



British Politics Group NEWSLETTER+

Officers

President

Wyn Grant 2004-2006
University of Warwick

Executive Committee

Karen Beckwith 2004-2006
College of Wooster

Samuel H. Beer 2004-2006
Harvard University

Sarah Childs 2004-2006
University of Bristol

Mark Franklin 2005-2007
Trinity College

Rachael Gibson 2005-2007
Australian National University

Ian McAllister 2004-2006
Australia National University

Pippa Norris 2005-2007
Harvard University

Donley Studlar 2005-2007
West Virginia University

Paul Whiteley 2005-2007
University of Essex

Graham Wilson 2004-2006
University of Wisconsin

Executive Director

Terrence Casey
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

Fall 2005, No 122

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Awards	Page 2
Activities	Page 4
Announcements	Page 6
Following Up	Page 9
From the BPG-L	Page 10
Articles	
The Trade Unions and the Labour Party by Wyn Grant	Page 13
Chairing a Parliamentary Committee by Professor The Lord Norton of Louth	Page 14
On Becoming a London Cabbie by Kevin Portch	Page 15
Abstracts	Page 16
Book Reviews	
T. P. Wolf on: <i>Modernising the Labour Party</i> by Quinn	Page 17
<i>Churchill and Strategic Dilemmas Before the World War</i> edited by Maurer	Page 18
<i>Forty Ways to Look at Winston Churchill</i> by Rubin	Page 20
<i>The Thames</i> by Schneer	Page 20
Pot Pourri	Page 20
Membership News	Page 23
Other	Page 23

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

Terrence Casey, Executive Director
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
5500 Wabash Avenue
Terre Haute, IN 47803
casey1@rose-hulman.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. Dues and inquiries about membership in the British Politics Group should be directed to the Executive Director – 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 Conference Paper on British Politics by a graduate student. Submissions for the Christoph Prize should be made to the Executive Director by October 15 following the meeting at which the paper is presented. Inquiries about the Beer Prize, the Stokes Fellowship, and the Christoph Prize should be made to the Executive Director. 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 services.

EDITOR'S REMARKS

(We intend for this to be a regular feature of the Newsletter. TPW)

The highlight of BPG events at the APSA Annual Meeting was the Friday evening, September 2, 2005 reception at the residence of the Deputy British Ambassador, Alan Charlton. Some members will recall gathering at this impressive site a few years back.

After drinks and *hors d'oeuvres*, Mr. Charlton, and BPG President Wyn Grant made a few comments, followed by Sam Beer, who praised Donley Studlar for the excellent service, he had rendered to the BPG over his eleven years as Executive Secretary, Sam's words were notably appropriate since Donley was the first

recipient of the Beer Prize. Graham Wilson then presented Donley with a large framed print, and Tom Wolf, offered a few comments on his collaboration, as BPGN editor, with Donley and, on behalf of the BPG, presented him with a certificate of appreciation for outstanding service to the BPG. Donley concluded the ceremony with an expression of appreciation to our organization.

At that time, Donley received a framed political satire print from the 1831 debate on suffrage, a bottle of single malt Scotch whiskey, a bottle of Jacob's Creek wine, and a framed certificate of appreciation. During a previous luncheon, he was given by a person of lupine name, a large coffee cup and saucer, made in England, of course, entitled 'Very Important Person,' which this lad from the west Texas plains certainly is. (For Donley's reaction to the marking of his departure from his BPG post, see **OTHER** at the end of this edition of the newsletter.)

The British political scene has lost three distinguished members in recent weeks: Robin Cook, Ted Heath, and Marjorie "Mo" Mowlam. "Mo" was a great hit when she spoke at our reception at the penultimate Boston APSA meeting. She filled the reception hall. One must not forget the passing of James Callaghan in April of this year. Perhaps there has been another short period in which so many political figures of such stature passed on, but I don't recall one. *T.P.W.*

AWARDS

The Samuel H. Beer Prize - **Richard Katz**, Johns Hopkins University, chaired the selection committee, whose other members were **Alexandra Dobrowolsky**, St. Mary's University (Halifax), and **William Messmer**, Drew University.

The recipient of the award was Scott Edward Lennarson Greer, for his dissertation, "Self-Government: The Politics of Regional Autonomy in Scotland and Catalonia" (Northwestern University, 2003). At the time of award, Greer was with the Political Science Department, School of Public Policy, University College, London. This fall, he has taken a position with Department of Health Management and Policy, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

Katz offered these remarks on behalf of the selection committee: "We had five dissertations to consider, which of course opened up the possibility of endless debate. But in this case, although the contenders were all very good, one dissertation stood out, and rather than having to reach agreement, we started with unanimity."

“This really is a piece of work that has all the things one would like to see in a dissertation: It’s well-written. It addresses a wide range of literature, and does so with intelligence and insight. Its methodology is sophisticated. Its argument is convincing.

“The question that Greer addresses is why nationalism in ‘stateless nations’ like Catalonia, Flanders, Quebec, and Scotland has fed into a global trend towards regionalization, rather than persisting in its original demands for secession and a separate state – or at least why that has happened in the first and last of these cases, which are the two addressed in the thesis.

“Rather than impose my interpretation in summarizing the thesis, let me simply give a very closely paraphrase of Greer’s own abstract:

“The study argues that the dynamics explaining the demand for greater self-government in Scotland and Catalonia also explain why they stopped short of secession – that is, it argues that the same actors that drove the process also provided the brakes. The actors were strong complexes of regional organizations that, like most organizations were seeking their own autonomy and environmental stability. Their interests included the formal or informal autonomy AND stability of the region. Because they were dependent on their regions for their resources, they would either sink or swim.

“The result of the dual objectives of their organization – BOTH autonomy AND stability – meant they would support regional autonomy when the centralizing state was the greatest threat, but oppose further autonomy if it threatened the destabilizing prospect of secession. Their primary mode of gaining and exercising influence was by making political parties resource dependent upon them.

“In more detail, in Scotland, initial proposals for devolution in the 1970s failed when many regional organizations opposed devolution a threat to stability. The experience of the centralizing Conservative governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major, however, converted their opposition in support for devolution in reaction to the loss of previously informal autonomy.

“In Catalonia, the nationalist party in office since 1980 has successfully built its relationships with regional organizations on the basis of winning autonomy and guaranteeing stability for them.

“This general argument is supplemented and advanced with reference to a series of case studies that explain how higher education, health, pre-university

education, and industrial policy each were regionalized when there was a pre-existing group of regional organizations that sought their own autonomy through a strategy of greater regional autonomy.”

(Editor’s note: This Scott Greer is the son of the late-distinguished sociologist of the same name.)

The James B. Christoph Prize for the Best Paper on British Politics Presented at a Professional Meeting (2004 competition)

Seth Kincaid Jolly, Duke University, “Determinants of Regional Party Success in Western Europe,” Midwest Political Science Association Annual Meeting, April 2004, Chicago

Abstract: “As European countries continue along their path to a deeper and wider Union, the prospect of state fragmentation continues to threaten the traditional boundaries of Europe. But the literature neglects an important theoretical and empirical question: does European integration increase sub-national mobilization within European Union member states? In an attempt to extend earlier works on sub-national mobilization, I suggest the following causal mechanism: European integration has created conditions under which regional groups (e.g. the Scottish) may not need the state (e.g. United Kingdom) to survive internationally. First, I consider the Alesina and Spolaore (1997; 2003) model for optimal size of nations and tease out observable implications for empirical research. Second, utilizing the hypotheses developed in the theoretical discussion, I analyze the electoral support of regional parties. Using a dataset of district-level *electoral and regional political economic variables*, I find that deeper European integration does indeed increase electoral support for regional political parties in the districts in which they compete. For the multi-level governance literature, this finding provides clear evidence that European integration has tangible effects on domestic politics.”

Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Fellowship for dissertation research - There were two applicants for the Donald E. Stokes Award for Ph.D. research. The selection committee of Ian McAllister (Chair, ANU), Janet Laible (Lehigh) and Jerold Waltman (Baylor) bestowed that prize on Stuart Tandler, a Ph.D. student at the University of Texas, for work on his dissertation, “Britain a Reluctant European? Great Britain, Europe, and Immigration and Asylum Policy.”

ACTIVITIES

CALL FOR PAPERS - 2006 British Politics Group Panels, 31 August – 4 September 2006, Philadelphia PA (at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association).

The BPG is accepting proposals for talks, papers, panels and roundtables for the 2006 Annual Meeting. Proposals on all aspects of UK politics are invited, including domestic, transnational and international politics; proposals that consider the UK in a comparative perspective are also welcome. Paper proposals should include an abstract of the paper and full contact details for the presenter; panel proposals should include an abstract for each paper and full contact details for each participant. The deadline for submitting all proposals is 1 December 2005 (note: this is slightly later than the deadline for submissions to APSA divisions).

Send proposals and queries to the 2006 BPG Program Organizer: Janet Laible, Department of Political Science, Lehigh University, 9 W. Packer Avenue, Bethlehem PA, 18015, United States. E-mail: jml6@lehigh.edu -Tel: 610 758 5879, Fax: 610 758 3348

E-mail proposals are preferred. Every effort will be made to acknowledge proposals within three weeks of receipt. Please note that all presenters must be dues-paying members of the BPG.

