



British Politics Group NEWSLETTER+

Officers

President

Wyn Grant 2004-2006
University of Warwick

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

Winter 2005, No 119

IN THIS ISSUE

Activities	Page 2
Announcements	Page 3
From the BPG-L	Page 5
Articles	Page 6
Abstracts	Page 9
Book Reviews	
K. Jefferson on <i>Right From the Beginning</i> by Kochan & Widdecombe	Page 10
D. Studlar on <i>Dictionary of British Politics</i> by Jones	Page 11
J. H. P. Williams on <i>Britain and European Unity</i> by Young	Page 12
W. Farrell on <i>The New Politics of Crime & Punishment</i> edited by Matthews & Young	Page 13
T. P. Wolf on <i>Winston Churchill and the British Constitution</i> by Theakston	Page 15
T. P. Wolf on <i>Conduct Unbecoming</i> edited by Gay & Leopold	Page 16
Pot Pourri	Page 17
Membership News	Page 18

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.

ACTIVITIES

New Executive Secretary - Terrence Casey of Rose-Hulman Institute has been chosen by the Selection Committee to be the new Executive Secretary of the BPG, succeeding Donley T. Studlar of West Virginia University. Casey will officially take over at the BPG Annual Business held at the APSA meeting in Washington, DC next fall.

The Selection Committee thought that there ought to be a fixed term for the Executive Secretary rather

than leaving it open-ended, as now. Three years was suggested. Studlar thought that four or five would be preferable. To implement any change will take action from the Executive Committee and the full membership.

BPG members may wish to be considering whether a fixed term would be desirable, and if so, how long should the term be? If a review were adopted that would be conducted by the Executive Committee, presumably.

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

ANNOUNCEMENTS

JOBS – [See also the BPG-L Section for this topic.]

A) Visiting Professor - NEW YORK CONSORTIUM FOR EUROPEAN STUDIES - Fall 2005

Application deadline 4 March 05

The New York Consortium for European Studies (New York University, Columbia University, New School University) seeks an established European scholar currently teaching in Europe with a minimum of five years teaching experience and specializing in one or more of the following fields: European constitutionalism, justice, and law; comparative politics of Western Europe; international relations of Western Europe; European public policy; modern European history; social movements; religion in Europe, to be the Consortium Visiting Professor during the Fall 2005 semester (September 1-December 31). We are particularly interested in scholars who are specialists on the European Union.

The consortium professor will teach two graduate-level courses, one at NYU and one at Columbia, participate in Consortium conferences and workshops, meet with students, and contribute to other activities of the New York Consortium for European Studies. The stipend for this position is \$25,000.

There is no application form. Those interested should send a letter, detailed CV and the names, addresses and contact details of three references, by March 4, 2005, to: Professor Martin Schain, Director, Center for European Studies, New York University, 58 West 10th Street, New York, NY 10011 Tel: 212 998-3838; Fax: 212 995-4188

If you have any questions about this position, please contact Jennifer Denbo, Program Administrator, NYU Center for European Studies at (212) 998-3838 or jed217@nyu.edu

B) Visiting Professor position – Bucknell University, Lewis, Pennsylvania 17837.

Closing date – April 1, 2005.

A one-year Visiting Professor position in the International Relations Program beginning August 2005. Entry level; Ph.D. preferred, ABD considered.

The International Relations Program seeks a person to teach a full-time course load (3/3) in two of the following three areas: (1) A regional focus or specialization in either Europe or Asia/So. Asia; (2) International Organizations, International Law, and/or Human Rights; and, (3) Topics courses or seminars, e.g. Migration, Genocide, Globalization, or other relevant topics. Bucknell is a predominately undergraduate institution of about 3,400 students with a strong commitment to teaching, research, and the liberal arts. Please send a letter of application with a statement of teaching and research interests, curriculum vitae, and three letters of reference. Bucknell University encourages applications from women and members of minority groups (EEO/AA). Apply to: Stephen C. Stamos Jr., Director, International Relations Program.

PUBLICATION NEWS -

A) JOURNALS

1) Government and Opposition – A free article, Cas Mudde, “The Populist Zeitgeist,” is available from this journal. For information visit www.blackwellpublishing.com/gov-opp. Full table of contents and abstracts are available at www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/toc/goop

2) Parliamentary Affairs –
New hands on the rudder - Duncan Humphrey sends this message (slightly edited): “With the retirement of Professor **Fred Ridley**, **Dr Jocelyn Evans** and Professor **Steven Fielding** of the University of Salford have taken over the editorship

of the journal. The new editors are taking this opportunity to re-launch *Parliamentary Affairs* as a fully peer-reviewed journal, with new sections and a refined focus. With this development we are now calling for submissions and members of the BGP are likely to be a valuable source of high-quality papers.

“We are distributing the attached call for papers....”

Duncan Humphrey
Marketing Manager
Oxford University Press
Great Clarendon Street
Oxford | OX2 6DP | UK
T: +44 (0)1865 353386
F: +44 (0)1865 353835
www.oxfordjournals.org

Parliamentary Affairs - Call for Papers

Now edited by Dr Jocelyn Evans and Professor Steven Fielding, *Parliamentary Affairs* is calling for contributions.

The journal seeks to sustain its established character as a forum for research articles based upon legislative and parliamentary studies, and commentary pieces designed to inform its readership of current issues in the field and stimulate debate on these topics. In addition, the Editors invite contributions that further our understanding of contemporary representative politics by more explicitly:

- adopting an historical perspective;
- situating political processes in their cultural and/or social context;
- employing a rigorous comparative framework; and
- assuming a theoretical perspective.

Parliamentary Affairs also includes a review article section, to which authors may submit contributions.

Peer Review and Rapid Publication

All articles published in the journal will be submitted to a process of independent peer-review in order to ensure the highest standards of rigour and appropriateness in its output. Given the journal’s role as a source of up-to-date information on British politics and government, the Editors are committed to rapid turn-around of submissions and rapid publication of accepted articles. With that end in mind, all accepted articles will be published in electronic format on the *Parliamentary Affairs* website within approximately six weeks of acceptance of the final version, in advance of print publication.

How to Submit

Potential contributors should send submissions to the Editors at: parl.affairs-pch@salford.ac.uk
For full submission information please visit our website: www.pa.oupjournals.org

B) BOOKS –

1) Scott L. Geer, Territorial politics and health policy: UK health policy in critical perspective (Manchester University Press, The Devolution Series, 2004), 234x156mm 288pp, Cl. [0-7190-6950-5], £55.00

This study is the first large-scale comparison of policy and divergence in the UK since devolution. It identifies the different combinations of market, profession, management and civil society that England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales chose in their efforts to provide health services to all. It explains why these four health systems, despite facing similar dramatically different health policy trajectories. Based on extensive original research in the UK, Canada and Spain, it argues that we should expect substantial divergence in policies and social citizenship in the UK as its autonomous political systems try to solve the unpredictable and difficult puzzles of health policy-making.

To order a copy visit www.manchesteruniversitypress.co.uk or contact the MUP trade department on +44 (0)161 2752310 pressures and opportunities, have developed.

2) Charles Pattie, Patrick Seyd, & Paul Whiteley, Citizenship in Britain: Values, Participation and Democracy (Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University, 2004), xvii & 346 pp, , Index, Bibliography, Cl. \$70.00, Pb. \$29.99

FROM THE BPG-L

Job Search Tips - Alistair Howard asked: “Can anyone on list advise the best comprehensive site for locating available lectureships in Britain (or elsewhere in Europe for that matter)? Are all jobs listed in/at the Guardian? Or is there an equivalent to the APSA job listing service?”

“As the current US administration knows, those with debt benefit hugely from the declining dollar (whether they are recently minted PhDs or tax-cutting Treasury departments!). If the greenback continues to decline, as seems likely, working over-

seas becomes ever more attractive, in no small part because sending money home is that much cheaper.” **Joel Wolfe** responded “The BPG website <<http://www.uc.edu/bpg/bpglinks.htm>> links to the PSA site and to job.ac.uk. Both provide listings.” **Wyn Grant** noted, “The correct name of the main site is jobs.ac.uk (not job)” **Michelle Egan** added, “Alistair get on uaces mailing list for job circulations.”

