

www.hicsocial.org/cfp_ss.htm

Format of Presentations:

-Paper sessions will have three to four papers presented in each 90 minute session, giving each presenter 20–30 minutes.

-Workshop presentations will be given a full 90 minute session.

-Panel sessions will provide an opportunity for three or more presenters to speak in a more open and conversational setting with conference attendees.

Submissions for these 90 minute sessions should include the name, department, affiliation, and email address of each panelist in addition to a description of the presentation and the title page.

-Poster sessions will last 90 minutes and consist of a large number of presenters. Poster sessions allow attendees to speak with the presenters on a one-to-one basis.

Submitting a Proposal:

1. Create a title page for your submission. The title page should include:

- a. title of the submission
- b. topic area of the submission (chooses from above list)
- c. presentation format (choose from above list)
- d. name(s) of the author(s)
- e. department(s) and affiliation(s)
- f. mailing address(es)
- g. e-mail address(es)
- h. phone number(s)
- i. fax number(s)
- j. corresponding author if different than lead author

2. Email your abstract and/or paper, along with a title page, to social@hicsocial.org

Receipt of submissions will be acknowledged via email within 48 hours. If you do not wish to email your submission, you may send it via regular mail or fax to:

Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences
P.O. Box 75023
Honolulu, HI, 96836, USA
808-947-2420 (Fax)

If submitting via regular mail, please supply two copies of your submission

There is a limit of two contributed submissions per lead author.

3. Submissions will only be published in the conference proceedings if at least one of the authors registers and attends the conference. More information will be provided upon acceptance.

4. If you wish to be a session chair, please e-mail your request to social@hicsocial.org and indicate the topic area in which you are interested. Registration for the conference is required to be a session chair.

Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences
P.O. Box 75023
Honolulu, HI 96836 USA
Telephone: (808) 946-9932
Fax: (808) 947-2420
E-mail: social@hicsocial.org
Website: www.hicsocial.org

ABSTRACTS

A. From the Chronicle of Higher Education (11/11/04)

National Institute Economic Review, "Academic salaries in the U.K. and the U.S."

British colleges find it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain faculty and staff members, in part because the pay is better for similar jobs in the United States or outside of academe, says Philip Andrew Stevens, a senior research officer at the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, in England, which produces the journal.

"There is a strong pay incentive for academics to migrate from the U.K. to the U.S.," he writes because American academic workers earn more than their British colleagues at all ages. And, in fact, more than a third of academic workers who leave Britain for jobs at colleges elsewhere move to the United States.

But based on his analysis of data from official British and American work-force surveys, Mr. Stevens argues that faculty and staff members on both sides of the Atlantic could earn more if they took jobs outside of academe, particularly during the early and middle parts of their careers.

That means British academic workers don't have to look overseas for higher pay, he says. They "would be better off," he writes, "choosing nonacademic careers in the U.K., than academic careers in the U.S."

B. American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, September 2004

(All abstracts are by the authors of the papers.)

Pippa Norris & John Curtice, "If You Build a Political Website Will They Come? The Supply and Demand Model of New Technology, Social Capital, and Civic Engagement in Britain." The core issue for this study concerns the social and political consequences of the rise of knowledge societies, in particular the capacity of the Internet for strengthening democratic participation, social capital, and civic engagement in Britain. To consider these issues, Part I summarizes debates about the impact of the Internet on the public sphere. The main influence of this development, it is theorized in a market model, will be determined by the 'supply' and 'demand' for electronic information and communications about government and politics. Demand, in turn, is assumed to be heavily dependent upon the social characteristics of Internet users and their prior habitual political orientations. Given this understanding, the study predicts that the primary impact of knowledge societies in democratic societies will be upon facilitating cause-oriented and civic forms of political activism, thereby strengthening social movements, voluntary associations, and interest groups, more than upon conventional channels of political participation, exemplified by voting, parties, and election campaigns. Part II summarizes the sources of data and the key measures of political activism used in this study, drawing upon the British Social Attitudes Survey, 2003. Part III examines the evidence for the relationship between use of the Internet and indicators of civic engagement. The conclusion in Part IV summarizes the results and considers the broader implications for governance, society, and democracy.

Patricia Sykes, “Toward a More Competitive Two-Party System? Party Governance in the US and the UK.” Since the founding of the APSA, political scientists have tended to lament the weakness of US political parties and envy the strength of British parties. That comparative perspective on American politics has overlooked a positive attribute of the US system - the vitality of two-party competition - and failed to detect a weakness of the British system - single-party dominance. In this paper, I briefly review why and how the British experience has guided the study of parties in the US and then sketch the history of party governance in the two countries. Comparisons between the US and the UK show that a single party has frequently controlled the British government without a viable official opposition for extended periods of time, especially in the past thirty years. By contrast, in the same period, the US two-party system has grown more competitive. Historically, US political parties have appeared weak and fragmented, but today the two-party system in the US is stronger and more competitive than in the UK. This paper adopts a comparative perspective that suggests we should think less about ways to make US parties more closely resemble their British counterparts and more about the need for reform in the UK.

Stuart Macdonald, George Rabinowitz & Ola Listhaug, “Issue Voting in a Responsible Party System,” This paper investigates issue voting in Britain from 1974 through 2001. We find that British voters tend to vote according to the directional rather than the proximity model. There is little evidence to support the view that voters in systems where discounting makes little sense vote differently from voters in systems where discounting would be rational.

Oleg Kodolov, “Deriving Theoretical Approach to British Territorial Politics: 1979-1999 Fiscal Policies in Scotland and Wales in a Broader Context,” The paper deals with deriving an appropriate theoretical approach to central government fiscal policy making towards territorial units. Using the example of 1979-1999 fiscal policy making in the United Kingdom, the paper attempts to establish a model for fiscal analysis of centre-periphery relations which is time- and place-specific yet flexible to modify it to the specific governmental arrangements and political realities of other nations. Using elements of structural and public choice approaches, the paper asserts that academic conclusions on fiscal allocations should focus on the central government interests rather than mainly or exclusively on territorial demands. In the British context in the period discussed, the priorities of a Prime-Minister-Chancellor ‘axis’ are determined to be closest to the

priorities of the central government at large, while the continuously shifting ordering of government priorities is determined to be based on some specific features of public policies, such as the policy’s relevance to the government support groups, the policy’s electoral and political visibility, the policy’s convenience for the central government and the ideas and individuals pursuing those ideas present in a specific public policy area. The paper has substantial theoretical significance in that it goes beyond evaluation of specific fiscal arrangements to discern the factors most relevant to the analysis of public policies at large and fiscal policies in particular.

Jessica Adolio, “Undone By the Special Relationship? The Implications of the British Government’s Support for the United States’ Iraq Policy,” Since coming to power in 1997 the Blair government has not been confronted with any serious domestic difficulties over foreign policy. Recently, however, backing the United States with respect to Iraq has left Tony Blair politically exposed—both in the eyes of the British public and within his own political party. Arguably, by deciding to so closely ally himself to the Bush administration, the Prime Minister has placed himself in some political jeopardy. In this paper I look at the Blair government’s policy towards Iraq as part of the war on terrorism. I consider the effect this policy will have on Blair’s leadership of and control over his party and the party’s electoral future. Has this provided an opportunity for Tony Blair to confirm his impressive leadership skills or will this be the one that finally gets away?

Charlie Jeffery & Daniel Wincott, “Policy Divergence and the (In)stability of the Devolution Settlement.” If it did not introduce some scope for policy divergence, what was the point of devolution to Scotland and Wales? Yet public debate around policy divergence in the UK often borders on the hysterical. Any instance of divergence is widely greeted as an intimation of crisis, perhaps for the UK state as a whole and certainly where matters of social citizenship are at issue (as is typically the case) for the UK’s Labour government. On the other hand, many groups in Scotland and Wales regard the scope for divergence as too strictly limited. Equally, the recently created office of the London Mayor has been used to highlight problems of poverty and deprivation in the midst of the UK’s wealthiest city. This paper complements the more detailed case studies of the other papers on the panel with a policy-theoretic approach to understanding the scope and limits of divergence in social policies. Lowi’s classical claim that different policy-types generate distinctive politics, suggests that this policy-focus will be highly relevant to discussion of the political prospects under devolution,

regionalisation and decentralization in the UK.