Executive Committee Election Results –

The BPG Executive Committee ballots are in and tallied. The winners are (in alphabetical order, not order of votes received):

Mark Franklin, Trinity College
Rachael Gibson, Australian National University
Pippa Norris, Harvard University
Susan Scarrow, University of Houston
Donley Studlar, West Virginia University
Paul Whiteley, University of Essex

The election was very close, requiring recount upon recount, court challenges (this is America!) and the like. A whopping total of four votes separated the #2 from the #8 candidate. We ended up with six winners because two people tied for the fifth slot. All told, 61 ballots were cast for a 35% 'turnout' — better than APSA got for its election I would note. Those elected will join Karen Beckwith, Samuel Beer, Sarah Childs, and Graham Wilson, all of whom have one more year on their terms.

Many thanks to those who have served on the BPG Executive Committee and to those who are about to serve. Cheers, *Terry*

Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, September 4, 2005

“The Executive Committee of the British Politics Group met for over lunch at noon, September 3, 2004, in the Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D.C... Present were Executive Committee members Wyn Grant (President), Terry Royed, David Baker, Ian McAllister, Justin Fisher, and Tom Wolf. Donley Studlar (ex officio) attended as Executive Secretary. Terrence Casey, the new BPG Executive Director, and Janet Laible, Program Organizer for 2006-2008, attended by invitation. Copies of the Executive Secretary's report had been distributed.

“The first order of business was to approve the appointment of Terrence Casey as the new Executive Director of the BPG, with full powers over BPG finances. Transition arrangements are well underway for Casey to take over the duties of this position and will continue. There was general contentment with the reception given for BPG members on Friday, September 2, by Deputy Ambassador Alan Charlton of the Washington Embassy at his residence. Studlar indicated he would be expressing his personal thanks for the honors bestowed on him to all BPG members after the meeting. Wyn Grant will continue as BPG President for 2005-2006. Under the new Constitution, balloting for the Executive Committee automatically will take place after the meeting. The Beer and Stokes prizes will continue in the present format and were approved. Casey suggested that the Christoph prize be changed to be one for a junior faculty member since we already had two prizes for graduate students. After discussion, this was approved as well.

“Casey, Royed, and Laible had attended the APSA Program Organizers' meeting earlier in the day. They reported that procedures for panels for the 2006 meeting in Philadelphia will remain largely the same. Although satisfaction was expressed with the content of the Year in Review, there was unfavorable comment about the APSA switching the session to a much smaller room than originally scheduled. The room was full as well as hot, and some people were discouraged from remaining, which lowered the attendance.

“BPG finances remain healthy. There have been no dues increases for at least eleven years. Studlar indicated the procedures followed to boost membership during his first year in office, which had remained stable at slightly above 200 ever since. There was some discussion about trends in women mem-

bers. Studlar said that along with the past President, Susan Scarrow, he had worked tried to recruit more women members, to minimal effect. Studlar revived previous discussions for thinking about possible special conferences in the U.S. that the BPG could co-sponsor, along the lines of the ones at Berkeley in 1995 and Norman, Oklahoma in 2002. There also was general discussion about possible speakers for the Year in Review in 2006.

“The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:30 P.M. This is my last act as BPG Executive Secretary. Respectfully submitted,
Donley T. Studlar, Executive Secretary”

Samuel H. Beer Prize of the British Politics Group, 2006

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 2006 award of \$300 for the best doctoral dissertation in British politics completed during the calendar years 2003, 2004, or 2005. 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, 2006 and sent to:

Terrence Casey, Executive Director,
British Politics Group
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
5500 Wabash Avenue
Terre Haute, IN 47803
Email: casey1@rose-hulman.edu
Phone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

The winner of the award will be announced at the BPG's annual business meeting at the 2006 APSA convention in Philadelphia.

2006 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 US 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, 2006. 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 2006 through August, 2007. 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, 2007, 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, 2006. 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*.

Applications should be sent to:

Terrence Casey, Executive Director,
British Politics Group
Dept. of Humanities and Social Sciences
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
5500 Wabash Avenue
Terre Haute, IN 47803
Email: casey1@rose-hulman.edu
Phone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

2006 James B. Christoph Prize for the Best Conference Paper on British Politics by a Junior Faculty Member (Please note that the eligibility for this award is no longer for graduate students but for fresh Ph.D.s or non-tenured faculty.)

The fifth annual James B. Christoph Award for the Best Conference Paper on British Politics presented

by a junior faculty member will be awarded by the British Politics Group. The paper (or poster) must be presented at a conference during the calendar year 2005. All papers on British politics, whether solely on Britain or comparative, are eligible. The author/presenter must have: (a) already received his or her Ph.D. at the time the paper was presented; and (b) been an untenured, full-time (tenure-track or visiting) or part-time faculty member 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. The prize is named in honor of the late James B. Christoph, a leading scholar and former President of the BPG.

Applications should be sent to:

Terrence Casey, Executive Director,
British Politics Group
Department of Humanities and Social Sciences
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
5500 Wabash Avenue
Terre Haute, IN 47803
Email: casey1@rose-hulman.edu
Phone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Publications – John Bartle and Anthony King, eds., *Britain at the Polls* (Washington: CQ Press, 2005) pb. \$29.95.

Pippa Norris & Christopher Wlezien, eds., *Britain Votes 2005* (Oxford & New York: Oxford Journals & Hansard Society Series in Politics and Government, 2005), pb. \$35.00.

Call for Nominations: The European Politics and Society Section of the APSA is seeking nominations for its: Best Book on European politics and society published during 2005.

Deadline: March 1, 2006

The Section's Prize for Best Book published on European Politics and Society during 2005 will be awarded by a committee consisting of Jeffrey Anderson, Frank Schimmelfennig, and Craig Parson. Books to be considered for this award must be nominated by the publisher by March 1, 2006 (we cannot accept self-nominations). Please send a letter of nomination and one copy of the book to each committee member. For inquiries, please contact Professor Jeffrey Anderson (jja5@georgetown.edu).

Prize committee:

* Professor Jeffrey Anderson (chair), BMW Center for German and European Studies, Georgetown University, ICC-501, Washington DC 20057-1022. Email: jja5@georgetown.edu

* Frank Schimmelfennig, Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS) Swiss Federal Institute of Technology, ETH Zentrum SEI G 12, Seilergraben 49 8092 Zürich, Switzerland. Email: frank.schimmelfennig@ep.gess.ethz.ch

* Professor Craig Parsons, Political Science Department, 1284 University of Oregon, 1415 Kincaid St, PLC 936, Eugene, OR 97403-1284. Email: cap@uoregon.edu

Fulbright-Robertson Visiting Professorship in British History-

The Fulbright-Robertson Visiting Professorship is an opportunity for a British historian to teach and research for a year in the USA. It is hosted at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri (the site of Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' speech). Funded by a stipend of \$45000, it also carries a substantial supplement for travel for research and conferences. Teaching load is typically two courses per semester. Previous post-holders have included modern and medieval historians, specialists in political, cultural and imperial history and junior scholars as well as more established figures.

Previous postholders include: John Ramsden, Charles Loft, Philip Morgan, Martin Francis, Maureen Meikle, Peter Catterall, Matthew Grenby. The post is administered through the Fulbright Commission and underlines its ambition to further US-UK cultural exchange. The post-holder must be a UK citizen. The deadline for application is 13th January 2006 and interviews will be held in London in early March.

Application forms can be downloaded from the Fulbright Commission website - <http://www.fulbright.co.uk>

Further information can be obtained from: Professor Richard Lael (Laelr@westminster-mo.edu) or Chairman Norman-Taylor (cnormantaylor@fulbright.co.uk) or from previous post-holders Lawrence Black (lawrence.black@durham.ac.uk) or Paul Ward (p.j.ward@hud.ac.uk)

Meeting: The Hansard Society is partnering up with the Washington based American Enterprise Institution and Brookings Institute to organise the 'UK/US Elections – Lessons to be learnt?' conference to be held on 16 January 2006'

This major conference will reflect on the most recent US & UK elections will bring experts together to discuss the fields of: campaigning, communications, public opinion and media/new-media. The booking form can be downloaded at www.hansardsociety.org.uk/assets/US_UK_Conference_2006_Flyer.pdf.

Confirmed speakers include:

- * Rt Hon Michael Howard QC MP,
- * Rt Hon Harriet Harman, QC MP, Minister of State, Department for Constitutional Affairs
- * Adam Boulton, Political Editor, Sky News
- * Newt Gingrich, former Speaker of the House of Representatives
- * Michael Gove MP
- * Jonathan Freedland, columnist and broadcaster
- * Deborah Mattinson, Joint Chief Executive, Opinion Leader Research
- * Dr Justin Fisher, Head of Politics and History, Brunel University
- * Terry McAuliffe, former Chair, Democratic National Committee

Many Thanks,

Angelo Evangelou, Events & Communications Co-ordinator, Hansard Society
40 - 43 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JA
direct line: 020 7438 1210
Hansard Society: 020 7438 1222
Book your place at the Hansard Society's 2006 conference http://www.hansardsociety.org.uk/conference_2006

Conferences: -

A) Call for Papers/Abstracts/Submissions - 5th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences, May 31 - June 3, 2006, Waikiki Beach Marriott Hotel, Honolulu Hawaii, USA
Submission Deadline: January 24, 2006 - Sponsored by the 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

The conference will provide many opportunities for academicians and professionals from social science related fields to interact with members inside and outside their own particular disciplines.

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, Social Work, Sociology, Sustainable Development, Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods, Urban and Regional Planning, Women's studies, and 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, and Reports on issues related to teaching.

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

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)
- c. presentation format (see http://www.hicsocial.org/cfp_ss.htm for format choices)
- 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. Please note that there is a limit of two contributed submissions per lead author.