Political Party Broadcasts – Chris Howell asked 04/Jan/05), “Does anybody know of an internet site that archives party political broadcasts? The Keele UK politics site has transcripts for elections after 1964 and Real Audio for the 1997 elections, but I can’t find the actual broadcasts for 2001, and the RealAudio for 1997 is fairly low quality.”

Ralph Negrine replied, “The BFI carries the more recent broadcasts and the BBC also has them but will probably charge for access. There is no website - unlike the US - and this is something that really does need to be sorted out. (I am making efforts in that direction). If you are searching for broadcasts pre-1960s, you are likely to encounter more difficulties. Several years ago, Politico’s released a ‘greatest hits’ political broadcasts video and I imagine it can still be obtained. You will find selections of broadcasts but not post 1997 (I think but am not entirely sure). If you are really desperate, the easiest way to access them is to work through colleagues who may have video-taped the broadcasts.”

Robert M. Worcester added, “LSE has them I believe. Jean Sykes is the Librarian and very helpful.”

A) From Philip Cowley on revolting matters – not sex.com (or whatever) – “Today (27 Jan 05) is the first anniversary of both the large Labour rebellion against the Higher Education Bill which cut the Government’s majority to just five - the lowest it’s been since 1997 - and (somewhat less dramatically) the launch by me and some of my colleagues of www.revolts.co.uk - a site which is never knowingly outanoraked. Since then we’ve had just under 35,000 visitors. Compared to sex.com (or whatever), this isn’t very many, but for a site on such a nerdy subject as backbench voting, we’re quite pleased.

“To celebrate our first anniversary, we’re launching two student essay prizes - one for pre-university students, and one for undergraduate students. Two separate prizes - each of £100 - are available, and all they have to do to enter is write a short essay (1000 words for pre-university students, 1500 for under-

graduates). Instructions on how to enter can be found at: <http://www.revolts.co.uk/essaycompetition.html>
“The closing date for entries is 1 August 2005.
“This might obviously be of interest to your students (entries may come from the US as well as the UK), and so we’d be grateful if you could circulate it widely.”

B) From Philip Cowley re the BJPIR - The *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* is carrying an extended review essay of Political Choice in Britain, the latest book from the BES series, in the next issue of the *BJPIR*. We wouldn’t normally flag up reviews but this extended review places the book in context and summarises its findings rather well. It might therefore be useful for teaching - as well as for those of you who’ve not yet got round to reading it but want to appear informed and on-the-ball. It’s available online via Blackwell’s Synergy service (most universities, at least UK ones, have free access): <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2005.00171.x/full/> or (for a pdf): <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/j.1467-856x.2005.00171.x/pdf>

ARTICLES

“Gordon Brown and Britishness”

Wyn Grant, Warwick University

For the second year running the Political Studies Association held an Awards Ceremony in London at the end of November. Gordon Brown was chosen as Politician of the Year and he used the occasion to make a major speech about his vision of ‘Britishness’. He argued that the heart of the Pre-Budget Report he was giving later in the week was ‘a patriotic vision of Britain’s future as a country of ambition and aspiration. The theme of the pre-Budget report will be that the next decade can be a British decade.’

He emphasised that what he had in mind was a multi-cultural Britain based on shared values rather than particular institutions. ‘Britain’s success and destiny depends upon understanding and building upon our historic strengths: our stability, our openness to the world, our scientific creativity, our world-class universities – and then understanding and addressing our weaknesses: the need to invest long-term in science, enterprise, education and in the potential of every young person and adult.’

He called for ‘a new Institute and Forum for

Britishness studies examining the forces at work in shaping the future of Britain’ to be established by politicians, academics and journalists. The Political Studies Association is considering whether there is any way in which this idea can be taken forward.

The speech was interpreted by the media as an attempt by the Chancellor to differentiate himself from the more pro-European stance of Tony Blair, even though he emphasised that Britain’s future was in Europe. The *Sun*’s Trevor Kavanagh, named at the ceremony as political journalist of the year, referred to the Chancellor wrapping himself in the Union Jack. Other journalists saw it as an attack on new EU trade commissioner, Peter Mandelson, who had been casting doubt on Britain’s economic achievements. Yet others suggested that the Chancellor was concerned about how easy it would be for someone from Scotland to become prime minister now that there is devolution. The Chancellor, therefore, needed to emphasise his ‘Britishness’ at a time when it is more common to refer to England.

I was able to talk to the Chancellor over lunch and he talked about his own origins as a lecturer at Edinburgh University. He displayed a keen interest in the state of political studies in British universities and the PSA’s journals. It was the first time I had met him and, as others have said, he comes across as a more engaging, charming person face-to-face than his rather dour image would suggest. He is very good at extracting relevant information from the person he is talking to, asking a series of rapid fire questions with the next one coming before you have finished your answer. He is carrying on with the practice of No.11 seminars as a means of keeping up to date with current academic thinking.

Criminal justice minister Baroness Scotland of Asthal QC was named as Parliamentarian of the Year. Born in Dominica, her family moved to Britain when she was two. In a subsequent BBC radio interview, she paid tribute to the way in which her parents had encouraged her to be a high achiever. At school she had been told that she if really impressed at a Saturday job as a supermarket cashier, she might one day rise to the dizzy heights of supervisor. She has had to pilot complex legislation through the Lords and has won widespread admiration for the way in which she handles the upper house. In her radio interview, she spoke of the difficulties of maintaining the balance between her career and being the mother of two children.

Kenneth Clarke received an award for 'lifetime achievement in politics.' Andrew Marr was introduced by Radio 4's Jim Naughtie as 'the ears have it' when he received his award as Political Broadcaster of the Year. Peter Riddell was named as Political Columnist of the Year, expressing the hope that political scientists could write more clearly and accessibly about their subject. The 'political satire award' went to Dead Ringers, originally on radio, but transferred to television with the audience being treated to impersonations of George Bush and Tony Blair. *Prospect* was named as political publication of the year. It now enjoys a larger circulation than the *New Statesman*. The Law Lords didn't turn up to collect their 'political turkey award' as they said they were busy in court. They turned down the listed Middlesex Guildhall building in Parliament Square as a location for the new supreme court.

Many people associated over the years with the BPG received awards. The Sir Isaiah Berlin Prize for lifetime contribution to Political Studies went to Ivor Crewe, now Vice-Chancellor of the University of Essex and President of Universities UK, the principal representative organisation for universities. A 'lifetime achievement' award went to Professor Carole Pateman of the University of California Los Angeles, who noted that it had been a long journey from a village school in Maresfield, Sussex. Professor Gerry Stoker of Manchester University received the 'making a difference' award for his policy oriented research. The prize instigated by Professor Richard Rose to recognise young talent in the political science community went to Dr Matthew Flinders of Sheffield University. Professor John Curtice of Strathclyde University received the 'political communication' award, some recompense for his late night vigils in election broadcast studios, as well as a recognition of his academic contribution to election studies. Last but not least, a popular figure from the publishing profession, Steven Kennedy of Palgrave-Macmillan, was recognised as 'political publisher of the year.'

"Rating British Prime Ministers"

*Kevin Theakston (University of Leeds)
and Mark Gill (MORI)*

There have been many surveys, going back to the 1940s, of American academics – historians and political scientists – producing league tables of presidential performance in the White House and of the 'best' and 'worst' presidents. But this research has lagged behind in Britain. A 1999 BBC Radio 4 poll of 20 'prominent historians, politicians and commentators', produced the verdict that Churchill was the best British PM of the 20th century. Lloyd George was in second place and Clement Attlee in third place. The worst PM in that survey was judged to be Anthony Eden. In 2000 the British Politics Group ran another poll, which attracted 22 responses, with the top three ranked in order as Churchill, Attlee and Lloyd George.