We critically review categorisations of 'policy types' and tentatively suggest a new application of this form of analysis to the devolution settlement to evaluate it in terms of the record of and prospects for the development of distinctive (social) policy profiles. Our paper connects with wider panel themes Lowi linked the now widespread claim that 'policy (re)creates politics' to variation in policy types. Building on Lowi and Majone, James Mitchell has noted that many 'distributive' and some 'regulatory' policies have been devolved, while 'redistributive' instruments are largely retained at the centre. The powers of the London Mayor also follow broad pattern, albeit with less authority and resources. Mitchell notes that 'distributive' programmes (in health, education etc) involve long-standing spending commitments, which conventional scholarly wisdom suggests are notoriously difficult to change (Lindblom, Pierson). Thus, Mitchell sees the scope for innovation by the devolved authorities being mainly in regulatory policies. We develop a variation on this theme which points in a subtly but significantly different direction. Drawing on Paul Peterson's work on US Federalism, we suggest that policy 'types' should be analysed in not a one-dimensional, but two dimensional conceptual space, defined by policy purposes and instruments respectively. Peterson sees taxing/spending and regulation as policy instruments that can be used to pursue aims of redistribution and economic development (and perhaps also 'allocation'). Of course, each instrument will have its own strengths and weaknesses for each purpose. Our hypothesis is that the greatest scope for innovation uses regulatory instruments in the pursuit of Peterson's category of developmental policies. Developmental policies take two principle forms concerning planning and incentives for business (often locational policies) and major spending programmes such as health and education (allocational policies). Contrary to Mitchell, we see considerable scope for - and indeed evidence of - innovative (revisions of) regulation of these policies in Scotland, Wales, and even to a degree in London. Perhaps particularly in the context of on-going welfare reform across the UK, the scope for divergence in the regulation of distributive policies is considerable. We analyse instances of divergence childcare and preschool education, health care, fees in higher education and residential care. Of course, the analytical distinctions developed here are not hard and fast in political practice. Thus initial divergences in regulation are likely to have fiscal implications, and sometimes sooner rather than later - a potential source of instability.

James Tilley & Anthony Heath, "Political knowledge and values in Britain." Using data from the British Election Studies this article examines how differing levels of

political knowledge affect party choice in Britain. Work in the US by Bartels has suggested that there are substantial biases in election results due to low levels of knowledge in the electorate, and the impact of demographic characteristics has been argued to be different for high and low knowledge voters. We find in Britain, as in the US, that social characteristics have more or less impact upon party identification depending on political knowledge. We also introduce measures of political values to our models to attempt to explain these differences, and find that the introduction of values reduces the majority of these demographic effect differences to zero. This reduction is partly due to the slight tendency of knowledge to strengthen the link between values and vote, but more importantly due to the fact that knowledge actually affects how group memberships predict value positions.

Patrick Sturgis, "Causes and Consequences of Core Political Values."

The notion of core political values has long been of central importance in understanding how citizens evaluate policies, parties and candidates. However, the characterisation of these higher order values as, if not immutable then highly stable, has meant little attention has been paid to the causes and consequences of shorter term fluctuations. This paper demonstrates that switching allegiance between main parties led to significant shifts in the left-right political value dimension amongst the British public during the early 1990s. I use a True Intra-individual Change (TIC) structural equation model (Steyer, Eid and Schwenkmezger 1997; Steyer, Partchev and Shanahan 2000; Steyer and Krambeer 2003) on data from the British Election Panel Survey to examine the influence of party allegiance and changes in party allegiance, on change in the left-right political values of individual voters between 1992 and 1997. Results indicate that switching allegiance from the Conservative to the Labour party between 1992 and 1994 resulted in significant and enduring shifts in left-right values in the direction of the party of defection. Some change was observed between 1992 and 1996 for those defecting from the Conservatives to the Liberal Democrats, though this group had returned to their 1992 positions by the time they were re-surveyed in 1997. Those who stuck with the Conservative Party between 1992 and 1994 had moved significantly to the right by 1996, a position they retained up to the General Election in 1997. No change was observed amongst stable Labour and Liberal Democrat voters. While the absolute magnitudes of these value shifts were not large, the fact that left-right position has itself such an over-riding influence on party popularity, means that even small shifts in this value dimension can have sizeable impacts on the popularity ratings and vote share of the main parties.

Jonathan Hopkin & Ingrid van Biezen, “Party Organization in Multilevel Contexts: Comparing the British and Spanish Cases.” This paper seeks to enhance our understanding of the ways in which decentralizing reforms influence and shape party politics at both the statewide and non-statewide level, looking at the special case of asymmetric devolution. In asymmetric devolution, statewide political parties have to adapt to the presence of new arenas of political competition at the subcentral level, but these new arenas are either not present, or not equally developed, in the whole state territory. The paper hypothesizes possible party reactions and adaptations to these circumstances, focusing on changes in party organization, interparty cooperation and interparty competition. It then goes on to assess the emerging reality of party politics under asymmetric devolution in two prominent Western European cases: Spain, where asymmetric devolution has developed over the past two decades, and the United Kingdom, where devolution has been established more recently. This comparative analysis illustrates the organizational strains that asymmetric devolution creates for political parties, and assesses its impact on party competition and government formation at the statewide level.

Selma Sonntag, “Hegemony and Resistance: Linguistic Globalization in the Early 20th Century,” This paper examines linguistic and cultural hegemony and resistance during the period of globalization at the beginning of the 20th century. The premise is that such an examination can broaden our conceptualization of contemporary linguistic and cultural globalization: Were the cultural implications of the earlier period of globalization fundamentally different from or nearly the same as those of today’s globalization?

The paper first identifies the nature of cultural hegemony in the early 20th century. Ranajit Guha, one of the founders of Subaltern Studies, has argued that British colonial rule in India exemplified cultural domination rather than hegemony. The British never penetrated the Indian cultural zone of autonomy, as Partha Chatterjee has put it. Yet by the nineteen-teens, Mahatma Gandhi was clearly concerned that a preference for the English language was widespread amongst Indian nationalists. Gandhi’s admonition against British linguistic hegemony was, however, constrained by the local language politics of North India. The renown historians, John Gallagher and Ronald Robinson, have suggested in their seminal studies of imperialism that resistance to colonial rule is patterned according to local culture and environment rather than to imperial practices. Similarly, cultural and linguistic imperialist patterns may well be determined by local politics in the

metropole. By comparing resistance to differing linguistic policies and practices in the early 20th century, the paper weighs the importance of the local and global contexts of cultural hegemony and resistance. For purposes of comparison, the focus of the paper will be on the English language in British India and French linguistic hegemony during the same period of rapid economic globalization and liberalization in the early 20th century.

The paper concludes with a longitudinal comparison of this early era of globalization with linguistic globalization of today, the latter outlined in my recent book, *The Local Politics of Global English: Case Studies in Linguistic Globalization* (Lexington, November 2003).

Rachel Gibson, Wainer Lusoli & Stephen Ward, “Phile or Phobe? Australian and British MPs and the New Communication Technology.” This paper compares the adoption of new information and communication technologies (ICTs) by Australian and UK legislators, with a view toward how this may affect styles of representation and roles of the MPs in the two polities. In particular we provide an overall picture of the scope of current activity in each country in terms of website adoption, and whether this is accelerating over time. In addition we profile the basic functions that legislators are using their websites for and what differences, if any, emerge in approach across the two systems. Finally, we examine factors at the individual, organisational and systemic level that might help explain the variance in rates and levels of uptake of the new technology. In addressing these issues we build on the extant literature that has examined the individual and organisational factors that have influenced candidates and parties adoption of ICTs in the UK and Australia as well as a range of other countries. In addition, the paper comparatively extends to Australia our recent benchmarking work on British MPs’ use of the Internet, which helps illuminate the macro and institutional-level factors influencing the diffusion of ICTs among elected representatives. We are thus able to examine larger questions about the extent to which national traits are determinative of political and particularly representational uses of the Web, over and above micro- and meso-level factors as well as of course, the imperatives of the technology itself. Finally, we can begin to start to look more broadly at what the new ICTs can offer to traditional models of representation in rapidly changing advanced industrial democracies.