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

B) THE SIXTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON KNOWLEDGE, CULTURE AND CHANGE IN ORGANISATIONS

Monash University Centre, Prato (Near Florence), Italy, 11-14 July 2006

<http://www.ManagementConference.com>

To be held on the Tuscan town of Prato, the conference will include some of the world's leading thinkers in the field of knowledge, culture and change management, as well as numerous paper, workshop and colloquium presentations by practitioners, teachers and researchers. The conference venue is the Monash University Centre in the Palazzo Vaj in central Prato, a sixteenth century town just to the north of Florence, and close to Florence International Airport.

I would particularly like to invite you to respond to the conference call for papers. Presenters may choose to submit written papers for publication before or after the conference in the fully refereed International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management. If you are unable to attend the conference in person, virtual registrations are also available which allow you to submit a paper for refereeing and possible publication in the journal, as well as access to the electronic version of the conference proceedings.

Full details of the conference, including an online call for papers form, are to be found at the conference website (printed above.). The next round call for papers closes on 31 October 2005.

Prof. Robert Brooks, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

C) FOURTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE HUMANITIES

University of Carthage, Tunis, Tunisia, 3-6 July 2006

<http://www.HumanitiesConference.com>

The conference will continue in its endeavors to develop an interdisciplinary agenda for the humanities. It will include keynote presentations by internationally renowned speakers and numerous small-group workshop and paper presentation sessions.

I would particularly like to invite you to respond to the conference call for papers and presentations. Presenters may choose to submit written papers for publication before or after the conference in the refereed International Journal of the Humanities. If you are unable to attend the conference in person, virtual registrations are also available which allow you to submit a paper for review and possible publication

in the journal, and provide access to the electronic version of the conference proceedings.

Full details of the conference, including an online call for presentations form, are to be found at the conference website. The next round in the call for proposals (a title and short abstract) closes on 30 November 2005.

We look forward to receiving your proposals and hope you will be able to join us in Tunis in 2006.

Yours Sincerely,

Prof. Tom Nairn, The Globalism Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

E) 6th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON DIVERSITY IN ORGANISATIONS, COMMUNITIES AND NATIONS

New Orleans, USA, 12-15 June 2006

<http://www.Diversity-Conference.com>

The concerns of this conference - Human Rights, Diversity and Social Justice - loom larger than ever in the light of the terrible events surrounding Hurricane Katrina. In addition to its usual global concern for the dynamics of diversity, the conference will include a specific focus on New Orleans, Hurricane Katrina and its aftermath. Main speakers will include leading thinkers in the field, and these will be supported by paper, workshop and colloquium presentations by researchers and practitioners.

We would particularly like to invite you to respond to the conference call for papers. Presenters may choose to submit written papers for consideration before or after the conference in the fully refereed International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations. If you are unable to attend the conference in person, virtual registrations are also available which allow you to submit a paper for refereeing and possible publication in the journal, and give you access to the electronic version of the journal.

The deadline for the next round in the call for papers (a title and short abstract) is 15 December 2005. Proposals are reviewed within four weeks of submission.

Following the devastating effects of Hurricane Katrina on the city of New Orleans, we have had to change the venue of the conference to the Sheraton Hotel, the first hotel to become fully operational in New Orleans after the hurricane. The conference was originally going to be held at Xavier University, an historically black institution and seriously damaged by the hurricane. Although the university plans to

reopen in January 2006, we could not be certain that it would be available for the conference by June.

We would also like to remind you of the Diversity Symposium to be held in Melbourne this coming 7-8 December 2005 which will focus on 'intersectional' issues of gender and culture. A limited number of presentation and registration opportunities are still available at this symposium.

Details of both the New Orleans conference and the Melbourne Symposium, including an online call for papers form, are to be found at the above website.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. Joe Melcher, Xavier University of New Orleans, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA

Dr Denise Egea-Kuehne, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA

Prof. Paul James, Director, Globalism Institute, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

F) The 6th International Student Symposium in Prague

– An opportunity for your students to become more interested in the future of world leadership, global politics, cross-cultural communication, and international relations:

As a lecturer with the Institute of Linguistic and Preparatory Studies at Charles University, Prague in the Czech Republic, I offer you the opportunity to invite your students to the 6th International Student Symposium in Prague.

There, they will build their negotiation & communication skills and broaden their understanding of the world through visits to European embassies in Prague, participation in a UN crisis simulation, political debates and so much more. They will also enjoy an unforgettable taste of one of the most beautiful and historic cities in the world, right in the heart of Europe.

This is a tremendous opportunity for you to encourage your students' growth by meeting politicians, official ambassadors and other students from many cultures and countries from around the world. They will exchange views and enjoy a true living-experience where they physically touch other peoples_ ideas _ something that can never be experienced from books or their regular classroom environment.

The conference will feature distinguished international experts on global issues and visits to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and selected foreign embassies in Prague. The UN crisis simulation and _Speaking Workshops_ will provide your students with the rare and invaluable opportunity to debate and

critique specific topics dealing with democracy, nationalism, military activities and European integration.

The 6th International Student Symposium will be open to only forty selected students from across the United States and more than 24 other countries. It commences on January 8, 2006 and I welcome you to encourage your students to register for a fee of EUR 650 (or equivalent). This covers hotel accommodation, food, activities, and all transportation to the conference site upon arrival in the Czech Republic.

For further information about the application process and the conference, please contact me directly at a.critchlow@student-symposium.com or visit the conference website at www.student-symposium.com

Yours sincerely,

Agnieszka Critchlow, Program Executive, P.S. To ensure students have ample opportunity to speak with politicians and ambassadors, the 6th International Student Symposium is limited to 40 places only. In view of this, please encourage your students to register as soon as possible to avoid disappointment.

FOLLOWING UP

(Devoted to following up commentary about matters in prior issues.)

“Ay ay” (See page 10 of BPGN #120 for translation.) – With reference to the section on local brogues in #120, Eric Shaw recommends *The Adventure of English* by Melvyn (Milord) Bragg.

In #121, we published the author's abstract of John T.S. Keeler's "Mapping EU Studies: The Evolution from Boutique to Boom Filed 1960-2001." At the suggestion of a sinecure in Morgantown, West Virginia, I offer additional comments on that study.

This paper utilizes two sets of data: 1) All Ph.D. dissertations in political science at American universities with a focus on Western Europe for the 41 year time period, 2) Articles on the EC/EU in 24 leading political science, international relations and public policy journals for the period. Of the latter, eight were published in the US, 12 in the UK, three in continental Europe, and one in Canada.

Keeler identifies three periods of these publications – 'the launch era, driven by the implementation of the Treaty of Rome and shaped theoretically mainly by debates between neo-functionalists led by Ernst Haas and inter-governmentalists such as Stanley Hoffman;

the doldrums era or 'dark ages,' driven empirically by the post-Empty Chair Crisis stagnation of the integration process and the turn away from grand theorizing; and the renaissance/boom era, driven empirically by the rapid succession of integration achievements from the mid-1980s onward (the Single Europe Act and the 1992 Program, the Maastricht Treaty, the creation of the single currency and the movement toward Eastern enlargement, to name but the principal highlights) and shaped theoretically by a new way of grand theory debates followed by an unprecedented proliferation and diversification of the EU studies literature." The launch era covers the years 1960-1962 to 1969-71, the doldrums 1969-71 to 1987-1989, and the renaissance/boom followed. These eras are based primarily on dissertation production; article frequency did not fit these eras exactly. In fact, article production increased during the doldrums.

From 19 articles in the period between 1960-62, the total was 446 in 1999-2001. As might be expected *The Journal of Common Market Studies* was the most frequent site of publication. From one dissertation in 1960-62, the total in 1996-98 reached 36. In the 1960s, 25 political science departments awarded Ph.D.s with an EC/EU focus. In the 1990s, 77 departments did. In both decades, some departments awarded more than one dissertation with that orientation. Increasingly, interdisciplinary committees supervise doctoral studies on the topic.

American writers of journal articles tend to favor theorizing and generalization while European authors are prone to write descriptive studies. The English language is the most common tongue used, especially for those pieces stressing theoretical matters. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

FROM THE BPG-L

Interviews with Downing Street Personnel – *(Wyn Grant sent this to the BPG-L on September 9, 2005. I listened to a few of the interviews and found them unexpectedly candid. TPW)*

"From the EPOP list via Justin Fisher, but may be of interest to some BPG members:

We've just done a series (writes Martin Rosenbaum) ('Look back at Power') with former special advisers to Blair talking about the workings of Downing St, and we decided to put the full uncut interviews on the web, as obviously only small parts make it into the programmes, and we thought the rest of the interviews might also be interesting. They have just gone up on the Radio 4 site this morning.

Is there a way of drawing this to the attention of those in the academic community who are particularly interested in Blair's Downing St, special advisers, etc? I think they would find lots of good material. Here's the link: http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/news/look_back_at_power.shtml"

Heath and Callaghan Papers – On October 2, 2005, Shannon Granville issued this request:

I've been poking around a bit on my own, but haven't been able to come up with anything conclusive or definite. Does anyone know the fate or the relative whereabouts of the late Ted Heath and/or Jim Callaghan's collected papers?

I was under the impression that Callaghan's papers were split between the LSE's archives and somewhere in the depths of the Bodleian, but I wasn't sure if there have been any changes or additions to them since his death. And though the majority of Heath's papers remained in his possession up until his death, I haven't been able to find any information on where they're bound to end up.

Thanks in advance for any help on this!