Neither of those surveys included Tony Blair (now in his seventh year as Prime Minister) and both were based on small samples. We wanted to see how Blair measured up against other PMs (while recognising that he has not yet completed his term of office) and to get the opinions and judgments of a much larger group of experts. We therefore polled 258 academics, with 139 answering the survey questions in full (a 54% response rate), making this the first large-scale survey of British academic experts in British politics and/or modern British history, asking them to rate all the 20th century British Prime Ministers in terms of their success and asking them to assess the key characteristics of successful PMs. (The survey was conducted online by MORI between 27 September and 5 November 2004. A more detailed analysis paper of the results is being prepared and will be presented at the PSA Conference at the University of Leeds in April 2005.)

Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale of 0 to 10 how successful or unsuccessful they considered each PM to have been in office (with 0 being highly unsuccessful and 10 highly successful). We were then able to calculate the mean score for each PM and work our own league table.

Ranking	Prime Minister	Mean score
1	Clement Attlee (Lab. 1945-51)	8.34
2	Winston Churchill (Con. 1940-45, 51-55)	7.88
3	David Lloyd George (Lib. 1916-22)	7.33
4	Margaret Thatcher (Con. 1979-90)	7.14
5	Harold Macmillan (Con. 1957-63)	6.49
6	Tony Blair (Lab. 1997-)	6.30
7	Herbert Asquith (Lib. 1908-16)	6.19
8	Stanley Baldwin (Con. 1923-24, 24-29, 35-37)	6.18
9	Harold Wilson (Lab. 1964-70)	5.93
10	Lord Salisbury (Con. 1895-1902)	5.75
11	Henry Campbell-Bannerman (Lib. 1906-08)	5.01
12	James Callaghan (Lab. 1976-79)	4.75
13	Edward Heath (Con. 1970-74)	4.36
14	Ramsay MacDonald (Lab. 1924, 29-31, 31-35)	3.73
15	John Major (Con. 1990-97)	3.67
16	Andrew Bonar Law (Con. 1922-23)	3.50
17	Neville Chamberlain (Con. 1937-40)	3.43
18	Arthur Balfour (Con. 1902-05)	3.42
19	Alec Douglas-Home (Con. 1963-64)	3.33
20	Anthony Eden (Con. 1955-57)	2.53

That the survey results placed Attlee rather than Churchill in first place as the most successful 20th century British PM was the first surprise of the poll. Respondents were asked to give their views on the greatest domestic and foreign policy successes and failures of the 20th century, and the majority of those responses singled out the Attlee government's welfare state reforms and the creation of the NHS as the key 20th century domestic policy achievements. Churchill and Lloyd George are the two great world war winners, while Attlee helped to make the post-war consensus which Margaret Thatcher 'unmade' and then recast in the 1980s.

At the bottom of the league table, Neville Chamberlain is forever associated with the failures of appeasement, Balfour saw his party split and sent crashing to a landslide defeat, Douglas-Home was a stop-gap compromise leader who served as PM for only a year, and Eden's premiership and his reputation were both sunk by the Suez crisis.

The profile of the survey respondents helps shed some light on the survey findings. In terms of academic specialism, 55 per cent describe themselves as politics experts, 37 per cent as historians, and 8 per cent as other. The top four PMs – Attlee, Churchill, Lloyd George and Thatcher – are ranked in the same order by political scientists and by historians. However, there are some key differences between the two groups. Political scientists rank Blair as 5th, but historians rank him as 10th (below Baldwin, Macmillan, Asquith, Wilson and Salisbury in that order). Both groups placed Eden in bottom place, but whereas political scientists place Chamberlain in 19th place out of 20, historians put him

more towards the middle of the table, in 14th place. Historians place Major in 17th place, but political scientists judge his performance perhaps a little more favourably and place him as 14th.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how they would vote if there were a General Election tomorrow. Among those who named a party (75% of total respondents), half say they would vote Labour (50%), with 27% supporting the Liberal Democrats and 11% the Conservatives. When the results are split out by type of academic, there are some marked differences in overall ratings. Conservative academics rate Thatcher most highly (in fact nine of the eleven rate her as either a 9 or 10 out of 10). Blair makes the top 5 among Labour academics, but the strength of support is not as high as among Conservatives for Thatcher. Among Labour academics, none give Blair a 10 out of 10 rating, and just 9 out of 52 give him a 9 out of 10 rating) The top five PMs for each party group is as follows:

Labour academics (n=52)	Conservative academics (n=11)	Liberal Democrat academics (n=28)
1 Attlee (8.48)	Thatcher (9.18)	Attlee (8.32)
2 Churchill (8.00)	Churchill (8.36)	Lloyd George (7.42)
3 Blair (7.35)	Attlee (8.20)	Churchill (7.36)
4 Lloyd George (7.16)	Lloyd George (7.80)	Wilson (6.29)
5 Thatcher (6.94)	Baldwin (7.30)	Macmillan (6.25)

(Mean score)

Blair (6.09 = 8th place) Blair (5.32 = 9th place)

The bottom of the league table by each party group is as follows:

Labour academics	Conservative academics	Liberal Democrat academics
17 Balfour (3.66)	Major (3.64)	Bonar Law (3.05)
18 Douglas-Home / Chamberlain (=) (3.62)	Balfour / Heath (=) (3.30)	Chamberlain (2.93)
19		Douglas-Home (2.74)
20 Eden (2.79)	Eden (2.80)	Eden (2.46)

For all groups, the bottom four PMs are all Conservatives. But whereas Labour supporting academics rated Heath in 13th place and Major in 14th, Conservative supporting academics were much more critical.

In addition to asking to rate individual performance, respondents were asked to select up to three out of a list of 20 characteristics that they think are most needed for a Prime Minister to be judged successful. The top answers are:

- leadership skills (picked by 64 %)
- sound judgement (42 %)
- good in a crisis (24 %)
- luck (23 %)
- decisiveness (23 %)
- stable parliamentary majority (20 %)
- good quality colleagues (18 %)
- understands the problems facing Britain (16 %)

Rated less important were:

- integrity (11 %)
- practices Cabinet government (10 %)
- charisma (picked by 9 %)
- in touch with ordinary people (8 %)
- ruthlessness (6 %)
- poor state of the opposition (5 %)
- strong convictions / ideology (4 %)
- high-level ministerial experience (3 %)
- understands world problems (2 %)
- understands economics (1 %)
- down-to-earth (1 %)
- honesty (1%)
- patriotism (0%)

ABSTRACTS

Paul Gilroy, “From a Colonial Past to a New Multiculturalism,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Section B, The Chronicle Review (January 7, 2005), pp. B7-B10.

Gilroy is a professor of sociology and chair of African-American Studies at Yale University. He has taught in the UK.. This article is evidently from his new book, *Postcolonial Melancholia* (Columbia University Press).

The quotations that follow indicate the content of this article: “...Britain has become extremely concerned about the ebbing cultural content of its uncertain national identity. These anxieties – strongest in England because the Scots, Irish and Welsh all have their invented ethnicities (Emphasis added.) to fall back on – are an unwelcome product of postcolonial circumstances.” (B7)

“Britain’s post-1945 immigrants were colonial subjects. They arrived, motivated by loyalty as well as hope for advancement, to take on the dirty and dangerous tasks that native citizens no longer wanted to do. Their difficulties fitting in were connected to the fact that Britain found itself unable to mourn or work through its loss of empire.” (B8)

“Poles and Kosovars are ‘white,’ but they can still be held hostage by the racialized definition of immigration that sets them apart from the local working class because, until very recently to be an immigrant was to be black.” (B8)

The movie, “*The Great Escape* is aptly symbolic because it can be read as a handover of the British project to the United States, represented by the film’s star ...Steve McQueen. The British heartily enjoy his triumph, but it refers is nonetheless to the painful, unacknowledged loss of the country’s capacity to rule.” (B9) [Here Gilroy is evidently woefully ignorant of the facts upon which the film was based. The movie is a distortion of what actually transpired. There were no Americans in the POW camp at the time of the actual Escape. McQueen and other American actors were put in the film as a marketing device to appeal to American audiences. The British media reported this when the film was released.]