Gita Subrahmanyam, “Schizophrenic Governance and Fostering Global Inequalities in the British Empire: The UK Domestic State Versus the Indian and African Colonies, 1890-1960.” It has long been acknowledged that the British Empire played a role in fostering

global inequalities. However, the extent to which the Empire was characterised by deeply contrasting administrative arrangements and developmental goals between the domestic state and the non-white colonies has not been fully explored. In this paper, I analyse institutional structures and budgetary data pertaining to the UK, India and three African colonies (Nigeria, Kenya and Tanganyika) between 1890 and 1960. The results of the analysis highlight a few major trends. First, while UK domestic politics became more inclusive over the seventy years, with new groups being granted full citizenship rights, in Britain's non-white colonies political participation rights remained restrictive until very late in the period. This was especially the case in British Africa, where the basis of Crown rule was autocracy rather than representative government and where Africans were excluded from substantive participation in central government bodies until the 1950s. Africans were not adequately prepared for self-government and independence, which affected their country's global position post-independence. Second, whereas in the UK government spending on welfare expanded substantially between 1890 and 1960, in Britain's Indian and African colonies public outlays on social development were both non-growing and scant relative to other programmes of the state. Until after the Second World War, Indian and African public expenditures were concentrated in the agencies of control – that is, military, law and order, general administration, and transportation infrastructure. The British contention of having developed the colonies beyond the military and commercial requirements demanded of any imperial power appears unsupported by the budget analysis. Because the British Empire pursued schizophrenic goals – one set for the domestic arena and another for the non-white colonies – it fostered inequalities between the two sectors during the colonial era. The legacy of those policies has extended beyond the Empire itself.

Patrick Fournier, “Who Can Be Persuaded to Reverse Their Opinions?” This study examines the individual determinants of attitude change. The analysis relies upon panel survey data from the British, Canadian, and National Election Studies. An extensive list of potential individual determinants of political persuasion is considered: opinion strength, ambivalence, inconsistency, indifference, issue importance, political sophistication, need to evaluate, and need for cognition.

Nicole Richardt, “What Difference Can the European Union Make? Gender Equality Policies in the United Kingdom and Germany Compared.” The subject of the paper – European gender equality policy and its implementation in the United Kingdom and Germany –

provides a window on social policy making at the interface between EU and domestic politics. The paper examines the evolution of EU social policy in regard to gender equality in the labor market and analyzes how the British and German governments have implemented EU directives and EU guidelines of the European Employment Strategy into national legislation. The central question of the paper is twofold: How are policy input (EU directives and EU guidelines) and policy output (national legislation) linked differently in the UK and Germany? Under what conditions can welfare state resistance and resilience to reform be overcome in the traditional and new community methods? To explain variation in policy change through EU law the paper focuses on institutional and cognitive veto points and domestic actor strategies evolving around them. To achieve significant policy change through EU resources, i.e. change that does not leave domestic legislation predominantly intact, domestic political actor mobilization evolving around institutional veto points of the EU legal system or new cognitive veto points of the open method of co-ordination (OMC) are essential.

Kensuke Takayasu, “The Two-Level Games Prime Ministers Play – A Principal Agent Perspective in Comparative Core Executive Studies.” After World War II it was believed that Japan carried out various reforms to create ‘clear lines of responsibility’ for its governing structures, which were based on the British model of a parliamentary cabinet system. A strong prime minister (against other actors) was expected under this system. This paper argues that parliamentary cabinet systems, even in Britain, do not always end up with strong prime ministers. Resorting to the principal-agent theory, this paper explores the impact of the governing party as principal of the prime minister as its agent in Britain and Japan. A conventional principal-agent perspective has often focused on political leaders as the principal of government bureaucracy in policy-making. This paper draws attention to another significant principal-agent relationship, in which the prime minister is regarded as the agent of the governing party. By so doing it distinguishes the two games prime ministers are involved in – office-keeping and policy-making – and reveals how the office-keeping game affects the prime minister's behaviour and policy preferences in the policy-making game. This paper looks into two cases from the 1970s, in which the exercise of prime-ministerial power was restrained in both Britain and Japan. Power resources deployable in the executive and a single-party government are not sufficient conditions for a strong prime minister in the policy-making game. When the governing party is divided and ways exist to materialise this division, prime-ministerial power is likely to be strongly constrained.

Devashree Gupta, “Encouraging the Moderates, Enabling the Militants: Selective Engagement in British Responses to Irish Nationalism,” How do governments respond to movements that contain multiple, competing factions, each with their own claims and demands? This paper explores how governments use selective engagement as a response to movement pressures, certifying some movement groups as legitimate and acceptable bargaining partners while sidelining or repressing others. These choices, however, impact not only the prospects for successful negotiations in the near future, but also the movement’s internal balance of power and long-term development. By targeting some groups for action and not others, the government creates an uneven political opportunity structure for the movement, which forces organizations to adapt by pursuing different strategies to build support and influence. These differences in strategy, in turn, alter the choice of potential bargaining partner for governments at later phases of contention.

Alan Zuckerman, Jennifer Fitzgerald & Josip Dasovir, “The Social Logix of Bounded Partisanship among Young Persons: Dynamic Patterns in British and German Households.” In already completed papers (Zuckerman, Dasovir, Fitzgerald, and Brynin 2002 and Zuckerman, Fitzgerald and Dasovir 2002), we show that partisanship is bounded—most everyone never supports one or the other of the major parties prefers its main rival at varying rates. Decisions about partisanship reflect the logic of appropriate behavior, which is torn between processes of social conformity and individualization, and the principles of out-group homogeneity. In this paper, we demonstrate that those who are just entering the electorate also display the characteristics of bounded partisanship. As would follow from studies of social networks and political socialization, the partisan preferences of their parents strongly influence the characteristics of bounded partisanship among the young. As would follow from the logic of appropriate behavior, young persons do not automatically and routinely follow the partisan examples of their parents. For them too, political interest and reinforcing social contexts facilitate the recognition of appropriate behavior. At the same time, our analysis provides very little evidence of young persons taking partisan stances that depart from those of their parents. In the established democracies of Britain and Germany the partisanship of the young tends to follow that of their parents.

Daniel Wincott, “Transformed Risks and Inherited Welfare Regimes: ‘Worlds of Early Education and Childcare and the ‘Territorialisation’ of Welfare Policies.” If deep changes in gender roles and a linked

demographic shift are transforming social risks, can we expect existing ‘worlds’ of early childhood education and care (ECEC) policy to remain robust, even as they experience change? Changes in gender roles and feminism undoubtedly play an important part in the development of ECEC policies in this period. Yet in many cases feminist political activism seems to have changed the context for policy while playing only a limited direct role in the origins of early education and childcare policies. The facilitation of female employment was often a crucial proximate cause, but policy change probably owed as much to state concerns with managing labour market as to women’s liberation. Equally, growing medically and sociologically generated ‘expert’ evidence concerning child development is generating some pressure for ECEC and particularly improving the quality of early care and education. This evidence also has implications for social justice, as it indicates that early experiences have a huge impact on later life chances (in terms of education, health, employment and so on). This paper concentrates on the British and French cases, although they are placed in a broad comparative and theoretical context. The accent is placed on the intersection of territoriality and welfare.