As Jimmy Durante used to say, "What a revolting development!" [If you don't know who Durante was, ask one of your elders.] -

From Philip Cowley (10 November) – "Anyone interested in the rebellions over the Terrorism Bill might be interested in this short (5 pp) paper on last night's voting, which we posted at www.revolt.co.uk shortly after the vote. <http://www.revolt.co.uk/Blair%20defeated%20twice%20on%20Terrorism%20Bill.pdf>

"Just to clear up any doubts, all the parties were whipped - with reports of very heavy whipping, at least by Government and Conservative whips.

"In a slightly shameless bit of self-promotion, I would also draw your attention to the recently published book on Labour rebels, which came out two weeks ago (information on which is available at www.therebels.co.uk). It costs just £9.99 - available at all good book shops, and even Waterstone's - but you can have the following extract for free (I'm kind like that). The following section was written in the summer - when everyone was telling me that Labour MPs would behave differently with such a reduced majority, and Blair would be alright. I wouldn't change a word of it today. Nearly all of the MPs listed rebelled yesterday.

"The book's subtitle is *How Blair Misled His Majority*, and even at its launch party a fortnight ago, one or two people doubted that was what had really happened. Does anyone doubt that any more?
Phil

From Ch. 9: *Office Without Power?*

"When all the dust had settled, the government was left with a majority of 66. It may have survived undefeated since 1997, but it had struggled mightily to enact key pieces of legislation while enjoying a

majority of over 160. How would it possibly manage with a majority of almost 100 fewer? Echoing Norman Lamont's famous verdict on the Major years, one Labour insider had already described the possibility as 'office without power'. The line from Labour HQ on election night, and since, has been that this smaller majority will 'concentrate the mind'. The bloated majorities enjoyed since 1997 had allowed Labour MPs to rebel without giving much thought to the consequences. With a smaller majority, so the argument goes, Labour MPs will have to exercise more self-discipline.

"Possibly. There's no doubt that the smaller majority will make some MPs more careful about how they will behave. Rebellions can no longer be entered into without a real risk of defeating the government. Some Labour MPs have already made it clear to their whips that they intend to behave differently given the size of the majority. But its worth remembering the last time a government lost a 100+ majority and found itself re-elected with a much smaller majority. Immediately after the 1992 election most commentators declared that John Major's 21 seat majority was a perfectly workable state of affairs. But they had reckoned without the extent to which the habit of revolt had been widespread within the Conservative Parliamentary party during the Thatcher years, years when (just like those between 1997 and 2005) MPs were able to rebel relatively freely given the size of the majority. Ask John Major whether he feels that having such a small majority 'concentrated the minds' of Bill Cash, Teddy Taylor, Teresa Gorman et al. Do you think he'd get the joke? Or go back and look at how the Labour Government of 1974-79 managed with a small, and sometimes non-existent, majority. Self-immolation rather than self-control were the order of the day then.

"Similarly, does anyone seriously believe that Jeremy Corbyn got out of bed the morning after the 2005 election, and decided over his muesli and carrot juice that whilst he'd tried this rebellion malarkey for the last eight years it was now time for him to knuckle down and toe the party line? Does anyone think that John McDonnell immediately reached for the phone to contact his regional whip to ask for the latest instructions? Or that Lynne Jones spent the morning boning up on the standing orders of the PLP? Ditto for Bob Marshall-Andrews (whose mind appears to have been concentrated almost entirely on the removal of Tony Blair ever since he arrived in the Commons), or Bob Wareing or

Alan Simpson or Kelvin Hopkins or Dennis Skinner or Kate Hoey or Diane Abbott or Glenda Jackson or Mark Fisher or Neil Gerrard or Mike Wood or Peter Kilfoyle or David Taylor?

"And that's before you think about Clare Short or Gwyneth Dunwoody or Ian Gibson or Jim Cousins or Frank Field or Gordon Prentice or David Drew or Frank Dobson or Michael Connarty or Harry Cohen or John Austin or Jim Dobbin or Ronnie Campbell or Paul Flynn or Michael Clapham or Roger Berry or Andrew Mackinlay or John Grogan.

"Some of these names may not be all that known outside of Westminster, but they are very well known indeed in the Government Whips' Office. The 34 MPs listed above have all rebelled on key votes against the Blair government before and there can be little doubt that they will do so again at some point during the 2005 Parliament. And to their ranks will, on occasions, be added people like George Mudie, Ann Cryer, Ian Davidson, Rudi Vis, Geraldine Smith, Bill Etherington, Chris McCafferty, Austin Mitchell, Julie Morgan, Betty Williams, and many others far too obscure to mention, even in a book like this.

"For the whips the arithmetic is fairly simple - and fairly depressing. Its nominal majority is 66. Its effective majority - once you allow for the non-voting Sinn Fein MPs - is 71. There were 87 Labour MPs with regular 'form', who had voted against the whips on 10 or more occasions during the last parliament. Of these, 27 are no longer in the Commons and or in receipt of the Labour whip. But this still leaves 60 MPs who rebelled on 10 or more occasions between 2001 and 2005. That's more than enough to defeat them. Still sitting on the backbenches, for example, are 56 of those who voted against the Prevention of Terrorism Bill prior to the 2005 election, easily enough to defeat the Government should they mishandle similar legislation now, even after the terrorist attacks in July 2005.

"Of course, a majority of 66 could still be sufficient. It's hardly wafer-thin. If the PLP was treated with a bit of TLC then there shouldn't be too many problems. Tony Blair's immediate post-election speech - in which he promised to listen - certainly sounded as if he might take such an approach. But the Prime Minister always sounds like this. After every bloody nose he gets, Tony Blair sounds conciliatory. The problem is that he then struggles to be conciliatory. It's just not in his political DNA. It's like expecting Graham Norton to become butch. It just won't happen. And the result will be trouble. Minds may

well be concentrated, but if the Government continues to govern as they governed in the 2001 parliament, minds will be concentrated on how to defeat the Government.

“The real problem for the Government will come when (or if) they suffer their first defeat. Once they have gone down to their first defeat, and once it becomes clear to all and sundry that the sky does not fall in, that no votes of confidence are called, and that the government does not collapse as a result, then defeats will become more regular. Once they’ve been defeated once, the whips will no longer be able to threaten rebels with victory - and defeat could well follow defeat.”

Websites: www.revolt.co.uk www.votesforadults.co.uk

Conferences -

A) - CALL FOR PAPERS “Hate and the Media,” 19-20 January 2006, at the Institute of Historical Research, London

Key speakers include: Peter Tatchell, Evan Harris, Zia Sardar, Lesley Abdela and Lord Avebury

The fourth Hate Crimes conference will examine the (re)presentations of hate in the media, exploring ways in which, it has been argued by those inside and outside the media, various media formats have served to disseminate or dissipate hate, either promoting or negating the processes producing hate crime. A key focus will thus be on the strategies which are, or could be, utilised by the media in managing and reducing hate and hate crime, including ways in which socio-cultural and legal systems, past and present, have worked with the media to stereotype and so institutionalise either positive or negative stereotypes of race, gender, religion etc associated with prejudice and hate crime. Or, how have such systems opposed media presentations of stereotypes associated with hate? As well as papers, there will be workshop sessions, aimed at developing strategies to heighten awareness for practitioners and professionals in the media or engaging with them, to enable them to evolve policy and practice around the management of hate.

Suggestions for round tables which address the ways in which a fruitful dialogue between those outside the media world (academics, practitioners and professionals) and those working within the media (full or part-time) can be promoted, including ways in which media formats can be best utilised, are particularly welcome.

Proposals (of around 350 words) are invited, and should be sent to the conference organisers at SOLON or the CCBH by 8 December 2005. (Email virginia.preston@sas.ac.uk with proposals; contact judith.rowbotham@ntu.ac.uk or michael.kandiah@sas.ac.uk to discuss possible contributions). Conference details, including the programme and the booking form will be available on the CCBH website, at <http://www.icbh.ac.uk>

The conference is being jointly organised by SOLON (which is a partnership between Manchester Metropolitan, Nottingham Trent, Oxford Brookes and Plymouth Universities in association with the Galleries of Justice, Nottingham) and the Centre for Contemporary British History, Institute of Historical Research, School of Advanced Study, University of London.

Contact: Dr M. D. Kandiah, Lecturer in Contemporary British History and Director of the Oral History Programme, CCBH, Institute of Historical Research, University of London, Senate House, Malet Street, London, WC1E 7HU, UK. Tel.: +44 (0) 20 7862 8801

B): PSA British and Comparative Territorial Politics Conference - Territorial Politics in Perspective

Sponsored by the PSA and the ESRC Programme on Devolution and Constitutional Change, Institute of Governance, Queen’s University Belfast, 11-13 January 2006

The conference will review new research on territorial politics. The principal focus will be on the UK, but we also invite proposals for papers focusing upon territorial politics in other countries of interest to UK scholars. Papers that adopt a comparative approach are strongly encouraged.

Papers are welcome on any aspect of territorial politics, including the politics of devolution, inter-governmental relations and multi-level governance, centre-periphery relations, regionalism, nationalism and identity politics, ethno-territorial conflict and conflict resolution, elections and parties, institutional and policy developments, and political ideas.

The conference will be one of the last outlets for dissemination of research from the ESRC Devolution and Constitutional Change Programme before the programme ends in Spring 2005. It promises to be a key event. In addition to the academic programme, the conference will also feature guest speakers from the academic and political worlds and will include a conference dinner at Stormont Castle.