To make the loss of empire even more central to understand contemporary Britain, Gilroy finds that it is the source of the popularity of the Harry Potter series of books. (B9) [Rather illogical since the youthful readers of these books have no first hand memory of the Empire.] The continuing significance of empire is also found, Gilroy contends, in the response of those British citizens, imprisoned at Guantánamo Bay, who upon their release, soon asked for Highland Shortbread biscuits. (B10) As a result, Gilroy argues that the “problem of assimilation specified in the 1960s should be laid to rest forever.” (B10). *T.P. Wolf*

Niall Ferguson, “The Widening Atlantic,” *The Atlantic Monthly* (January/February 2005), pp. 40 & 42.

Upon reading this, one is tempted to suggest that Ferguson has spent too much time contemplating and publishing hypothetical historical scenarios. As evidence of the increasing differences between the US and Europe, Ferguson cites surveys that show a large majority of Europeans favored John Kerry in the recent US election. Of course, that is a temporary and expected phenomenon since the election is over and most Europeans were correct about the Iraq matter while Bush was not: there was no threat from Saddam.

More important is the growing presence of Muslims in Europe, which makes it unlikely, according to Ferguson, that the EU governments would support any action against a predominantly Muslim nation.

[Do you recall the thunderous outcry of protest when western forces invaded Afghanistan???] Ferguson asserts that party leaders in Germany “are terrified of alienating the already large Turkish-German community.” (p. 42)

Another reason that Ferguson alleges will stretch the distance between America and Europe is the decline of Christianity in the latter, while it continues to be prominent in the former. Evidently, Ferguson has not been in the States long enough to witness the hardly disputable decline in religion there, especially among young Americans. *T.P. Wolf*

Jane Kramer, “Blood Sport,” *The New Yorker* (January 24 & 31, 2005), pp. 70-77.

Kramer, who has written widely about events on both sides of the ‘Pond’, offers a perhaps surprisingly even-handed narrative about the effort to end fox-hunting in the UK, as well as the opposition to that effort.

The political dimensions of her account are of most interest to BPGers. She notes that this issue was not a priority for Tony Blair, but this policy became a sop to his backbenchers, unhappy with the Iraq intervention. Labour firebrands, such as Tony Banks and Gerald Kaufman, lead the drive to end fox-hunting. As the conflict over the issue developed more radical elements arose on both sides of the issue.

Serious followers of British politics will want to follow the legal case brought by the defenders of fox-hunting, who are pursuing a judicial appeal of the ban, arguing that the Parliament Act of 1949 was illegally amended. [Should this appeal be successful shall I have to contact hundreds of former students to whom I have incorrectly characterized this Act?]

Among the other tidbits in the article: A sympathetic, portrait of the land owning class, whose impotence on this matter clearly demonstrates the loss of their historic political muscle. It may be fresh information, but probably not a surprise that Roger Scruton rides to hounds. Americans will notice the similarity between the growing presence of foxes in British cities with the increasing number of coyotes in American municipalities and suburbs.

Kramer admits that she hunts, but does not ride well enough to follow the hounds. I have not found another piece of writing on the west side of the Atlantic that is as informative about this inflammatory, if arcane, issue. *T.P. Wolf*

BOOK REVIEWS

Kochan, Nicholas, *Ann Widdecombe, Right from the Beginning* (London: Politico’s 2004), x & 340 pp., Index, Pb. £8.99.

The life story of Ann Widdecombe is a fascinating tale of how the formative years of a politician’s life can play a critical role in that person’s development both personally and politically. Widdecombe is, without a doubt, one of Britain’s most unusual politicians, both as a Conservative woman and as the champion of views that are seen by many in her country today as out of the British or European mainstream. Ironically, if Ms. Widdecombe were running for office in the United States today she would be in line for a very high leadership position in the Republican party. Yet, she clawed and scraped her way to the top of the Tory hierarchy, and eventually held a junior ministerial position in the John Major government and her long-sought shadow home secretary post under William Hague by 1999. Nicholas Kochan’s biography is interesting, yet unspectacular. It is quite informative, yet like Widdecombe’s life, it is a roller coaster of ups and downs that seem to all revolve around her quest to find herself spiritually.

Widdecombe is not a traditional Tory. First, she came from the southern part of England. Her parents were from Devon and Cornwall. Her father was a bureaucrat in the Royal Navy. Her religious identity was distinctly Christian, yet fragmented with High Church Anglican, Baptist, and Roman Catholic influences. She attended a Roman Catholic girls school and by the time she entered the University of Birmingham in 1966 she was a budding evangelical. She had been interested in politics as a secondary school student. Yet, after completing her degree, she went on to Oxford where she had failed to matriculate three years before. It was here that her future was planned.

Kochan describes nicely the intricacies of the Oxford Union and its rituals and ways. Widdecombe spent most of her time debating numerous contentious political issues. One broad topic was placed before the union: legalization of pot, abortion, and homosexuality are all signs of a progressive society. Another issue was framed as “God is not dead; he was never alive.” Widdecombe, an evangelical and growing militant conservative politically, argued against these motions. By the early 1980s, she was a self-proclaimed agnostic, although very active in Tory politics. Two major undercurrents of this book are

the rise of a strong-willed, independent woman in politics (along with the accompanying sexism tied to British politics) and her longstanding dichotomous ideology which pitted tough conservative social policies such as a pro-death penalty and anti-immigration stance (she asked for and got Enoch Powell's biography in 1968 for her 21st birthday) against her belief in progressive applications of helping battered women and the downtrodden. Widdecombe ran for parliament in 1979 in the election that brought Mrs. Thatcher to power as premier. Widdecombe lost Burnley although she halved Labour's vote. She then lost to former Labour defense minister, Dr. David Owen, who was standing for the first time as a Social Democrat after his defection from the Michael Foote-led debacle of a party in 1983. Owen's star-power proved too much and she lost to him by 4000+ votes. Finally, in 1987, Widdecombe won a seat in Kent and started her parliamentary career.

The remainder of the book would be of interest to political science and history students given the discussion of some of the internal machinations within the House of Commons. Her maiden speech (on the need for trident nuclear subs in Britain), committee work, her obsession with the abortion issue and defending the minority pro-life position in Britain (which cut across the Conservative party membership), and her interest in climbing the political ladder are discussed in detail. Her flamboyant conversion to Catholicism in 1993 is examined minutely. Having been opposed to Catholicism, she left her agnosticism behind and publicly joined the church and said that the Catholics were addressing social and religious issues far better than her old church, the Church of England. Her personal religious conversion may resonate with Americans as it is similar to the Republican US Senator from Kansas Sam Brownback's conversion to Catholicism in 1999 as he had been mentored in the faith by conservative colleague, US Senator Rick Santorum. Brownback left the United Methodist Church. So, even politicians aren't immune from changing their Christian and religious perspectives as they operate in the limelight. Kochan does a nice job of discussing Widdecombe's career. The book would be a useful supplement for a course in British politics, legislative politics, or women's politics. It would be especially helpful in the latter given that Widdecombe's political perspectives would not fit neatly in a feminist or other political science typology that many assume most women politicians have. It would have been nice had Kochan talked a bit more

about how women have helped transform British politics in the House of Commons and other regional legislatures in recent years as well. In general, the life of Ann Widdecombe makes interesting reading and American students in the midst of President George W. Bush's revolution may find it of interest to see where conservatism stands across the ocean in the United Kingdom today. *Kurt Jefferson, Westminster College*

Bill Jones, *Dictionary of British Politics* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2004), ix & 401 pp. Websites, Bibliography. Pb. \$85.00

The ever-industrious Bill Jones has produced yet another volume in the "Politics Today" series. This one focuses on key terms and individuals in British politics, especially those of recent and contemporary importance. Thus it provides useful information for undergraduate and graduate students as well as the occasional need for teachers and professors. Libraries should certainly consider purchasing a copy for general use.