In general, neither case fits neatly into established welfare regime clusters. Although often regarded as the leading ‘liberal’ regime in Europe, the UK’s historical record is much more mixed. It includes one of the most deeply entrenched and popular universal health-care systems. Into the 1960s UK social policy shared a mix of social democratic and liberal principles with Nordic welfare provision—in both places liberalism militated against state intervention in family life (outside exceptional war-time provision). In the 1960s, these paths diverged, with Britain nearly uniquely failing to develop any significant policy in this area. Since 1998, in apparently unfavourable circumstances, ‘early-years’ policies have developed rapidly. A ‘New Labour’ government often disparaged as the continuation of Thatcherism by other means, initiated a remarkable growth of EYCP, despite the ‘hard times’ of ‘permanent austerity’. Devolution and federalism are usually thought to retard welfare growth. But the (admittedly early) experience of ECEC policy in the UK is that devolution has allowed experimentation to increase the dynamism of policy development, with both Scotland and Wales seeming to move ahead of, and perhaps drag forward, the more fragmented English policy. Family policies famously distinguish French welfare from other ‘conservative’ regimes. ECEC policy developed in two broad waves—early education in the nineteenth century and ‘care’ during the 1960s. In the latter period the expansion of childcare intersected with some ‘new left’ currents pushing for greater local control and decentralisation. More recently the

impact of 'territorialisation' of welfare policies has been widely debated, with some seeing it undercutting established social citizenship rights. Partly because of the continuing national co-ordination role of the CNAF, childcare seems to have been somewhat protected from these dynamics.

Andrew Moravcsik & Inannis Evrigenis, "Britain and the Creation of the United Nations Human Rights Regime." In this preliminary analysis of postwar British policy toward the formation of a UN human rights regime, based on recently published documents, we find strong support for "republican liberal" theory. The core of British policy—support for rhetorical commitments but not for mandatory enforcement—remained essentially unchanged from 1945 through 1953, and that position reflected a broadly acceptable compromise position within the British government—a position that incorporated the considerations central to republican liberal theory. Four empirical findings are decisive: First, decision-makers draw a fundamental distinction between rhetorical commitments and enforcement mechanisms such as compulsory jurisdiction and individual petition. Second, the British government, arguably like nearly all other Western governments, viewed human rights regimes most fundamentally as devices to stabilize emerging and potentially unstable democracies against totalitarian threats that can eventually lead to tyranny and war. Third, established democracies like Britain tended to be ambivalent or opposed to effective international enforcement, because—as republican liberal theory argues—in a strictly self-interested sense they benefit less from domestic stabilization. Britain supported such commitments to the extent they believe that strengthening neighboring democracies enhanced the "democratic peace" by reducing the number of potentially aggressive non-democracies and by bolstering alliances among democratic states—both phenomena predicted by "republican liberal" theory—but, unlike transitional democracies like France, it did not view such regimes as contributing to domestic democratic consolidation. Fourth, other complex factors at the core of existing historical analyses, such as contingency, individual political personalities, and bureaucratic politics, played a secondary or epiphenomenal role.

Jonas Hinnfors & Eric Shaw, "New Labour Britain, SAP Sweden and the two dimensions of social democracy,"

Recently, two of the strongest social democratic parties in the world, the British Labour Party and the Swedish Social Democratic Party (SAP) have taken puzzlingly different policy trajectories. Far from narrowing—as a consequence

of imperative structural conditions, predicted by a number of theorists—the institutional configuration of their welfare regimes has widened. Nor have the trajectories followed the institutional logics of divergence that would be projected by historical institutionalist scholars.

In order to map welfare policy we introduce two dimensions: the 'quantitative' and the 'qualitative' dimension of social democracy. 'Quantitatively' (distribution of life-chances and resources, social expenditures) there has been far less change than critics tend to hold. Policies are distinctly separate from the 'liberal' model of welfare state.

The real change in Labour's position has occurred in the character of the welfare state programmes—the 'qualitative' dimension of social democracy (aspirations for altering the ethos of social relations)—a surprisingly neglected dimension.

In SAP changes have been far less deep. Non-municipal schools and private care-sector sub-contractor may form growing parts of the social state, but the core make-up of the welfare state is still solidly universal with public sector financing and provision.

In conclusion the two-dimensional approach provides a tool for description and enables us to pose new questions for future research. Structuralist and historical institutionalist accounts are too deterministic. There does not seem to be an overall neo-liberal logic. The construction of political problems and possibilities is laden with agency, which calls for further research.

BOOK REVIEWS

Errata – *In the last edition, the review essay that addressed political/media relations in Britain, inadvertently identified Bernard Donoghue as a Number Ten press secretary. His position was director of the policy planning unit in the Wilson government.*

Michael Foley, *John Major, Tony Blair and a Conflict of Leadership: Collision Course* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University, dist. in U.S. by Palgrave, 2002), xi & 212 pp., Index, Cl. \$74.95, Pb. \$32.95.

This book explores political leadership in the post-Thatcher period. Michael Foley begins his research by noting that the British have historically had an ambivalent attitude toward political power being centralized in the hands of a single person, that is, the prime minister. The traditional perspective is that the "prime minister has a minimalist position within the machinery of government" (p. 3). Since the time of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, however, the British

polity has been characterized by a style of leadership that many have called “presidential.” Specifically, political power has consistently gravitated toward the prime minister who now makes most of the key policy decisions without the input of cabinet colleagues. Foley notes, “Even in a period of peacetime, Thatcher managed to exert an extraordinary level of influence within cabinet, across Whitehall and in the country as a whole” (p. 4). This trend has continued in the Blair years. Similar to scholars who studied the American presidency in the 1970s, British political scientists are now describing the troubling trend of executive centralization and personalization in their political system.

To study this topic in the British context, Foley focuses on the leadership styles of John Major and Tony Blair. Throughout his book, the author explores how Major and Blair took control of their political parties and how they contested various general elections. There is some focus on how prime ministers govern, too. “The aim,” he states, “is to elicit the operational dimensions of leadership confrontation and to clarify the methods, strategies and protocols of leaders seeking to displace one another in terms of public and professional esteem” (p. 6). While Thatcher is not the central focus, she is not far from the story. For instance, Foley describes how John Major’s leadership approach differed from the one established by his predecessor. During Thatcher’s time, she disregarded the cabinet and made judgments based on ideological factors. Major had a more cooperative style and shunned the use of ideology to guide his decisions. Nonetheless, during his election bids of 1992 and 1997, Major adopted one aspect of Thatcher’s leadership approach: he personalized his premiership by making himself the central focus of the party’s election strategy. As for Blair, he adopted a more Thatcherite style by disregarding the cabinet and centralizing power in No. 10 Downing Street. He also became the central feature of the Labour Party’s election strategy. But Blair did not solely follow Thatcher’s model; he also had other factors influencing his approach. That is, Blair was building on Neil Kinnock’s approach, which also focused on centralized control in the hands of the party leader.

This book is useful for undergraduate courses dealing with British politics. For general audiences, this work offers a plethora of information about the recent histories of the Tory and Labour parties, with specific attention paid to party leadership contests in the 1990s. There is also useful information for undergraduates concerning the 1992 and 1997 general elections. The main limitation of Foley’s book is that there seems to be little attention paid to the general leadership literature. The reader is left with a feeling that more scholarship needs to be presented and discussed. Overall, however, this book offers a useful look at leadership in the context of contemporary British politics. *Scott Cole, Longwood University*

Neal Ascherson, *Stone Voices: The Search for Scotland* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2002), viii & 326 pp., Index, Bibliography, Pb. \$14.00

Stone Voices is a work of cultural history that explores Scottish national identity and the multifaceted meanings of Scotland itself. From the ancient standing stones to the return of the Stone of Destiny, Ascherson looks at the hybrid formation of Scottish identity and, treating the land as a cultural artifact, seeks to understand what Scotland has meant to its inhabitants throughout history. Comparing the country to a work of art, Ascherson acknowledges that art historians are generally concerned with when, where, and why a work of art was created. Quoting Francis Haskell, Ascherson points out: “But once the picture is completed, the historian loses interest. What it may have meant to the man who ordered and paid for it, or to the artist’s contemporaries and successors, to the critics and historians of the time or later – all this tends to be neglected.” (p. 9)

In a sweeping exploration of Scottish history, Ascherson brilliantly elucidates the myths of Scotland’s past and seeks to establish why these myths became crucial features of Scottish identity. He discusses the Picts and the myths of extermination, the hybrid formation of the early medieval Scottish kingdom from a culturally heterogeneous region, and the Wars of Independence and persistence of the Bruce and Wallace national mythos. Ascherson engages with the ongoing debate as to the existence and nature of “primordial” nationalism in Scotland during the Fourteenth Century and raises poignant questions regarding the Declaration of Arbroath and whether or not it truly represents an early expression of proto-nationalism.