The conference in Belfast follows on from the successful conferences held at the University of Strathclyde in January 2004, Cardiff in 2001 and Newcastle in 1998. It aims to feature papers on new research by established academics as well as papers by researchers who are about to complete, or have recently completed, their doctorates.

The deadline for submitting proposals is Friday 30 September 2005

A full conference programme will be agreed and published soon after, with details of booking arrangements and accommodation.

For further information or to submit paper proposals, please contact the Academic organisers of the conference: Dr Jonathan Bradbury, Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Wales Swansea, Singleton Park, Swansea SA2 8PP. Tel: 01792 295961 or Email:

j.p.bradbury@swansea.ac.uk
<mailto:j.p.bradbury@swansea.ac.uk>

OR - Dr Nicola McEwen, School of Social and Political Studies, University of Edinburgh, Adam Ferguson Building, 40 George Square, Edinburgh, EH8 9LL
Tel: 0131 651 1831, or Email:

N.McEwen@ed.ac.uk
mailto:n.mcewen@ed.ac.uk

For information regarding travel and other local organisation matters, please contact the local organiser, Mr. Trevor Leonard, Institute of Governance, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast BT7 1NN. Tel: 02 890 9750 46 or email: govinfo.qub.ac.uk

(The PSA British and Comparative Territorial Politics Group conveners are grateful to the Institute of Governance, Queen's University, Belfast, for hosting this conference. In particular we would like to thank Professor Elizabeth Meehan, Dr John Barry and Mr. Trevor Leonard. We would also like to thank the PSA and the ESRC Devolution and Constitutional Change Programme for their generosity in sponsoring this event.)

ARTICLES

The Trade Unions and the Labour Party

Wyn Grant, University of Warwick

The past year has seen an increase in tensions both within the Trades Union Congress (TUC) and between the TUC and the Blair Government. The very future of the TUC has been called into doubt, something that would have been unthinkable in the years of 'tripartism' in the 1960s and 1970s when it sometimes seemed that economic policy was being made by both Labour and Conservative governments in conjunction with the TUC and the Confederation of British Industry (CBI). The crisis within the TUC has arisen from the proposed merger of Amicus, the TGWU and the GMB to create a giant union of 2.6 million members that would dominate the organisation. Together with Unison, the largest public sector union with 1.3 million members, the two groups would dominate the TUC, accounting for 60 per cent of its membership of 6.5 million (organised into 67 unions in 2005). The general secretary of the merged union would have 25 per cent of the vote at the Labour Party conference.

The annual fee of a merged union to the TUC would cost around £5 million and questions have already been asked about whether it would represent value for money. As it is, there have been increasing tensions between member unions and the TUC leadership.

Many union leaderships have shifted to the left, while the TUC leadership has tended to take a moderate, pro-Blair stance, advocating dialogue with government to obtain concessions. Research shows that contacts between the TUC and the government were lower in the Major years than under Thatcher. 'The election of a new Labour government in 1997 was accompanied by an initial increase in contacts, but contacts declined subsequently.' (Marsh and Savigny, 2005, p. 173). The strategy of dialogue does not seem to have rewarded by increased contacts:

Contacts did increase in the first years of the New Labour government, but only to an average of 50 per year in the first three full years (1998-2000), well below the level in the Thatcher years, let alone the level in the Labour years in the 1970s.

However, they subsequently fell significantly to an average of 22 in 2001 and 2002. (Marsh and Savigny, 2005, p. 171).

Of course, one has to look at the outcome of the contacts, as well as the frequency. Gordon Brown has emphasised that the government will honour the Warwick (University) Agreement struck with the unions before the 2005 election when the government needed their financial support and other forms of help for the election. The proposals agreed included doubling statutory redundancy pay and not privatising, even partially, the Royal Mail. The CBI took particular exception to the proposal to give temporary staff the same rights as permanent workers after just six weeks in line with the EU Agency Directive, arguing that it would add to business costs and hamper flexibility.

However, the unions want far more than was offered by the Warwick Agreement. In particular, they want Labour to repeal anti-union legislation introduced by the Conservatives. At the 2005 Congress the unions voted for a new trade union freedom bill to allow sympathetic industrial action, simplify balloting procedures, protect strikers from dismissal, and bar employers from replacing striking workers. These demands were, of course, influenced by the dispute in which 600 workers at Gate Gourmet, the catering supplier to British Airways, were sacked. The calls got a frosty response from the government who saw them as a threat to its support in Middle England. The trade and industry secretary, Alan Johnson, declared:

“We’re not going to do it. We’re not inclined to go to the British public and say ‘vote for us and we’ll make it easier for BA baggage handlers to walk out unballoted in industrial action that has nothing to do with their employer’. (*Financial Times*, 13 September 2005).

There is, however, further trouble ahead over public sector pensions. The government wants to increase the age of retirement for public sector workers from 60 to 65 to deal with a growing funding problem as retired workers live longer and their numbers increase. The government is insisting on the change and the unions have responded with the threat of the biggest national stoppage since the 1926 general strike. The unions are back as a force in British politics but whether they will achieve their goals is another question.

Marsh, D and Savigny, H. (2005) ‘Changes in Trade Union-Government Relations 1974-2002’, *Politics*, 23 (3), 2005, 165-74.

[After the above was written, Wyn Grant sent this update: “HMG has caved in on public sector pensions and all existing staff will be allowed to retire at 60, only new entrants retire at 65.”]

[The piece below appeared in the September issue of PSA NEWS. It is reprinted here with the author’s permission.]

Chairing a Parliamentary Committee *Professor The Lord Norton of Louth*

The Constitution Committee was appointed by the House of Lords in February 2001 and has its origins in a recommendation from the Royal Commission on the Reform of the House of Lords (the Wakeham Commission). There was general support for such a committee and it was appointed to report to the House on all Bills of constitutional significance and to keep the operation of the constitution under review.

The committee was established as a twelve-member committee with the usual formula applied of 4 Conservative, 4 Labour, 2 Liberal Democrat, and 2 Cross-bench members. The House appoints not only the members but also the member who is to be Chairman. I was appointed by the House as Chairman. A rotation rule applies to most committees in the Lords, under which each member retires after three years on a committee. I served from 2001 until the end of the 2003-04 session in November 2004.

The House selects members as far as possible who have some expertise in the area covered by a committee. Apart from me, the committee comprised former Cabinet ministers, including John MacGregor [Lord MacGregor] and Ian Lang [Lord Lang], Lord Jauncey, who had served as a Law Lord; Lord Fellowes, who had spent several years as the Queen’s Private Secretary; Lord Morgan [Ken Morgan], one of our leading historians, as well as experienced politicians such as Lib Dem Lord Holme and Labour’s Baroness Gould.

At my instigation, our first report was on how we intended to proceed and the criteria that would determine whether a Bill would merit report to the House. I devised the two p’s test: that is, a Bill has to affect a principal part of the constitution and has to raise an important issue of principle in order for the committee to report. (This avoided the committee having to be overly reactive and report on a raft of minor issues.) The committee appointed a legal adviser - Professor Tony Bradley - to advise on measures laid before the House.

The Committee devoted much of its time to proactive investigations, that is, investigating issues of constitutional importance. We were able to draw on a range of distinguished experts, not least political

scientists, for our major inquiries; among those appearing before us were Peter Hennessy, Charlie Jeffery, Robert Hazell, Christopher Hood, Vernon Bogdanor, and David Heald. The range of officials, academics and politicians that we were able to draw on for our devolution inquiry, for example, was a researcher's dream!

During my chairmanship, we published a total of 33 reports, mostly on Bills (resulting in changes to a number of measures) but with our major inquiries being on:

Devolution: Inter-Institutional Relations in the United Kingdom (a year-long inquiry, as part of which the committee took evidence in Edinburgh, Cardiff and Stormont);

The Regulatory State: Ensuring its Accountability; and Parliament and the Legislative Process.

All three were debated in the House. The Devolution report has been variously drawn on, not least by the Richard Commission. As a result of its report on regulation, the Committee is pushing for the creation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on Regulation. The report on Parliament and the Legislative Process looks like it has served to push forward the prospect of more systematic post-legislative scrutiny: as a result of the report, the Government has asked the Law Commission to report on how it can be undertaken.

In addition, I also instigated the practice of commissioning and then publishing papers from leading experts on particular topics, notably the growth (or otherwise) of centralising trends in legislation and the consequences for the British Constitution of the draft Treaty establishing a Constitution for the EU. I also indulged in what was once the traditional practice for parliamentary committees: that is, the Chairman drafting the reports, rather than leaving it to the clerk. Hence the reference to me in the House by my successor, Lord Holme as Chairman, as not only a hands-on chairman but a hands-on-keyboard chairman!

The experience helped marry my knowledge as a social scientist with the needs of a parliamentary committee in investigating and reporting on issues of constitutional import; it meant that I knew who to approach when we needed information and advice. The result was, in the view of commentators and members of the House, well-researched and authoritative reports that have helped establish the reputation and impact of the committee.

On Becoming a London Cabbie

Kevin Portch

(17 months, and around 3500 points into The Knowledge)

Visitors to London, whether here for business or pleasure, will almost certainly see, and quite probably make use of one thing.

The almost unique London cab, also known as a "black cab", despite its availability in many colours, is, like the mistakenly named "Big Ben", or a red double-decker bus, is one of the enduring images of the modern capital.

Something visitors will have also seen, but may not have taken much notice of is the fleet of mopeds and scooters, usually with a sheet of Perspex and several street maps attached to the handlebars. The rider will normally be looking everywhere but in the direction he or she is traveling, will be hunched over the map scribbling in what would appear to be obscure shorthand, or will be cursing the bus driver who has just used him for target practice.