It's always interesting to see what is included and excluded from such volumes of basic terms and how they are defined. This one has the virtue of being very explicit about its orientation. There is little with which to quibble concerning most definitions and discussions of terms; Jones even provides his own opinions on some issues. Most terms that I thought should be included were; the only ones missing were "beer and sandwiches," "yesterday's men," "abortion," "Blair's Babes," and *The Independent* (other contemporary newspapers are listed, even the non-political *Daily Sport*). I found two errors in the descriptions. Ireland is generally recognized as having received its independence in 1921, not 1949, but there is a discrepancy on this between the entries for Ireland (correct) and Government of Ireland Act 1920 (incorrect). Mo Mowlam taught at Florida State University in the US, not Florida University.

Some items seem esoteric. How many scholars could identify the following entries: Saint Kilda, Rajani Dutt Palme, Socialist Alliance, Socialist League, Socialist Labor Party, Socialist Party of Great Britain, "Napoleonic system," garbage-gate, golden triangle (nothing to do with drugs), Welsh Republican Movement, Free Wales Army, awkward squad (nothing to do with the EU).

There are several interesting features of the "people" section. First, major contemporary journalists and even civil servants are included (yes, Andrew

Gilligan and David Kelly are there). There are several people who work in No. 10 and the Prime Minister's office as well as a rather large number of secondary Labor ministers. Some questionable decisions are made—for instance, why include David Mellor, Nicholas Ridley, Derek Hatton, and Peter Tatchell, but not William Deedes, Paul Foot, Martin Jacques, or Tariq Ali; why Margaret Jay but not Peter Jay? Since this is primarily a work intended for a British audience, one might not expect many U.S. entries, except for those normally resident in the U.K. While Milton Friedman and George Mitchell make it, Sam Beer, Bill Clinton, and George Bush do not (although “weapons of mass destruction” does). According to Jones's entries, the major social scientists practicing in Britain have been Brian Barry, Vernon Bogdanor, David Butler, Ivor Crewe, Bernard Crick, Patrick Dunleavy, Anthony Giddens, Peter Hennessy, Dennis Kavanagh, Anthony King, David Marquand, Philip Norton, Ben Pimlott, Raymond Plant, Richard Rose, and Tony Wright.

Finally, a few academic organizations studying politics are listed, such as the PSA and the Politics Society. But where is the BPG? *Donley T. Studlar, West Virginia University*

John W. Young, *Britain and European Unity, 1945-1999* (Houndmills & New York: St. Martin's, 2000, 2nd ed., xii & 237 pp., Index, Bibliography, Cl. \$55.00

John Young's *Britain and European Unity* provides an engaging summary and analysis of Britain's relationship with its friends on the continent. With only about two hundred pages of text, the question is bound to emerge whether there is enough of interest to buy a book that was published five years ago. The short answer is yes, Professor Young provides a very readable (at least to this reviewer) presentation of what was going up to that point, coupled with insightful analysis about the politics of European cooperation.

The book is largely about British, rather than European, politics. In looking at the efforts of successive Governments, and of specific administrators, Young works to establish how much weight is actually being brought to bear by each actor. Rather than simply saying ‘something was the policy of thus-and-such Government,’ Young pursues the source of proposals aggressively: is something being done by the Foreign Office, or by the Cabinet? Does a policy reflect individual or national perspectives? This approach is essential in understanding the foreign

policy of democratic governments, yet too many people rush past such important details, or treat policy alternatives as having equal importance. Further, while there is lots of material on other countries and leaders, the focus here is on Britain. Discussion on non-British actors is usually more of a commentary on the brilliance or clumsiness of British policy, or a statement of policy, rather than a parallel analysis of foreign political infighting.

A second point is that, until the last chapter, the book is about politics, not policy. It does not really ask whether different efforts at unification are good or bad, but whether Britain was positioned to influence events. Analytically, this simplifies discussion, but presents both pluses and minuses. On the positive side, analyzing politics provides a recurrent theme of managing cooperation, so parallels between cases over time are more apparent. On the down side, not analyzing policy makes it difficult to evaluate the stakes in each case.

Analyzing politics alone says whether the British succeeded in promoting a particular point of view, but an assessment of policy might say whether a negotiation defeat was a total failure, or whether a worse outcome had been avoided. This problem can be seen in Young's treatment of federalism, where he makes a conscious decision to lump the cooperation choices into either inter-governmental cooperation or supranational coordination. Federalism becomes supranationalism, rather than remaining a distinct choice. Given the gradual transition in the US away from dual federalism, Young's view may well be correct, but he does not make this critique explicit. Further, federal and supranational perspectives are important divisions among pro-European groups, so leaving it out hampers the overall presentation.

The book's chapters appear as eight historical phases and a conclusion. The first chapter actually starts in 1929, adding an important element to understanding British behavior. Young's coverage is very good, but it would have been an interesting addition to note the Anglo-American effort at Bretton Woods to introduce Liberal trade policy world-wide. In this way, the fumbling mentioned in Chapter Two during the Schuman Plan, EDC plan and Treaty of Rome negotiations would have emerged in a different context. Young's treatment of the period otherwise is very thorough however, including brief discussion about Germany's Ludwig Erhard's role in the process. For a more detailed account, see Schaad's *Bullying Bonn* (St. Martin's, 2000).

The struggle between political performance and policy evaluation presented a problem in the first three chapters. Young echoes other writers about Britain's failure of leadership in participating in the evolution of the EEC. Although Young notes the weakness of the Sterling Area's emphasis on raw materials, he and the other writers miss the larger failure. EFTA made more sense from the standpoint of trade policy couched in liberal economic, comparative advantage terms. Being 'in on' the EEC negotiations meant that British leadership had already failed.

Subsequent chapters paint a vivid picture of the political minefield of developing Britain's European policy, whether speaking of Wilson, Heath, Thatcher, or Major. One is reminded of Napoleon's complaint of the 'Spanish ulcer,' a problem that provides no safe resolution, but which will not go away. The material new to this edition, dealing with the Major and Blair Governments makes these relationships especially poignant.

Young's conclusions point to the schizophrenia of British policy toward Europe: it wants to use cooperation with Europe as a way of shaping its place in the world. That is, being in Europe is part of the larger goal of working with Atlantic and Commonwealth partners to raise its status. This apparent contradiction echoes works like McKay's *Federalism and the European Union* (Oxford 1999), who argues that competing views on cooperation were emerging from internationalist and institutionalist perspectives.

Young's analysis suggests that Britain is not alone in this apparent schizophrenia: most European countries hope to shape the evolution of union in a way that will benefit their country. Even if London does not call the tune in Europe, it has provided a vision of possibilities for how to challenge the ponderous momentum of integration. *John H. P. Williams, East Carolina University*

Roger Matthews & Jock Young, eds. *The New Politics of Crime and Punishment* (Clumtom, Devon & Portland Ore.: Willan, distr. in U.S. by ISBS, 2003), xi & 260 pp., Index, Cl., \$59.95

In 1973, Jock Young and his colleagues at Middlesex Polytechnic (now Middlesex University) in North London published *The New Criminology* (Taylor et. al., 1973). This influential book gave rise to a leftist criminological paradigm that eventually came to be known as "left realism." In a related work Young criticized criminology "of the left" as being too idealistic and termed it "left idealism"

(Young 1979). He argued that leftist views of crime were idealistic because of an overemphasis on corporate crime and for romanticizing street criminals and ignoring the victims of crime.

Left realism argues that it is essential to include both victims and offenders in their relationship to each other, to the state's criminal justice agencies, and to the general public. They argue that the competitive individualism of capitalism produces inequality and "relative deprivations" that cause discontent and crime. People at the bottom of the heap are powerless to change their economic situation and become angry and violent. Rather than protect them from crime, police agencies tend to reinforce the inequalities, and the criminal justice system produces its own casualties within already impoverished neighborhoods.

The response to rising crime in the United States and Britain since 1980 has been to "get tough" on crime by focusing on massive use of incarceration at the expense of crime prevention. Young calls this approach "right realism." Instead of tougher sentences and more prisons, left realists prefer alternative practical policy interventions that deal with the immediacy of the crime problem and people's fear of crime (Lea and Young, 1984). These include preventive policies that (1) introduce problem solvers into working-class neighborhoods to defuse problems and to address residents' concerns through local crime surveys, (2) use alternative sanctions such as restitution and community service to "demarginalize" offenders and reintegrate them back into the community, and (3) encourage community involvement and democratically accountable control of the police by community citizens (Lanier and Henry, 1998:267).