Ascherson’s study deals with other important elements of Scottish national identity. He explores the Covenanters and assesses their relevance to the hybrid creation of Scottish identity. He is critical of the Calvinist tradition and somewhat skeptical as to the influence of the Scottish Enlightenment in the formation of national identity.

Though much of Ascherson’s discussion centers on these fairly common themes in Scottish history, his extensive examination of the Scottish Diaspora is particularly intriguing. Assessing the extent and range of the Diaspora, Ascherson reveals a great deal concerning the migration and settlement patterns of Scots to Poland, Asia, and North America. In particular, he dismisses the Thatcher’s comments in a May 1988 speech to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in which she claimed “Scots invented Thatcherism long before I was heard of.” (p. 238) Ascherson’s refutes, with sound evidence, Thatcher’s connection between rugged individualism and Scottish entrepreneurial emigration. According to Ascherson, Scottish emigrants traveled and worked within intricate and truly global family networks – many of which originated in

small towns in Scotland. Ascherson's conclusions regarding the collective rather than individualistic nature of the Scottish Diaspora were particularly compelling and fascinating.

A reader expecting a straightforward chronological survey of Scottish history, however, will be disappointed.

Ascherson takes the reader from the Picts to the re-establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 2000 and back again. His work includes an insightful and entertaining account of a bus tour that preceded the referendum for the Scottish Parliament. Furthermore, Ascherson acknowledges the drive for democracy in Scotland, through devolution, Nationalist agitation, and into the future with an interesting discussion of e-democracy in the new Scottish Parliament.

Overall, *Stone Voices* is a work of brilliant scholarship and outstanding writing yet that is to be expected from a scholar and journalist of Ascherson's caliber. What is unique about this work is that for the first time, the author has turned his talents and insightful analysis to his own country in a search to understand the multifaceted nature of Scottish national identity. In this, Ascherson is overwhelmingly successful. Though *Stone Voices* may lack the structure and rigor of an academic monograph, it is an exceptional work, extraordinarily well written, and highly recommended for any scholar interested in Scottish politics and national identity. *Sterling J. Harris, Indiana University Southeast*

Heather Nunn, *Thatcher, Politics and Fantasy: The Political Culture of Gender and Nation* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, distr. in U.S. by Paul & Company, Chicago, Ill., 2002), 208 pp., Bibliography, Index, Pb. \$25.00 (CAN \$32.95); Stanislaw Pugliese, ed., *The Political Legacy of Margaret Thatcher* (London: Politico's, 2003), x & 419 pp., Index, Cl. £25.00

These two books have a common topic, Margaret Thatcher, but address that topic in strikingly different ways.

The Pugliese anthology is a collection of 30 pieces segregated into six sections (Parts) plus an opening essay by Peter Riddell and a brief statement, "Reflections on Liberty" by the Baroness herself. The latter was her speech to the attendees at America's Hofstra University conference devoted to her career and its place in history. The conference was the source of the entries in this collection.

Part I, "The Intellectual and Historical Roots of Thatcherism" has essays by Leo Abse (whose opening sentence is "I fear you will find this little essay churlish."), Alan Allport, Ariana Huffington (the American columnist and political figure), Joseph S. Meisel ("Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Gladstone"), and Larry Bumgarner ("Thatcher and Reagan").

Part II, "Thatcher and Domestic Policy" contains pieces by Peter Dorey (taming of the trade unions), E. Bruce Geelhoed (the prelude to the 1987 elections), Candice Hertzner (MT's half-completed economic revolution), and Diane Windsor ("Reprivatising Britain).

Part III, "Thatcher and Foreign Policy" begins with "Bush and Thatcher" (One of the most impressive analyses in the book.) by Ryan J. Barilleaux & Mark Rozell followed by Sir Bryan Cartledge's examination of the impact of Thatcher's personality on foreign policy. Frank M. Smist, Jr. & Zachary M. Stolz comment on "Thatcher, Bush and Hussein," Dov S. Zakheim offers "The Special Relationship and the Falklands War" and David Monaghan finishes the section with "Mrs. Thatcher's War: The Rise and Fall of an Ideologue."

Part IV, "Thatcher and British Culture," widens the purview of Thatcher's impact, beginning with Diane Antonio's "Virgin Queen, Iron Lady, Queen of Hearts." Less controversial are the remaining chapters: Leonard Quart, "British Film in the Thatcher," Simon Doubleday, "Ken Loach and the Cinema of Social Conscience," Martin Durham, "The Thatcher Government and the Politics of the Family," and Charles Delheim, "More Estonian than Etonian: Mrs. Thatcher and the Jews."

Part V, "Leadership and the Monarchy" has six contributions: Wayne Hunt, "Thatcher to Blair: Different Conceptions of Political Leadership," Dennis Kavinagh, "Margaret Thatcher: A Test Case of Political Leadership," Jeremy Moon, "Margaret Thatcher and Innovative Leadership," Ben Pimlott, "Two Queens: Thatcher and the Monarchy," Stuart Prall, "Thatcher and the Monarchy," and The Rt. Hon. Brian Mulroney, "Margaret Thatcher: A Study in Strong Leadership."

The final section, Part VI, "The Thatcher Legacy," begins with a piece by Reagan's Secretary of Defense, Caspar Weinberger: "The Thatcher Years: Repudiating the Conventional Wisdom," followed by Philip Allmendinger, "Myth and Reality: The Impact and Legacy of Margaret Thatcher," Dennis Kavanagh, "New Labour as a Thatcher Legacy," Terry Wright, "How Mrs. Thatcher Saved the Labour Party (and Destroyed the Conservative Party), and Michael A. Genovese, "Margaret Thatcher: Revised, Revisited, Re-Examined, and Reappraised."

Several of these essays echo topics in Nunn's book but others outside that category warrant comment: Delheim's piece examines Thatcher's relations with the sizable number (about 15%) of Jews in her Finchley constituency, on her personal staff, and in her cabinets. He finds a understandable affinity between her position as an outsider among the Tory establishment and of Jews in Britain, as well as the 'small business' status of Jews and her father.

Meisel does not attempt a comprehensive comparison of Gladstone and Thatcher but touches upon several differences and similarities. For example, among the former were their attitudes toward cabinet colleagues; among the latter was their Victorian and generally low-church values. [One might wish the current White House incumbent would adhere to Gladstone's practice of viewing "ministers as entitled to their own opinions" and handling "disagreements with courtesy." (49)]. The brief efforts of comparison by Huffington (4pp.) and Bumgardner (10 pp.) are less impressive than Meisel's work.

Nunn's book is not as broad in scope as the Hofstra papers, but there are several common themes: Nunn employs a psychoanalytic approach to MT, as does Abse; Nunn finds MT to be a 'warrior queen' for which data may be found in Part III of the Pugliese volume [Of which, Monaghan's piece most directly parallels Nunn while the others in that section offer less ideological data.]; Nunn explores MT's policy toward the family, as does Durham, although the approaches they adopt are notably dissimilar; Antonio's chapter while following different paths address the theme to which Nunn devotes a chapter: women leaders' roles in a traditionally male-dominated society;

Professional students of British politics, i.e., most members of the British Politics Group, will find common ground in the two pieces by Dennis Kavanagh, albeit brief, and the one by Peter Riddell. Both sound themes that they have expanded upon in their larger works. Hunt's contribution also warrants praise, especially for his use of Steve Skowronek's typology of leadership patterns.

As one would expect, the entries are of mixed quality, but individual chapters will reward a reader who will spend an afternoon skipping about the book to peruse those topics about which one seeks to know something but does not wish to invest a substantial time on them.

Nunn's book begins with observations on 'image,' in this case the political kind. Her first example is widely disseminated 1988 photograph of MT protruding from the turret of a military tank – a sight that emphasized her military (and male?) strength. This reviewer recalls a similar photograph that same year of the Democratic presidential nominee Michael Dukakis – a vision that was used for ridicule in the campaign of that year. Context is everything, one might conclude.

This work casts MT as a warrior queen. In fact, the cover of this paperback has the famous statue of Queen Boedicea standing in her chariot with twin steeds rampant in front – but with Thatcher's face imposed upon that of the Queen.