This unfortunate creature is a "knowledge-boy"...or -girl. I trust that female readers will forgive me the use of the masculine form for the sake of brevity. There are knowledge-girls out there, just as there are female cabbies, and two female examiners at the "home" of the London Knowledge, the Public Carriage Office (PCO) of the Metropolitan Police.

A knowledge-boy's mission in life (or at least for at least 2 years of that life – some get through "the K" quickly, others do it part time whilst in other full time employment and take seven or eight years. The average is around three and a half years) is to become a London cabbie. It's not as simple as applying for a licence, buying a vehicle and the appropriate insurance, and then hitting the allegedly gold-paved streets of Dick Whittington's London, oh-no!

The mission, in brief, is to learn the 25,000 streets within a six mile radius of Charing Cross, to know where on those streets just about every "point" is. A point could be any building, be it a museum, station, embassy, restaurant, place of worship, library, public building, pub or hotel. Anything, even statues.

To add to the equation he will need to be able, without the aid of maps, sat-nav, or the advice of a friendly bobby, to work out the shortest route between any two of the estimated 30,000 points. And all of this is to be done in a road system that has evolved from the first Roman roads, through the

narrow streets of Medieval and Victorian London, to modern motorways and office developments such as those at Canary Wharf.

So what is the holy grail that lies at the other end of The Knowledge?

Quite simply it's a small, green metal badge that says you are fit to drive a vehicle for hire to the public. Nothing else. All other rewards come after that. The freedom to be your own boss, to work whatever hours you want to, and the prospect of some good earnings – The London Olympics site is, I'm glad to say, within our six mile limit. With trips from there to Heathrow and back, 2012 could be a very good year for the London cabbie.

So next time you hail a cab in London, think of what the driver may have had to go through, just for the pleasure of your company (and your cash). Several thousand pounds of their own money; something like 20,000 miles sitting astride a small 2-stroke moped in pursuit of those often elusive (and frequently long-gone) points; everything that a British winter and London traffic can throw at them; and so many ... oh so many... hours of mind-numbing revision? There is even rumoured to be a tradition that the first fare for a newly appointed cabbie is free. (If it's me, please keep the journey short, or tip well).

There may come a time when sat-nav systems can keep a database similar to that of a London cabbie's mind, which is believed by some to physically expand while doing the Knowledge. One day, they might even find a way to get the satellite signals in between the tall buildings of the centre of large cities. Goodness, they might even get the maps up to date one day, and even a communications system that works uninterrupted 24-7-365.

Until that day you can expect to see the weather beaten paupers and their trusty two-wheelers doing their best to become a member of one of the finest taxi networks anywhere in the world.

ABSTRACTS

Mayling Birney, "Does Civic Participation Contribute to Political Engagement? Using Fixed Effects Panel Analysis to Investigate Correlations and Causation" Annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, DC., September 1-4, 2005.

Abstract: Does civic participation contribute to political engagement and, if so, through which mechanisms? Data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS), which consists of thirteen recent waves of observations of over 10,000 individuals, is used to address this question. This study first tests whether observed commonly cross-sectional relationships between civic and political engagement are potentially causal, as opposed to both driven by an individual's particular fixed personal characteristics. It finds that they often may not be, as they are often not robust to fixed effects panel analyses. This implies that commonly used cross-sectional analyses of the relationship between civic and political engagement may sometimes be misleading and should be interpreted with caution. Secondly, where the relationship between civic and political engagement is robust, this study attempts to determine the likely type of causal mechanism. 'Situational effects' arise from changes in self-interest, information flows, and other highly context-dependent factors, and they may lead to more immediate and temporary changes in political behavior. 'Educative effects' arise from long-term changes in civic-political skills, experience, confidence, social capital, civic-mindedness, and other internalized factors, and they may lead to more gradual and enduring changes. Voting propensity seems to be increased via situational effects associated with joining certain types of civic groups, such as religious groups. Political interest is also apparently affected by situational factors associated with membership in issue oriented, public service oriented, and private welfare oriented groups. External political efficacy seems to be raised through both situational and educative means, particularly through issue-oriented groups.

David P. Barash, "C.P. Snow: Bridging the Two-Culture Divide," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, section B., pp. B10-B11. Some topics survive through the generations, and C.P. Snow's canon on the Two-Cultures is an example. Barash, a psychologist, notes that the two cultures, originally referred to physics and literature or more broadly the humanities and the physical sciences. Social scientists tended to view it as politics and science. Barash adds to that specialists and generalists and argues for less hostility between the humanities and the physical sciences, noting that his discipline has been at some universities deemed as a science and in others as part of the humanities (social sciences?). *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

David Baker, "Everyone's a Winner? UK Pre- and Post-Election Politics in 2005," British Politics Group: Panel 1, American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., September 1-4, 2005. In the campaign, it was widely believed that Gordon Brown was a valuable electoral asset to Tony Blair, as the popularity of the latter was in decline to the point that he was rated only level with the Tory leader, Michael Howard on polling day. Two months after the election, following the bombing in the London underground, Blair's standing with public rebounded, assisted by the French and Dutch referenda rejecting the EU constitution and removing a controversial issue from the Blair agenda. As the bombing lifted Blair's poll ratings, the dismal economic forecasts torpedoed Brown's. The Tories gained seats but still were firmly in second place, as they sought a successor to Howard. The Liberal Democrats did less well than anticipated with some MPs criticizing Charles Kennedy's "undemocratic" leadership style and the policies emanating from the top. The government's legislative agenda, especially in areas such as law-and-order remained controversial even within Labour's own ranks. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

Justin Fisher, "The Blair Trilogy Part 3: This Time Its Personal," British Politics Group: Panel 1, American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., September 1-4, 2005. (*Justin presentation was made with slides. The abstract is drawn from those.*) The election featured a "highly focused campaign by Labour in 100-111 target with an inner core of 45 seats," including billboards, mainly in those seats, where leadership toured. The national party spent extensively in those targets, focusing on 2001 Labour voters that appeared to be wavering. Increased use of campaign technology: synchronized direct mail and telephoning, along with distribution of 300,000 DVDs in 60 key constituencies. Conservatives targeted 180 seats, spending most funds to influence floating voters with Tory inclinations. Substantial direct contact with individuals, up to 8 direct mailings, varying message by region, increased telephone voter identification with automated calling that was less successful than that of Labour. Tories also used advertising in cinema and newspapers. Lib-Dems had most funds ever, but some came too late for extensive strategic impact. Most money was spent on C. Kennedy's campaign

tour of two target seats daily. 3,459 leaflets were analyzed in 223 constituencies. Main Conservative themes (93% or higher) of leaflets were law-&-order, health, and education. For Labour, top (91% or more) themes were health, education, law-&-order, and the economy. Liberal Democrats stressed (97% or higher) law-&-order, health, education, and Iraq. (These local themes were not always those emphasized on the national scene.) The Conservative stressed local matters the most, Labour leaflets were the most positive overall, Tories and Lib-Dems were more likely to be negative and personal (Especially the Liberal Democrats!). Three myths fell: that the Tories were only concerned with immigration, that the Lib-Dems were more principled than their foes, and that they were the party most oriented to local matters. Tories are now the strongest party in England, and also gained seats in Wales and Scotland, yet won fewer seats than did Labour in 1983. Labour lost seat to several parties, now has 88 marginals (10% lead or less), compared with 61 after 2001. Lib-Dems won three seats from Conservatives while losing five to them. *T. P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

BOOK REVIEWS

Thomas Quinn, *Modernising the Labour Party: Organisational Change since 1983* (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2004), xx & 227 pp., Index, Bibliography, Cl. \$65.00

For one, such as this reviewer who recalls the Labour Party of Herbert Morrison, Nye Bevin, et al., and once had the privilege of hearing Clement Attlee speak, the Labour Party of Anthony S. Blair's New Labour, this is a welcome study. Quinn's tome has its origins in his Ph.D. dissertation at the LSE, but unlike many such studies this one has benefited from subsequent revisions and suggestions of others that are knowledgeable about his subject. As one would anticipate, he draws upon the ground breaking empirical work of Patrick Seyd and Paul Whitely throughout.

Quinn begins by defending his use of rational choice theory to illuminate the transformation of the Labour Party, not just since the 1970s, but why that form of explanation applies to the earlier years of the party. In the process, he points to the flaws of theoretical approaches of others, such as Anthony Downs (economics), Lewis Minkin (sociological),

and Joe Schlesinger (ambition), Thus, chapters 1 and 2 are recommended for graduate students that wish to become familiar with the principal theoretical orientations utilized by experts on political parties.

Chapter 3 examines the federal structure of Labour, including the trade unions block vote, the historic roles of the Parliamentary Labour Party (PLP) and the constituency Labour parties (CLP), as well as the tensions among the three constituent components: PLP, CLP and trade unions. Persistent electoral defeat in the 1980s stimulated a coalition within the party to make substantial changes.

The next chapter, one of the most theoretical, looks at policy-making within the party, why it had to change, how it changed, and the unanticipated consequences on policy-making of the transformation. The reforms have made the annual conference a shell of what it used to be, and a largely hollow shell at that. In this, Labour has joined the pattern of American presidential conventions which have become symbolic and of minor significance for enunciating fresh policy perspectives.

Chapter 5 addresses the issue of selecting candidates to stand for the Commons, a topic that continues to generate visions of the agony that this matter created within Labour during the early 1980s. Labour MPs that wish to stand for re-election are largely insulated from the leftwing threats of those years. Quinn explains why that is the case.