Matthews and Young's book of readings, *The New Politics of Crime and Punishment* attempts to analyze the campaign promises and subsequent crime control policies implemented by Tony Blair's New Labour. Blair campaigned on the slogan "tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime" (p.5). This phrase was taken from an article he wrote for the *New Statesman* in 1993, "Crime is a Socialist Issue" (p.5). The article criticized the Tory's punitive program of punishment and imprisonment. He argued that Britains must be "tough on crime", that people have a right, and society a duty, to punish offenders who have violated the rights of citizens. And yet, he argues that society must also be tough on the causes of crime. "Above all, any sensible society acting in its own interests ... will recognize that poor education and housing, inadequate or cruel family

backgrounds, low employment prospects and drug abuse will affect the likelihood of young people turning to crime” (p.6). Blair introduced the phrase “social exclusion” which was to dominate New Labour’s thinking. From this perspective crime is caused by the criminogenic tendencies of the marginalized, individuals, families and communities at risk. The emphasis was placed on bringing young people back into the social and economic mainstream of society. The underpinning of Blair’s argument is the New Labour credo of rights and responsibilities. “People have the right to security, job opportunities, a stable community; against this they have the responsibilities to act honestly, not violate the rights of other citizens, and actively participate in the workforce” (p.6).

Labour came into office by promising to be both tough on crime and to practice inclusive (rather than the Tory exclusive) strategies of crime control. Social inclusion would tackle the structural causes of exclusion by embracing measures necessary for “the realization of full citizenship economically, socially, and politically” (p.26). The recurring theme of the essays in this book is that Labour succeeded in getting and remaining tough on crime, but pursued the “politics of inclusion” with less rigor. Eventually, it appears that the Labour government talked a good game when it came to social inclusion, but eventually failed its efforts to be “tough on the causes of crime.”

The first two essays by the authors outline the philosophy and political history of Blair’s approach to crime and make for an excellent summary. Subsequent essays seem to add little to the substance of the first two essays. Since the book is written by criminologists, the politics of Blair’s crime control are given short shrift. This is a major limitation to the book. It is important to understand the reasons that the politics of inclusion failed. It is never made clear the extent to which Blair’s new criminology contributed to his election. It is also never made clear why the Labour government never pushed its inclusion agenda once in office.

There is a large literature on the relationship between punishment and politics, mostly American. Specifically, Elliott Currie (1998) and David Garland (2001) both have excellent analyses of the functions of crime in politics. The essayists in this volume largely ignore this literature. The exception may be Patrick Slaughter’s article “Of Crowds, Crimes, and Carnivals” in which he analyzes the rise of football “hooliganism” in Europe. He argues that this phe-

nomenon coincides with the growing marginalization of the working class, rising unemployment, high immigration levels and increasing racial tensions.

The concluding essay, “Rethinking Penal Policy: Towards a Systems Approach” by Roger Matthews is an excellent outline of proposals to replace massive imprisonment with intermediate sanctions in the community. He argues that the failed promise of Blair’s inclusive strategy can still be accomplished by shifting policy and resources to public service sentencing, drug treatment, and “reentry” strategies to help integrate convicts back into the community. This essay, while critical of the New Labor government, still holds out hope that the promise of “New Realism” can still be implemented in Britain.

In conclusion, I would recommend this book to anyone interested in learning more about recent crime control policies in Britain. The first two essays in the book are especially informative. If you are interested in the relationship between crime and public policy, you will have to look elsewhere.

Bibliography:

- Tony Blair, “Why Crime is a Socialist Issue,” *The New Statesman* (1993) 29(12) 27-28
- Elliott Currie, *Crime and Punishment in America* (New York: Henry Holt. Co., 1998)
- David Garland, *The Culture of Control Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001)
- Mark Lanier and Stuart Henry, *Essential Criminology* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, 1998)
- John Lea and Jock Young, *What is To Be Done About Law and Order?* (Hammondsworth: Penguin, 1984)
- Taylor, Ian, Paul Walton and Jock Young, *The New Criminology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973)
- Jock Young, “Left Idealism, Reformism and Beyond,” in Bob Fine, Richard Kinsey, John Lea, Sol Picciotto, and Jock Young (eds.), *Capitalism and the Rule of Law* London: Hutchinson, 1979)
- William J. Farrell, *Indiana University Southeast*

Kevin Theakston, *Winston Churchill and the British Constitution* (London: Politico's, 2004), vii & 263 pp., Cl. £20.00.

Constitutional matters are prominent in contemporary commentary about politics in the UK. Churchill, who is regularly ranked as one of the leading prime minister of the twentieth century (See the Theakston and Gill article *supra*.) had many excellent leadership qualities, but one doesn't associate him with legal profundity. Kevin Theakston examines Churchill's views on that most weighty of legal matters: the Constitution.

Churchill's writings and speeches are voluminous and Theakston has mined them with meticulous attention. After an introductory chapter that addresses Churchill's general views on democracy and constitutionalism, including the parallels between the American and British constitutions, Theakston devotes a chapter to Churchill's recommendations for reforming the House of Lords. Winnie's stance during the 1909-1911 controversy has been examined in several publications, but his subsequent recommendations especially in the 1920s, as well as later, have garnered less analysis. As one would expect, the future P.M. had a different view of the upper chamber when initially standing as a Tory candidate for Parliament in the 1890s than as a member of the Liberal cabinet in the years just prior to World War One. From the latter years, he maintained a long commitment to versions of the Ripon plan, whereby some members of chambers would meet to work out solutions to legislative matters. Given his admiration for the 1911 Act, it was not surprising that he opposed its amendment by the 1949 Act. Later in the chapter, Theakston recounts the proposal of the early 1950s that Churchill accept a peerage but continue, with Anthony Eden leading the Government in the Commons, as P.M. Other key figures found this desirable, but not Churchill, who would later personally endorse Tony (nee Anthony Wedgewood) Benn's successful effort to permit peers to disclaim their titles.

Chapter Three, "Home Rule, Devolution and Heptarchy," addresses that self-inflicted thorn in the side of the British body-politic – Ireland and the quasi-federal issues that emerged from its struggle for independence. As with his views on the Lords, Churchill, in the 1890s a devoted Unionist, would largely reverse his stance on Home Rule. His support for Home Rule was pragmatic. As examples: He noted that in 1880, the population of Ireland was 5,000,000 compared with Britain's 10,500,000; by

1911 the respective figures were 4,000,000 and 41,000,000. (Even with its greatly reduced portion of the UK population, the number of Irish MPs were critical in passage of the 1911 constitutional amendment.) Moreover, it would more efficient if regional legislative bodies masticated those issues pertaining only to their geographic areas (Ireland, Scotland, and Wales) and delete those items from the menu at Westminster, which could confine itself to chewing on national and imperial morsels. As have others that have written on Churchill and Home Rule, such as Paul Addison, Mary Bromage, and Robert Rhodes James, Theakston concurs that the issue had a low priority on Winston's policy agenda. At one point in the pre-WWI years and long before the 'West Lothian' phrase was uttered, Churchill laid out a detailed proposal for devolution, including ten regional governments. This was a non-starter. Asquith rejected a return to the Heptarchy of older days. (pp. 75-76) Later, the future P.M. would propose sixteen regional governments, but that also was dead upon arrival. (p. 88) The last subtopic in the chapter is local government, for which Churchill had little patience, a sentiment partially shared by this reviewer, who has held minor posts at that level separated by more than a half century.

In the fourth chapter, "Trust the people," Theakston examines Churchill's positions on women's suffrage, elections and election reform, and referendums. Churchill was for women voting, but with reservations, opposing in the mid-1920s lowering their qualifying age. He enjoyed election campaigning, advocating longer campaigns, favored compulsory voting and plural voting, as well as frequently expressed support for PR, but at the same time did not want the chaos he saw in the coalition governments of foreign nations. Given his great respect for Parliament, it is not surprising that he was opposed to referenda. [Pardon the spelling, but exposure to a minimal education in Latin at an impressionable age conditions this reviewer to be uncomfortable when he encounters the plural of referendum as "referendums." Old habits do die hard!]