A political scientist of this reviewer's generation is puzzled that a psychoanalytic study of a political leader would be undertaken with no reference to Harold Lasswell, Abraham

Maslow – or even Karen Horney, but Nunn does that. Her field is communication, not political science. She draws upon gender studies rather than political analyses.

Whether Nunn's book appeals to a reader may be determined by the reader's reaction to phrases such as, "[T]his book acknowledges political culture and its representation as part of a broader system of representation. This analysis of Thatcher works from assumptions made in recent feminine cultural analysis that the image of the 'woman' in Western society functions as both guarantee of stability and as destabilizing problem." (p. 17 with reference to J. Rose, 1986)

Throughout, Nunn examines the effort (and success) of MT playing both male (prime minister) and female (cooking for Dennis) roles, including Thatcher's exploitation of her duties as military leader (cf. George W. Bush?) and defender of the family. Her posture on the last issue was undermined when reports of child abuse by parents topped the news.

Nunn has written a book that is clearly off the main path of political science, one that is a diversion from the typical political science analysis. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

Jonathan Hollowell, ed., *Twentieth Century Anglo-American Relations* (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave, 2001), xvi & 206 pp., Index, Bibliography, Cl. \$60.00; Nigel Ashton, *Kennedy, Macmillan and the Cold War: The Irony of Independence* (New York & Houndmills: Palgrave, 2002), xiii & 288 pp., Bibliography, Index, Cl. \$78.00.

The Ashton volume concentrates on the "Special Relationship" as it occurred between one president and one prime minister; the Hollowell collection surveys a wider time span of the "Relationship," and from diverse perspectives.

Hollowell's collection begins with "Isosceles Triangle" by Margaret Macmillan, now well known for her book *Paris 1919*. "Triangle" is also about the Versailles Conference and the efforts of Britain to gain representation for the Dominions at the conference table. One might draw a parallel with the Soviet insistence on Ukraine having a seat at the U.N., but clearly the Dominions were moving toward postures independent from those of the U.K.

Priscilla Roberts' piece on America's Council on Foreign Relations, often a target of disdain by conservatives, focuses on the period from 1919, when the initial movement began toward an entity, such as the Council, founded in 1921, to the end of the 1930s. This is justified, as she notes, by book-length studies of the Council's activities since that 20-year period. For this two-decade span, Roberts traces the generally Anglophilic stance of the Council and its service as a forum in which prominent Brits could present their nation's view.

Fred Leventhal writes about Eric Knight, one of those moderately notable figures on the world stage, but now largely forgotten. Knight was born in the U.K., but lived much of his life in the U.S. He made a major impact on American sympathy for Britain with his two novels: *This Above All*, which rose to the top of the bestseller list, and *Lassie Come-Home*, whose success in its film version in the U.S. was monumental. Knight, also was a screen writer and worked with Frank Capra in producing what were essentially propaganda films, after the U.S. entered WWII.

Danilo Ardia examines the reaction to the treaty proposed by U.S. Secretary of State James F. Byrnes which proposed to lay the foundation for post-WWII Europe. Although, it was eventually abandoned, its provision that the U.S. would maintain a long term presence in Europe, a factor that was heartily endorsed by the British, and laid the foundation for the ultimate American policy toward Europe. Ernest Bevin, among others, contended that a commitment after WWI, such as found in the Byrnes treaty, would have been desirable between the two world wars.

Steven Fielding's chapter concentrates on two groups of Labour Party influentials who, contrary to the party's affinity with continental socialists, came to see close ties with the U.S. as essential to the party and the nation. The earlier group encompassed such figures as Hugh Gaitskell, Roy Jenkins, Denis Healey, and Tony Crosland. By the 1960s, a second group, for which close ties with America was essentially a given, included Roy Hattersley, David Marquand, David Owen, and Shirley Williams. Fielding does not contend that the individuals were invariably supportive of the U.S., but that they deemed it imperative that Britain worked closely with the U.S. These 'revisionists,' as Fielding labels them, based their pro-American stance on the grounds that the U.S. was not an imperialist power, that the U.S. was susceptible to being influenced by its friends, and the spread of Soviet power was used in ways that were anti-thetical to social democracy.

In the 1950s, the revisionists were displeased with McCarthyism, the topic of the chapter by Jussi N. Hanhimaki. He notes the unwillingness of top members of the Eisenhower administration to accept the damage that McCarthyism was doing to the image of America around the world, even among its allies. (Unlike the current dismay about American policy, the source then was a member of the U.S. Senate, not the White House itself. In both cases, the American chief executive was not moved by European, even British, public opinion.) As it was, the decline of the Senator from Wisconsin was not due to actions from the White House but by his own bravado in his committee's hearings on the Department of the Army. The legacy of McCarthyism survives as part of the political lexicon in both nations.

Sir Roger Makins, who followed Sir Oliver Franks as the British Ambassador to Washington, tenure, 1953-56, in that post has not been accorded the significance he warrants. That is the theme of Saul Kelly's chapter. Kelly explores why Makins was chosen rather than other likely prospects, as well as his role as intermediary in several international issues, including Suez, during the first Eisenhower administration.

Joint economic defense policies of the Anglo-American nations in the 1950s and the 1960s are the subject of the entry by Alan P. Dobson. He delineates the efforts of the two countries to formulate and impose economic sanctions on the Soviet bloc, i.e., embargoes on goods and raw materials, beginning in the late 1940s. Generally, the British had a more flexible approach, although there were frequent differences within the Cabinet. Analysts found that the embargo had little impact on the economies of the Soviet empire or the West, but carried substantial psychological weight. Contrary to many expectations of the time, Eisenhower was more accommodating than his administration colleagues.

What more on Suez, if only a chapter? Peter G. Boyle answers in the affirmative. His chapter mines the correspondence between Sir Anthony Eden and President Eisenhower in the period preceding the Suez War. Boyle demonstrates convincingly that Eisenhower persistently warned Eden against the use of force until all diplomatic avenues were exhausted. Eisenhower's caution and recommendation of seeking a multinational reminds one of Tony Blair's advice to the second President Bush on Iraq prior to the 2003 invasion. Of course, in 1956, it was the partner with the strong hand that was urging restraint.

Lyndon Johnson, Harold Wilson and the Vietnam War: A Not So Special Relationship? by Sylvia A. Ellis assesses the complex relationship between the leaders of the U.K. and the U.S. in the last half of the 1960s. Given that both Johnson and Wilson were consummate politicians, one might have expected them to have an affinity for each other, but that was not to be. Ellis notes several instances in which LBJ appeared to appreciate Wilson, but the two men disagreed on Vietnam. Moreover, the president resented Wilson's efforts to be an honest broker, engaging the Soviets' assistance to seek a diplomatic solution to the Southeast Asia quagmire. Absent his paranoia about Vietnam, Johnson might have sympathized with Wilson who faced a constituency oppose to American action in the former Indochina.

The Ashton book, focusing on the Kennedy presidency, fits chronologically between the Boyle and Ellis chapters in the Hollowell collection. Much has been written about that presidency, perhaps glorifying it to excess, but Kennedy was far more familiar with the British scene than Johnson, and found a soulmate in Macmillan, at least to the extent that both sought to ease tensions between the Soviets and the West.

Ashton offers a sustained perusal of the 'special relationship' over a period that lasted less than three years. After an introductory chapter that lays out the backgrounds, outlooks, and the roles of key advisers to the two leaders, the core of the book is eight chapters: The Laotian Crisis, The Berlin Crisis, The Castro Question and The Cuban Missile Crisis, The Middle East, The Congo Crisis, The EEC Application, Interdependence and the British Nuclear Deterrent, and The Search for a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Those topics remind one of how full of international problems the Kennedy regnum was. Within weeks of each other, both JFK and 'Supermac' were gone from office: the first by an assassin's bullet, the second by resignation.

For one such as this reviewer who recalls the public side of the issues that Ashton analyzes, it is evident that Ashton has done a superb job of collecting the pertinent information and assessing that with admirable insight. Not only is the scholarship well done, the writing is smooth.