Chapter 6 is directed to the changes in selecting the leader of the party. The most important is the creation of an electoral college, which has subsequently been modified. The upshot of the party's transformation is that the leader is strengthened, the impact of the trade unions, as well as the CLPs, is diminished, and the party must seek financial support beyond the traditional trade union deep pockets, and even the dues of individual members that were briefly, in the mid-1990s, a substantial source. Labour is now confronted with the necessity of raising large amounts of money from wealthy individuals and other entities – a position shared by American parties. The declining concern for increasing membership is one that Susan Scarrow noted in her work on British and German parties, a finding confirmed by many other scholars.

Overall, the quality of writing is sound, but readers will notice a flaw on p. 189 where the phrase 'fairly unique' occurs. Unique, of course, means 'one of a kind,' and thus logically cannot be modified, unlike 'rare' or 'distinguished,' although regrettably Quinn is not alone in the usage here.

Some readers will not relish Quinn's theoretical explication, those that seek to understand the key changes within the Labour during the last quarter century will benefit from reading this book. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

John H. Maurer, ed., *Churchill and Strategic Dilemmas Before the World War: Essays in Honor of Michael I. Handel* (London & Portland, Ore.: Frank Cass, distr. in U.S. by ISBS, Portland, Ore., 2003), ix & 164 pp., Index, pb. \$26.95

In this set of essays, the authors focus on aspects of Churchill that illuminate his roles as a military leader. The studies were presented at a 2001 strategy conference convened at the United States Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island, where the honoree, Michael I. Handel taught. This is one of three tomes generated from the conference proceedings.

John H. Maurer's "The 'Ever-Present' Danger: Winston Churchill's assessment of the German Naval Challenge before the First World War" demonstrates effectively that Churchill as First Lord of the Admiralty in the several months before the onset of the Great War was not a 'hawk.' Instead, he pursued a policy of seeking to reduce naval expenditures while trying to persuade the German government to declare a 'holiday' on further expansion of its navy. This holiday would require that British not only to halt further construction of ships, but to reduce their numbers. While policy-makers on the British side were split among those that opposed further expansion, those that favored it, and those that were proponents of less government spending, their German counterparts were, with perhaps one exception overwhelmingly for additional naval power. Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz, the chief spokesman for the German navy, was convinced that fate was on the side of Germany in this arms race.

As the French say about things changing but remaining the same, we find that in this context: German leadership was confident the British press were the cause of misunderstanding of the German posture on this matter. (p. 30) Contemporary leaders on both sides of the Atlantic continue to blame the messenger.

Maurer's analysis brings to this reviewer's mind the Conflict Project, headed by Robert C. North at Stanford more than four decades ago. A primary target of that enterprise was a content analysis of communications among the powers that would eventually participate in the Great War. The general conclusion from that huge project was that all sides

misunderstood the positions and intentions of the others. While that may fit the general case for the period prior to the outbreak of WWI, Maurer's analysis indicates there was a substantial mutual understanding of the motives and inclinations of key decision-makers.

The two pieces in the middle of this quartet – Christopher M. Bell, “Winston Churchill, Pacific Security and the Limits of British Power 1921-41” and B.J.C. McKercher, “The Limitations of the Political-Strategist: Winston Churchill and the German Threat, 1931-39” – share a common theme. That of Churchill changing his mind as events emerged. As my teenage grandchildren would say, “Well, duh!” That comment is not intended to be derogatory, but wouldn't one be expected to modify his assessment of the proper policy as situations evolve?

Bell's chapter confirms the maxim that where one stands (on an issue) is likely to be determined by where one sits. In the 1920s as Chancellor of the Exchequer, Churchill repeatedly opposed large expenditures to increase the British naval presence in the Pacific, meaning Hong Kong and Singapore. He persistently assigned Japan a secondary status in British foreign policy and military priority. Moreover, he presumed the Asian nation was more inclined to pursue military ventures in China and be attentive to the potential threat of the Soviet Union than to seek a confrontation with British-controlled territories. Given the distance of those territories from the United Kingdom, providing logistical support and maintaining manpower was exorbitantly expensive.

In the 1930s, now out of office, Churchill recognized the growing military strength of the Japanese and their tendency to take provocative action. Yet he assumed that the United States was better able to contain Japan and was likely to do so, as Japan extended its reach.

When he returned to office with the outbreak of WWII, he slightly modified his resistance to arming Hong Kong and Singapore adequately as he continued to give the Pacific theater a lower priority than that of Europe where Nazi Germany was a proximate danger to the British homeland. Despite promises to Australia, Churchill never allocated sufficient resources to defend it if the Japanese launched a full-scale assault on that dominion.

The last piece in the volume, “Churchill and Technology” is by David Jablonsky, whose writings on Churchill have previously been reviewed in this Newsletter. This chapter is one whose content would

only be unexpected by one superficially familiar with Churchill's life.

First, Jablonsky addresses Churchill's view of the impact of technology on modern warfare. Appalled by the massive carnage wrought by modern weaponry, Churchill none the less played a prominent role in the development of this advanced weaponry. His advocacy and implementation of the armored tank while serving as First Lord of the Admiralty, a post one would not associate with that vehicle, is well known. After WWI, he held the main government post responsible for promoting military air power. (Even before his future American collaborator, Dwight Eisenhower learned to fly, the future prime minister had completed several hours as a pilot, an avocation that he might have continued if his Clementine had not vetoed further time in the cockpit.)

In war, Churchill favored when initially engaging a new technical development to maximize the element of surprise. Thus he advocated building a substantial number of tanks before any were used in combat and then spring dozens of those vehicles on the unsuspecting enemy. That was also his preference for the “Mulberry” harbors at Normandy in 1944, which enabled the Allies to quickly bring ashore equipment and supplies over devastated beaches.

The ultimate consequence of familiarity with technology should be to inform policy. As First Lord, Churchill exemplified this in converting naval ships from coal to oil as fuel; greatly increasing the vessels' speed and maneuverability. His advocacy of a naval air wing was initially dismissed as foolish by others, and his foresight was not acknowledged when others recognized the significance of air power.

On a sustained basis, his long-term consultation with F.A. Lindeman was a major influence on Churchill's understanding of the potential of technological developments for military purposes. He and the “Prof” were not always wise prophets in this vein, but they often were.

Of the four studies in this collection, that of Maurer is notable for its analysis of the differing political agenda among the key figures in both Britain and Germany. Hardliners were evident on both sides, especially Admiral Alfred von Tirpitz. Not only he, but other German officials were leery of Churchill's motives and personality traits – “a dangerous demagogue.”(p.19). All four pieces are even handed, avoiding hagiography. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

Gretchen Rubin, *Forty Ways to Look at Winston Churchill: A Brief Account of a Long Life* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2003), xi & 307 pp. Bibliography, Index, Cl. \$22.95

From reading about Churchill in a book on World War II, Rubin proceeded to examine his life in detail. The result is a book that is at the same time, a storehouse of trivia and a handful of brief, but insightful commentaries about him. She begins by offering a few statements that various predecessors to her, e.g., Martin Gilbert, John Lukacz, William Manchester, and Lord Moran, have noted about the great man.

Several chapters look at Churchill in the many roles that he manifested; Failed Statesman, Depressive, Belligerent, Son, Father, Painter, Spendthrift, Husband, Hero, Imperialist, and collaborator with Franklin Roosevelt.

The briefest chapter lists 67 notables that Churchill met. Those include America's Ehtel Barrymore, Irving Berlin, Buffalo Bill Cody, and Billy Graham. As Rubin notes Adolph Hitler, Churchill's most famous opponent, was among the famous people that Churchill never met.

Rubin's unfamiliarity with the mechanics of Britain's governing system occasionally is evident: on p. 28, she is correct that Halifax was the choice of some to succeed Neville Chamberlain, but she errs in stating that the Foreign Secretary declining to become prime minister gave Churchill the post. Halifax was unacceptable because he was a peer and did not have the support of Attlee's Labour Party.

The book has 16 photographs of Winston, as well as one of his statue across the street from the Houses of Parliament. Rubin has created a work that one may enjoy by browsing, here and there to sample her comments about one or another of the many facets of his life. The book is enjoyable for novices of Churchilliana, as well as for the expert. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

Jonathan Schneer, *The Thames* (New Haven: Yale University, 2005), xiv & 330 pp., Bibliography, Index, Cl. \$35.00; Gavin Weightman, *London's Thames: The River That Shaper a City and Its History* (New York: St. Martin's, 2004), x & 150 pp., Index, Bibliography, Cl. \$24.95.

If one wishes to read about the Thames, these two books could be tagged "the long and the short of it." Since neither primarily addresses political issues, they warrant only a brief commentary here, but especially

for non-Brits that have a romantic view of this notable river either book may be attractive.

Weightman is a documentary filmmaker who is a specialist on London. His coverage is the London section of the river; Schneer, an American and a historian, offers a lengthier examination. London's Thames is most likely to be useful as a guide to places to visit along the Thames. The longest chapter is a dozen pages on "Wharves, warehouses, and docks."

Schneer takes the reader through a lengthier tour of the river and with greater longitudinal depth. ("Longitudinal" being an adjective employed by social scientists in the 1960s to avoid repetitive use of "historical." Methinks, it did not catch on.) He addresses political matters that are pertinent. The last hundred pages, beginning with Chapter 9, are most useful to the student of contemporary British politics. These passages are primarily about developments, mainly technological but also social, such as the decline of the impact of class attitudes, on the river beginning with the 1940s. The book ends with a description of Churchill's funeral procession along the Thames in January 1965. Millions of us observed that through the medium of television.