Chapter Five, "Churchill and the House of Commons" details the great affection and admiration that Churchill had for that chamber, yet he was never a master of its procedure. Instead, as Attlee noted, Churchill was a great parliamentary figure, not a great parliamentarian. (p. 136). He proposed shorter sessions to enable the members to more fully comprehend the issues, impose a less burdensome task on

the citizens, who needed to know what Parliament was considering, and to reduce the number of bad bills that might be introduced. Perhaps influenced by his role as Chancellor – a strange responsibility for one who admittedly was ignorant of economics and whose personal finances were persistently woeful - in 1930 he proposed creation of an Economic Sub-Parliament, another non-starter. After setting out Churchill's views on the role of an MP and that of Parliament in wartime, Theakston points out the flaws that have been observed in Churchill's view of the Commons, such as its ability to hold a Government accountable. That certainly was not the case during his tenure at Number Ten, and is arguably less so with the current occupant.

In the chapter, "Churchill and Whitehall," this significant relationship is summed up in the opening paragraph, noting that great man served with or led seven departments over a span of 30 years, Theakston writes: "In one sense he was a civil servant's ideal minister: decisive, self-confident, industrious and battling hard for his policies at cabinet level. But he was always impulsive, erratic, capricious, argumentative and domineering – he was never an easy minister to work for and at times could be pretty impossible." (p.155)

One is unlikely to challenge Theakston's treatment of Churchill's position on the premiership and the Cabinet (Chapter Seven), although one might dissent on the analysis of the selection of Churchill as P.M. in 1940. Theakston is correct that a poll of the Tory MPs would not have given Churchill a majority. Yet with the overwhelming opposition by Labour to Lord Halifax and the precedent set by George V in selecting Stanley Baldwin rather than Lord Curzon in the early 1920s, and the likelihood that some Tories might have joined the Labour benches in support of Churchill, it seems improbable that Halifax would have prevailed over Churchill, despite the evident preference of George VI for Halifax.

Churchill's deep admiration for the monarchy is well known (Chapter Eight). Theakston finds Churchill's views of that institution to be more complex than a superficial perusal of Churchill's statements on the topic might imply. Impressive to this reviewer is the author's comments on the abdication crisis of the 1930s, where, in retrospect, Churchill clearly misjudged Edward VIII's character and the extent of his love for Wallis Simpson. That was not just a passing fancy and the Duke of Windsor could well have been a travesty had he not abdicated.

This is a book to be recommended for those that want to know more about Churchill, whose constitutional views were generally not original – whose are? – or an introduction to significant events in early 20th century politics, especially constitutional matters. Theakston has produced a well written treatise, although this reviewer might suggest the use of additional commas and dashes in the aftermath of his recent exposure to Lynne Truss, *Eats, Shoots & Leaves: The Zero Tolerance Approach to Punctuation*.

Libraries have many, many volumes on Churchill, yet this reviewer found it particularly appropriate to be reading Theakston's analysis forty years after the death of the great man and his magisterial funeral that was broadcast worldwide in January 1965. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

Oonagh Gay & Patricia Leopold, eds., *Conduct Unbecoming: The Regulation of Parliamentary Behavior* (London: Politico's, distr. in US by ISBS 2004), 378 pp., Index, Cl. \$39.95

This volume is difficult to review, not because it is unworthy of that effort, but because it is so rich in information and analysis. It holds eight chapters, plus an Introduction, Conclusion, and three appendices: Code of Conduct for Members in the House of Commons, The Minimum Requirements for fairness, and Code of Conduct for Members of the House of Lords. The appendices alone make the book something that students of British politics might wish to have on their book shelves.

The substantive topics, chapter titles are; The Hamilton affair; Media coverage of political scandals; The development of standards machinery in the Commons; The investigation and appeals process in the Commons since 1993; Parliament and the law relating to Parliamentary Standards; The Regulation of Standards of Conduct in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland; The Commonwealth, Ireland, and the United States Standards of Conduct in the House of Lords.

The Introduction by Oonagh Gay and Michael Rush is particularly recommended. It offers the historical background of the issue, as well as the general structure in which the topic should be framed. Along with that piece, the Conclusion by Patricia Leopold is also notable for its contemplation of what has been achieved in Britain and what one might expect in the future.

Upon reading this book, one is reminded, if not initially made aware, of the complexity of the misconduct issue, and gains an understanding of why MPs, as well as members of other legislative bodies are reluctant to confront this topic.

Admittedly, this reviewer found it more enjoyable to read about the John Profumo Affair four decades back than the cases examined in this anthology! *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

POT POURRI XLII

American knowledge of Britain and of European history exposed once again – Don Imus, whose radio/TV program is broadcast each weekday in the States nationwide, commented (03/Jan/2005) upon his family's trip to England over the holidays: "We visited Windsor Castle. There were a lot of planes flying over it, making a lot of noise. *Why would you build a castle so close to an airport?*" [Emphasis added.]

He was also puzzled by the reports of David Blunkett's *affaire d'amour*. Imus characterized the photographs of the female in question as not visually attractive. An aide noted that this was irrelevant since Blunkett is blind. To clarify matters, he had Tina Brown on his program the next day.

Come again? – [John H.P. Williams brought this item to our attention.] It's time again for the annual Plain English Awards, when the worst examples of gobbledegook win recognition. So who, err, won? The annual Foot in Mouth award winner for the most baffling statement by a public figure went to **Boris Johnson** for the following nugget of nebulosity: "I could not fail to disagree with you less." Mr Johnson spoke the line in a December 2003 edition of the BBC TV quiz "Have I got News For You." The Plain English Awards also highlighted eight particularly testing examples of corporate gobbledegook.

1. Bank of Scotland for a letter to Scottish Widows (with a copy to a customer) – "We hereby give you notice that Bank of Scotland have retrocessed, reponed and restored Executors and Assignees, in and to their own right and place in the undernoted policy of Assurance by our Office, Videlicet."

2. British Airways for terms and conditions – "Charges for changes and cancellations Note - cancellations - before departure fare is refundable. If combining a non-refundable fare with a refundable fare only the y/c/j-class half return amount can be refunded. After departure fare is refundable. If combining a non-refundable fare with a refundable fare refund the difference /if any/between the fare paid and the applicable normal BA oneway fare. Changes/upgrades- permitted anytime."

3. Department of Health for a definition of a container in the Medicines for Human Use (Clinical Trials) Regulations 2004 – "Container", in relation to an investigational medicinal product, means the bottle, jar, box, packet or other receptacle which contains or is to contain it, not being a capsule, cachet or other article in which the product is or is to be administered, and where any such receptacle is or is to be contained in another such receptacle, includes the former but does not include the latter receptacle"

4. European Commission for Innovate for a Competitive Europe consultation document - Highlights include, "The Commission will introduce aid to innovation in the future 'LASA' (aids without a significant impact on competition) instrument 46. Before the end of 2004 it will elaborate a Vademecum on the State aid rules applicable in the field of innovation. In the context of Better Regulation, the Commission will develop ex-ante assessment of the impact of regulations and standards on innovation. The Commission and the Member States will work to unlock clusters, through internationalisation, inter-regional cooperation and cross-sector fertilisation. Sector-specific benchmarking and dissemination of best practices will be encouraged by extending the current PAXIS initiative 38 to local systems of innovation and cluster."

5. The GENIUS project (based at the University of Reading) for a project overview - "The project is structured around multifaceted incremental work plan combining novel content design based on new pedagogical paradigms blended with the e-learning environments to facilitate hybrid mode of delivery. This is combined with series of educational experiments on the target learner groups with possibilities to adjust the approach and disseminate the interim and final results."

Our pedagogical approach is based on the educational model which assumes that the learning process is an interactive process of seeking understanding, consisting of three fundamental components: Conceptualization, Construction and Dialogue. The relevant modules of the New Curricula are mapped onto these three components and a hybrid way of delivery is investigated through different scenarios.”