Both books document from numerous perspectives, the one-sidedness of the 'special relationship,' as Britain's weight on the international scene declined and its ally's increased. At times, the personal relation between the respective heads of states was cordial, but American leaders and their emissaries could also be discourteous and thoughtless toward their British 'cousins.' *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

POT POURRI XLI

Advice in the "Special Relationship" - Bush is visiting the Queen of England.

He asks her: "How do you run an efficient government? Any tips you can give me?"

The Queen says: "Well, the most important thing is to surround yourself with intelligent people."

Bush frowns, and replies: "Well, how do I know the people around me are really intelligent or not?"

The Queen takes a little sip of tea, and says: "Oh, that's easy. You just ask them a riddle".

Then the Queen pushes the button on her intercom and says: "Please send Tony Blair in here, would you?"

So Tony Blair walks into the room. "Yes, your Majesty?"

The Queen smiles at Tony and says: "Tony, answer me this, would you? Your mother and father have a child. It's not your brother, and it's not your sister. Who is it?"

Without hesitating, Tony Blair says: "Well, that would be me."

The Queen smiles and says: "Very good, thank you!"

So, back at the White House, Bush is a bit puzzled. So, he asks to speak with Donald Rumsfeld: "Hey Don, answer this for me, would ya? Your mother and your father have a child. It's not your brother and it's not your sister... who is it?"

Donald Rumsfeld frowns and says: "Gee, I'm not sure... let me get back to you." So, Donald Rumsfeld goes to all advisors, and asks everyone he can, but no one can answer it for him. Finally, he ends up in the men's room, and he recognizes Colin Powell's shoes in the next toilet. So Don shouts over to him: "Hey Colin! .. can you answer this for me? Your mother and father have a child. It's not your brother and it's not your sister. Who is it?"

Colin Powell flushes, and yells back: "Hey, that's easy... it's me!" Donald Rumsfeld smiles and yells: "Thanks!"

So, Donald Rumsfeld goes back into the Oval Office and tells Bush: "Hey, I finally figured out the answer to that riddle! It's Colin Powell!"

Bush gets up, and angrily stomps over to Donald Rumsfeld.

Bush yells right in Don's face: "No, you idiot! It's Tony Blair!"

In case you missed it – "Crashing the wrong party" A man walks into a pub looking for a quiet drink. He has had a hard day at the office – to be honest, a hard seven years – and he just wants to relax in a dark corner somewhere.

Alas, it is not to be. A cheerful chap kitted out like a pantomime fire chief strolls up, slaps him on the back and offers him a jar. "Viva Tony," he shouts. Tony makes the terrible mistake of accepting the drink – only to discover from everyone's black looks that the mysterious buccaneer is the most unpopular in the house.

Poor old Tony Blair. He cannot seem to do anything right. To much of British establishment, he now has the status of a scion of the Royal Family – criticized on the least pretext for anything he does. Even on holiday, he is in trouble, for staying with Silvio Berlusconi.

Tony must wonder where it all went wrong. The war in Iraq? Foundation hospitals? No, Tony, it happened much earlier – right at the beginning. Your mistake was in not joining the Tory party.

New Labour is so different from Old Labour. It has no real intellectual interest in the unions. It believes in flexible labour markets. The welfare state is no longer sacred in every respect. Many New Labour concepts could easily have been sold to the Tories. The Old Lady's independence over interest rates fits with Conservative convention that bankers know best. Some New Labour themes such as 'right and responsibilities' were arguably more Tory than Labour when Tony's journey began.

Tony could even have been Thatcher's favourite one, rather than John Major. If so, he might have climbed to the very top of the greasy pole even earlier. What great news for Gordon Brown. Instead of playing second fiddle to Tony while pretending they were thick as thieves, he could have faced him across the floor of the Commons as leader of the opposition – entertaining the nation with fruity insults every Wednesday.

[From David Turner's 'Notebook' in *The Financial Times* of 19 Aug 04. Our thanks to Richard Rose for bringing this to our attention.]

In the Dominions:

A) Which has priority? The telly or the trial? - A recent inquiry in New Zealand discovers that in a trial there, members of the jury were more concerned to see the latest episode of Coronation Street than assessing the guilt or innocence of the accused whose fate they were evaluating. Around the Dominions (or at least Canada)

B) Lawyerly intellect – In Toronto, a lawyer, demonstrating the quality of safety glass to a group of law students, plunged 24 stories below to his death when he crashed through a window. He had previously conducted such demonstrations several times, charging toward a window and striking it with his shoulder. The managing partner of his firm said the victim was, “one of the best and the brightest,” of their 200-member group.

C) Here birdy! – In a Toronto suburb, a man cleaning a bird feeder on the balcony of his condominium, standing on a wheeled car, lost his balance and fell 23 stories to his death. (Both B and C were listed among the nine nominees for the 2004 Darwin Award. This annual competition recognizes the event that most clearly represents an incident that removes a ‘defect’ set of genes from the human gene pool. Toronto was the only locale to have more than one nominee.)

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Kudos – On 27 September 2004, **Philip Cowley**, University of Nottingham, was interviewed for National Public Radio’s “Morning Edition” about Tony Blair’s tenure in office, nothing that it is not the length of one’s time at Number Ten, but what one does while there that determines the significance of a prime minister’s place in history.

See the comments about **James Douglas** at the end of this section.

New Member

Karen Wright - Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, 301 19th Ave. S., Minneapolis, MN 55055

Change of address -

Timothy Hellwig - Department of Political Science, University of Houston, 447 Philip G. Hoffman Hall, Houston, TX 77204, USA

Luis Lobo-Fernandez - Dept. of Political. Science and Public Administration, Univeristy of Minho, 4704-553 Graga, PORTUGAL

Ed Page - Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UNITED KINGDOM

New or changed email addresses –

Timothy Hellwig - thellwig@uh.edu

Luis Lobo-Fernandez - luislobo@eeg.uminho.pt

Ed Page – e.c.page@lse.ac.uk

Karen Wright - kwright@hhh.umn.edu

Tributes to James Douglas

From Richard Rose: Re: James Douglas. Dennis Kavanagh’s obit [THE LAST ITEM BELOW] says a lot. I might add a bit of colour as follows:

Anyone who thinks of a political party as a machine did not know the Conservative Research Department of which James Douglas was a very distinguished part for quarter of a century. Instead of having a high-tech battle room it had an 18th century house overlooking St. James Park. Instead of the beeps of electronic messages, there was leisurely conversation and reflection. And in the midst of it all was James Douglas.

After finishing a Nuffield election study; someone suggested I look him up as he was an interesting person. English understatement. At a time when Anthony Downs was unknown in England, James could elaborate on his theories with illustrations from the practices, and someones the obtuseness, of practicing politicians. All of this was done with an infectious laugh and a manner of speech that was old fashioned.

When I started writing *Politics in England*, James Douglas was much engaged with making comments in detail on successive drafts. In part this reflected his own proclivities to reflection on politics, and I was used as a stimulus for his own thoughts, which were always interesting though not always the stuff of political science. His comments reflected a belief, now absent in British politics, that parties had and ought to have an intellectual tradition above and beyond that of winning headlines and votes. When a leftwing member of an academic seminar audience accused him of implicitly endorsing a philosophy of social stability *a la* Parsons, he paused briefly, and said with a smile, ‘Yes’.

From William Field: I never met James, but considered him a friend nonetheless. We had several exchanges off the list, sparked by a comment he or I posted. His level of interest in politics was at the most basic level of human motivation and interaction rather than the day-to-day back-and-forth of the issues or polls.

My most interesting exchange with him concerned the nature of justice. His approach to the topic had little to do with social science theory, but was more concerned with a basic sense of whether there is a universal standard of justice or not, and how one should order society given the presence of absence of a universal standard.

We need more discussions like the ones I had with him, here on the BPG and elsewhere on the planet.

From Thomas P. Wolf: As with William Field, I never met James Douglas, but through our email exchanges, I came to know him and developed great respect for him. We discussed various political topics, as well as matters in other areas. I was flattered to be asked by him for advice about a granddaughter who was planning to change her college field of study.

He invariably impressed me with his wisdom – often giving a fresh perspective to a topic, including those in the American domain.. It was a shock to me when I read Wyn Grant’s email about James’ passing. He was a treasure to those of us that are fascinated by politics, especially the British variety.