6. Panorama Software for a brochure advertising a seminar with Microsoft – “Accountability has taken on a new meaning. Any employee that can impact results must be empowered to make decisions. How do you provide information access and business visibility universally across your enterprise? The Panorama Software and Microsoft Roundtable is gathering leading minds in business intelligence and the analyst community for expert consensus on the answer. Dialogue and discourse will focus on how business intelligence can address key strategic challenges concerning customers, costs, competition and change. Industry experts will highlight how you can leverage business intelligence to provide visibility into business critical information.”

7. Trilogy Telecom for an e-mail to a customer - “BT have started processing the first stage of our MPF orders i.e. the line test and production of a line characteristics report. However with the second stage (i.e. physically installing the metallic facility path between the customers line and the Trilogy equipment) they will only walk one or two orders through the system Thursday of next week.” (“Physically installing the metallic facility path” appears to be better known as “laying the cable”.)

8. TriMedia for a press statement by CEO Chris Schwartz about a partnership to promote Captain Scarlet – “The combination of Gerry Anderson’s creativity and state-of-the-art high-definition animated production and production facilities, Sony’s global strength in providing a one-stop global solution to develop Captain Scarlet product iterations across all media platforms, ability to define and launch a business management strategy leveraging Sony’s market strength in each category and our ability at TriMedia to converge the film and music worlds independently with vertical and street marketing expertise will prove to be of great benefit for all involved. I believe that a cross-pollination of creative properties in multiple media formats with a vertical market approach allows companies to maximize the return for their investment in creative properties and talents and will prove to be the economic engine for our industry in the future.”

Speculating on Blair’s post-General Election

2005 – Damian Whitworth recently offered this hypothetical scenario of the ‘PM-for-life (?)’ – May 6, 2005 – Whitworth visits T. Blair at Number Ten where the victor offered these remarks, “New Labour is now the natural party of government. People were so confident we would win that they didn’t feel the need to vote. The fact that they stayed away in droves, ensuring the lowest turnout in history, is evidence of how contented the electorate is with us.”

May 12, 2005 – Blair is in Washington to receive the Congressional Medal of Honor for his role as “joint commander-in-chief in the triumphant War on Terror.” There a Senator suggests that the Constitutional amendment “so that Arnold Schwarzeneger could run for President be extended to make it legal that any British PM with a medal of honor to be drafted as a candidate.”

July 6, 2005 - Blair mentions to John Britt that he had been looking forward to opening the Olympic Games but that event had been awarded to Paris. Britt responds, “But the games are in 2012” and “You said you won’t run for a fourth term.” To which Blair replies, “I cannot foresee the circumstances under which I would be compelled for the sake of the British people to change my mind.” [Source: *The Times* (6 January 2005), “Voters stayed away in droves – proving how they like Labour.” *Thanks to Richard Rose for recommending this.*]

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Kudos - Several BPG members have contributed to recent media reports. **Tony King** analyzed You/Gov survey data for a *news.Telegraph* article (03/Jan/02005) on how Brits rated nearly two dozen nations on 12 criteria. **Wyn Grant**, **George Jones**, and **Paul Whiteley** in an *AFP web-article* (27/Jan/2005) directed to the impact of the Iraqi elections on British policy in Iraq and that issue on the expected forthcoming election.

Wyn Grant has a website www.footballeconomy.com - Voted by readers of *When Saturday Comes* as one of the best 20 football related sites on the internet. It is now getting up to 1,000 hits a day.

We take this opportunity to recognize landmark events in the lives of two long time members of our organization: **Bob Worcester** and **Bill Muller**.

On 10 January 2005, **Robert M. Worcester** was appointed by Her Majesty as Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire (KBE). Bob moved from the States to the UK in 1969 to create MORI (Market & Opinion Research International), which is now one of the 20th largest research enterprises of its kind in the world. He became a UK citizen in 2004 after becoming a Deputy Lieutenant of the County of Kent.

The holder of four honorary degrees, Bob is a Governor of both the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) and the University of Kent. He has held Visiting Professorships at the LSE, the City University of London, and the University of Strathclyde, and is currently Honorary Professor at Warwick University and the University of Kent.

Among other offices, he is Chairman of the Pilgrims Society, a Governor of the English-Speaking Union, a Governor of the Ditchley Foundation, a Member of the Fulbright Commission, and a Freeman of the City of London. Bob is also frequent commentator in both the broadcast and print media.

For the British Politics Group, he is an invaluable source of information and wisdom about British topics, especially those pertaining to public opinion. Just one example of MORI's contribution – and at least indirectly, Bob's – is found in the article *supra* "Ranking British Prime Ministers."

Bill Muller, one of the BPG stalwarts, is retiring at SUNY Fredonia. **Jorgen Rasmussen**, the first Executive Secretary of our group, offers these remarks about Muller:

"In the days when the 'country' groups were young, the executive secretary of the German group told me that he was resigning because he did not want to be known as "the guy who did the newsletter." After mulling over that view, I concluded that if something was worth doing and if you could do it well, no disgrace attached to being identified with it.

"William Muller, who in January retired from the State University of New York Fredonia, is known to specialists in British politics for his work on trade unions and their relations with the *Labour Party*. *The Kept Men? The First Century of Trade Union Representation in the House of Commons, 1874-1975* was typical of Bill's output: comprehensive and thorough. His diligent research yielded information well beyond what previous writers on the topic had provided.

"For those of us, however, who were active in the early days of the BPG, Bill will always be 'the guy who did the *Research Register*.' I no longer recall whether Bill played the role of Mickey Rooney (we could put on a Broadway show in the backyard). Regardless of whether he or someone else first suggested such a publication, Bill assumed responsibility for it. The RR was intended to be a major factor in helping to create a community of scholars. Its detailed biographical entries made scholars who were

only names on articles and books come alive with information about education, academic appointments, and current research activities. For academic networking the RR clearly surpassed the APSA biographical directory.

"Bill saw the International Register of Research on British Politics, as it came to be titled, through eight editions. What even those who identified Bill with the RR generally didn't realize was the work he did to obtain institutional support for the publication. The great bulk of staff and office expenses incurred were covered by Fredonia. Had Bill not chosen the academic life, he probably, given his powers of persuasion, would have been a big success in diplomacy.

"Even with his Herculean efforts to obtain financing, the publication finally had to be abandoned for lack of funds. Production and mailing costs became prohibitive. In some senses the RR was a victim of Bill's accomplishments. He had made it so comprehensive and detailed that it had become a full-sized volume. Bill's success in finding a commercial publisher maintained the RR for awhile.

"The *Membership Directory*, that replaced the RR, was only a bare bones successor. Fortunately, by this time the BPG had become institutionalized. The networking which Bill's RR had helped to establish took on a synergy of its own. With the BPG now in its fourth decade, the organization clearly met a need. By facilitating a community of scholars the BPG played a significant role in furthering the study of British politics. Bill Muller-the guy who did the RR - was a key influence during the BPG's formative stage."

OTHER

Anthony Terrell Seward Sampson died December 18, 2004 at age 78. Although, Sampson was a journalist rather than a professional academic, his impact on the study of British politics was substantial over the last four decades, at least for American students of British politics. Among his 21 books, *The Anatomy of Britain* (1962) offered insight about the workings of British society and politics that was not available in any textbook at the time. It was often supplemental reading for courses on British politics at American universities. Three subsequent revisions of that work with new titles sustained his influence among American Anglophiles. His 1967 biography of Harold Macmillan, *Macmillan: A Study in Ambiguity*, remains the best, brief work about 'Supermac.'

The scope of his writing was not restricted to the UK. Among non-British works, his authorized biography of Nelson Mandela stands out. *T.P. Wolf*

Winter 2005, No 119

IN THIS ISSUE

Activities	Page 2
Announcements	Page 3
From the BPG-L	Page 5
Articles	Page 6
Abstracts	Page 9
Book Reviews	Page 10
Pot Pourri	Page 17
Membership News	Page 18



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