From David Baker: I am very saddened to learn of this Wyn, I corresponded with James a couple of times off the list and found him a lively, humane and thoughtful man, and his interventions on the list also betrayed such fine features I am sure all who remember them will agree. He also lived in Highgate in North London if I recall correctly, and as a former resident of Jackson’s Lane in Highgate I can honestly say that he had excellent taste in his choice of London location too!

And given his role in the Conservative election rules he clearly played a significant part in one of the most dramatic incidents in 20th century British political history - the ousting of Mrs Thatcher by her own party! Not that this would endear him to the Thatcherite faithful, of course!

From Jorgen Rasmussen: Dennis Kavanagh has provided a definitive summary of James Douglas’ contribution to British politics. I would like to add just a few personal comments. James was an excellent fellow and I greatly valued my acquaintance with him. Whenever I got to Britain, he was someone I always hoped I would be able to visit. Kavanagh’s obit in *The Times* mentioned the hospitality James and his wife Mary provided at their home. My wife and I were privileged to have enjoyed that; Dennis certainly was correct about how pleasant that was. James was a man of principle and insight without any dogmatism. His congeniality always made visiting with him a pleasure. It may be a cliché but, nonetheless valid, that I fear we will not see his like again.

(Below is the obituary that appeared in the Times.)

JAMES DOUGLAS

James Alexandre Thomas Douglas, Director of the Conservative Research Department, (1970-74) was a many-sided man who made a significant contribution to the party. He was born in Simla where his father served with the Indian Army. His godfather was the future French President Alexandre Millerand, the lawyer to his French mother’s family. His childhood was spent in Paris, but he was educated at the Roman Catholic Beaumont College, Old Windsor, between 1933 and 1938. The family moved to England in 1938, as war threatened. After graduating in 1941 in Politics, Philosophy and Economics at New College, Oxford, he entered the Civil Service, serving as a Principal at the Board of Trade (subsequently Ministry of Supply). At Supply he was secretary of one of the earliest inquiries into monopolies (the cotton textile machinery) and had responsibility for the rationing of clothes.

Conservative Parliamentary successes in the 1950 general election severely depleted the ranks of the party’s formidable Research Department. Iain Macleod, Enoch Powell and Reggie Maudling all left to become MPs. David Clarke, the Director of the Department, had met James through the study group Political and Economic Planning (PEP), and recruited him in 1951. At the time James regarded himself more “a political agnostic” than a Conservative, and his values remained those of One-Nation Conservatism. By temperament he was a sceptic and he had little time for the dogmatic certainties of the party headed by Mrs Thatcher after 1975. Asked in later years why he was a Conservative he replied: “A nice question.”

Douglas found his niche in the broad church of the post-war Research Department. His first post was as an officer in the Economic section in 1955 he became head of the section. In those days the Research Department, whose chairman from 1946 to 1964 was R A Butler, was based in a handsome house in Old Queen Street, overlooking St James’s Park. The researchers spent a good deal of their time with MPs and ministers (indeed many went on to become MPs) and were regarded as a cut above the party functionaries in Central Office. He contributed much to the university common room atmosphere in the department.

Like other researchers Douglas helped to provide propaganda, arguments, statistics and meat for the speeches of busy front-bench spokesmen and drafted policy papers, largely on economic policy. He was also alert to the new trends in election campaigning and Harold Macmillan, as Prime Minister, supported his suggestion that the party should commission its own private opinion polling. Party leaders were impressed with the cogency and style of his

papers although his discursiveness in conversation did not always please the busy minister.

After the Conservatives lost office in 1964 one of Douglas's first tasks, undertaken at the request of the party leader, Sir Alec Douglas-Home, was to draft a new set of rules for electing the leader. As a peer, Lord Home had become Prime Minister in 1963 by very informal, secretive and undemocratic methods. The Douglas rules were a more open and involved a ballot of all Tory MPs. He drafted the revised rules in late 1974 to allow for an annual challenge to the leader, then Edward Heath.

The 1965 rules provided that to be elected on the first ballot a candidate required an overall majority of MPs and a lead of at least 15 per cent of those voting. In 1975 this was changed to 15 per cent of those eligible to vote; significantly, abstentions could count. Home had told Douglas to devise a way of making a change of leader easier - because "the party will not have Ted". The new formula that he produced was used for the elections of Mrs Thatcher, John Major and William Hague.

Between late 1964 and 1970 the party was in Opposition and Douglas, as an Assistant Director of the Department, looked after the ambitious policy group exercise. The party Leader, Ted Heath, took a close interest in the operation and often commented on the high quality of Douglas's papers. Historians now examining the party records often echo the praise. James Douglas presided over this exercise with a combination of impartial academic analysis and political nous. Each proposal was examined for its value, practicality and political appeal. It was a time of intellectual stimulus and among the bright young men in the Research Department at that time were Douglas Hurd, Norman Lamont, Chris Patten, Tony Newton and John MacGregor, together with many others who went on to become MPs and junior Ministers. All undoubtedly learnt much from Douglas.

His experience and ability were recognised by his appointment as Director of the Department when the party moved into government in June 1970. Tony Newton would probably have got the post had he not made clear his determination to seek a parliamentary seat. Over the next three and a half years, Douglas's inability to establish personal rapport with Ted Heath, although not unusual, handicapped him. Close relations with the party leader are essential if the Research Director is to play an important role. Having begun working for the party under Churchill and ended it working for Heath he reflected: "Churchill wanted to be told what party policy was but knew how to say it. Poor Ted knew what to say but now how to say it. He expected us to communicate for him the thought that he was incapable of communicating."

He was one of the first in the party to see the significance of the Yom Kippur War, followed by a cut in Arab oil supplies and a steep increase in oil prices. He advocated calling an early general election, not on a "Who Governs?" platform - which he thought nonsense - but because of the adverse international situation. The election was duly called but -because of the miners' strike-not on the ground that he advocated.

Heads rolled in the party organisation after the Conservative defeat in the February 1974 election and Douglas stepped down; his disappointment was eased by the knowledge that Chris Patten, a man of similar political outlook, would be his successor. He remained as a consultant Director until 1977, when his wife, Mary Douglas, the distinguished professor of anthropology at University College, London, accepted a series of positions at leading American universities. He accompanied her and accepted visiting professorships in political science during the next decade. He also wrote a number of articles for academic journals.

Colleagues in the Research Department often commented on the remarkable range of Douglas's knowledge, his wide reading across disciplines and his ability to see links between them. As befitted an inquisitive person he was also open-minded on many political issues. His lack of partisanship and detachment from day-to-day political concerns was both a strength and a weakness. Perhaps his qualities would have been better employed in a university, although he found that the personal rivalries and backstabbing within American university departments were more intense than in politics. Enoch Powell in 1951 and Nigel Lawson in 1959 urged Douglas to seek a seat in Parliament. He ruled this out on economic grounds, although Powell argued that being an MP was sufficient to bring in another £1,000 annually in journalism and broadcasting.

He was one of a key group of Hampstead figures who helped to establish Which magazine in 1957 and was a member of the Consumers Association Council from 1957 to 1974. His fair-mindedness and habit of not speaking unless he had something to say were much appreciated on the Council. Douglas loved talking but had a greater talent for listening and of developing half-formed thoughts into more articulate and wise statements. His last years were marred by deafness.

He married Mary Tew in 1951 and she and two sons and one daughter survive him. The couple were marvellous hosts at their Highgate home to a wide range of friends across politics and academe. Devout Roman Catholics (inherited from their mothers), they were remarkably unspoilt and modest. He was appointed OBE in 1963.

Born Simla, India 22 July 1919; Died 22 September 2004.

Fall 2004, No 118

IN THIS ISSUE

Activities	Page 2
Announcements	Page 4
From the BPG-L	Page 6
Abstracts	Page 9
Book Reviews	Page 15
Pot Pourri XLI	Page 20
Membership News	Page 21
Tribute to James Douglas	Page 22



Thomas P. Wolf, Newsletter Editor
School of Social Sciences
Indiana University Southeast
New Albany, IN
47150