If one wants to know about the great river, Weightman is the *hors d'oeuvres*; Schneer is the full meal. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

POT POURRI XLV

Bottoms up (or out?) – In November, news from Ireland reported that medical researchers there found that the buttocks of some residents there had such corpulent bums that the customary hypodermic needles used for administering medicine often failed to penetrate through the fat layer to reach the flesh underneath. This was the case for over 90% of the female subjects and nearly half of the male ones.

The suggested remedy? No, not lose weight, but use longer needles.

(It is uncertain whether this will bring a measure of relief or fright to Americans, whose number of overweight members has been recently widely reported.)

Safe prediction! – The new Conservative Party Leader will be 'David.' (*Written of course, BEFORE the Cameroonians triumphed.*)

Faking it? – Should one be suspicious that the appointment of a woman as head of the Special Branch of Scotland Yard came within a few days of the announcement that the Special Branch was about to be disbanded? It was created in 1883 and has 560 officers collecting intelligence worldwide.

So you want to be a newly coined British citizen? – To do so, you must pass a test that includes questions such as: Where are the Geordie, Cockney, and Scouse dialects spoken? What are MPs? What is the Church of England and who is its head? What is the Queen's official role and what ceremonial duties does she have? Do many children live in single parent families or step-families?

Cross-national comparison – David Brooks, syndicated columnist recently referred to the nominated-then-withdrawn choice for the United States Supreme Court, Harriet Miers as “the John Major of American politics.” (Louisville *Courier-Journal*, October 13, 2005) He offered no explanation for that equivalency.

Kipling knew this all along! – “A cigar, under certain conditions, Sigmund Freud was supposed to have remarked once, may not be a phallic symbol, but simply a cigar.” [Peter Jay, *Broadway Anecdotes* (Oxford University Press: 1989), p. 140.]

Stacking dolls – A central contributor to the production of this publication (*Not the editor.*) recently received a set of stacking dolls, purchased by a friend upon visiting the Baltic region. The largest (external) doll is Tony Blair. The smallest is Neville Chamberlain with Winston Churchill encasing him. Most of the dolls are named (in Russian), but not Winston, who is readily recognized, or Chamberlain.

Cheese it! - Among the findings of a study, conducted in the UK, to determine if eating cheese just before sleeping generated sleep problems were these: Consumption of Stillson cheese often was followed by disturbing dreams. In one case, the dreamer took the role of a vegetarian alligator, which as a result was upset because it could not eat small children. Eating another brand of British-made cheese resulted in the subjects dreaming that they were important persons, including one that thought he was Prime Minister. (*No! The subject was not Gordon Brown!*)

Euro-English – (*This came off the internet.*) Euro-English – The European Commission has just announced an agreement whereby English will be the official language of the European Union rather than German, which was the other possibility.

As part of the negotiations, the British Government conceded that English spelling had some room for improvement and has accepted a 5-year phase-in plan that would become known as “Euro-English”. In the first year, “s” will replace the soft “c”. Certainly, this will make the sivil servants jump with joy. The hard “c” will be dropped in favour of “k”. This should klear up konfursion, and keyboards kan have one less letter. There will be growing publik enthusiasm in the sekond year, when the troublesome “ph” will be replaced with “f”. This will make words like fotograf 20% shorter. In the 3rd year, publik akseptanse of the new spelling kan be expekted to reach the stage where more komplikated changes are possible. Governments will enkourage the removal of double letters which have always ben a deterrent to akurate speling. Also, al wil agre that the horibl mes of the silent “e” in the languag is disgrasful and it should go away. By the 4th yer, people wil be reseptiv to steps such as replasing “th” with “z” and “w” with “v”. During ze fifz yer, ze unesesary “o” kan be dropd from vords kontaining “ou” and after ziz fifz yer, ve vil hav a reil sensibl riten styl. Zer vil be no mor trubl or difikultis and evrivun vil find it ezi tu understand ech oza. Ze drem of a united urop vil finali kum tru. Und efter ze fifz yer, ve vil al be speking German like zey vunted in ze forst plas. If zis mad you smil, pleas pas on to oza pepl.

Another Winston idiosyncrasy – Churchill de-tested the sound of staplers fastening paper together. As a result, no staplers were used in his presence. Instead, papers were fastened by punching holes in them and lashing them together with tape. [Bob Fenster, *They Did What!?: The Funny, Weird, Wonderful, Outrageous, and Stupid Things Famous People Have Done* (Kansas City: Andrew McMeel, 2002), p. 87.]

Winnie's view of combat – “Nothing is so exhilarating as to shot at without result.” [*Ibid.*, p. 233.]

Would a gentleman wear that? – In 1814, the Duke of Wellington was denied admission to his club. Why? Because, he was wearing trousers at a time when breeches and calf-high silk stockings were the proper attire for a gentleman. [*Ibid.*, p. 93.]

What unusual thing, at least in their life times, did these famous folks – Queen Olga of Greece, Czar Nicholas II, Randolph Churchill’s wife and the English kings, Harold, George V, and Edward VII - have in common? They all had tattoos. [*Ibid.*, p.105]

What unusual belief did these famous people – Queen Victoria, George Eliot, Karl Marx, Walt Whitman, Honoré de Balzac, Charles-Pierre Baudelaire share? – Each were devotees of the skull-reading ‘science’ of phrenology. [*Ibid.*, p. 114.]

Around Ye Olde Empire –

a) In the ‘gummint’ sector -
Criminal Justice – The Irish Minister of Justice recently proposed changes in the prison system of the Emerald Isle that would abolish ‘inhumane’ treatments such as restricted diets and corporal punishment. [*Do you hear Tories crying, “Bring back the cane!?”*] At the same time, these current practices would be terminated: letting inmates bring in their own furniture, hiring maids, and ordering food and alcoholic beverages. [*Appropriately, this was reported in The Australian.*]

Immortalizing outstanding law enforcement –
Earlier this year, in a largely gay sector of Toronto, a 13-foot tall statue dedicated to Alexander Wood was erected. According to local mythology, he was pressured to leave Toronto in the early 1800s. As a magistrate, Wood investigated a heterosexual rape in which the victim claimed to have scratched her attacker’s testicles. Wood apprehended several suspects and meticulously examined each for scratches. The statue depicts a five-foot tall Wood, seated, as he ‘inspects’ a standing man, whose trousers are down.

It is not just us ordinary Joes that are stupid! – In Nigeria, a woman has been sentenced to 30 months in jail, plus fines, in an ‘advance fees’ scam. [*Not uncommon in Nigeria, we are informed.*] The victim was a Brazilian bank that advanced the equivalent of \$242,000.000 for a nonexistent airport in the Nigerian capitol, Abuja. Most of the funds were recovered by the bank.

b) In the ‘non-gummint’ sector –
Canadian ‘Green’ or ‘defeating your purpose’ – The Rotary Club of Chatham, New Brunswick has announced that the winner of a raffle to garner funds to build an environmental awareness center will be awarded a Hummer (*HUMV as the U.S. military call it, which consumes gasoline by the foot moved.*)

Wake me when it’s over! – In Nelson, New Zealand, a support group for Chronic Fatigue Syndrome announced it would endorse International Awareness Day to publicize this illness, but added that most of its members would probably be too tired to participate.

Well, ain’t that a p—er! – A pair of British biochemists has invented the Indipod, supposedly the first toilet made for cars, at least the four-wheel-drive variety. In a test drive from Scotland to Italy, they reported never using restrooms en route. For installation in a car’s trunk (boot), the device costs \$550.

Around the EU –

Pardon my dog! – A councilman in Vienna, Austria has recommended collecting the canine droppings in public sites in order to test the DNA therein and match those to the DNA of registered dogs. Vienna has about 50,000 registered dogs. This would enable authorities to fine the owners of the canine miscreants. A similar proposal has been offered by officials in Dresden, Germany. In 1996, the English village of Bruntingthorpe, which then had 30 dogs and 200 humans, considered a similar proposal.

Out of bounds or beyond the pale (the veil?)
(*This does not address anything directly connected to British politics, the EU or the Commonwealth, but it is so bizarre, I am publishing it, as an example of comparative socio-political practices.*) In March, Ms. Laleh Seddigh, 28, finished first in Iran’s national championship car race. She was the first female allowed to compete in the event since Iran’s revolution. In accepting her first place award, she put on a scarf and covered her tight-fitting racing uniform with a cape.

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Kudos – In a Associated Press article from London on the day Tony Blair lost his 90-day provision in his anti-terrorist bill, **Bill Jones** noted “The vote has substantially weakened his position.”

Anthony Messina has received the Kaneb Teaching Award at Notre Dame, recognizing excellence in undergraduate teaching. **Frank Myers** received the Distinguished Teaching Award at Stony Brook University, which the political science department bestows for best undergraduate teaching.

New Members –

Malcolm Mackerras - Department of Politics, Australian Defence Force Academy, U. of New South Wales, Canberra ACT 2600, AUSTRALIA

Angelia R. Wilson – Department of Govt., International Politics and Policy, University of Manchester, Oxford Road. Manchester M13 9PL, UNITED KINGDOM

New addresses –

Michael Baer - Isaacson, Miller, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 710, Washington, DC 20009

Sydney Van Morgan - Associate Director, Institute for European Studies, Cornell University, 120 Uris Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853-7601, USA

Bill Muller - 18 Meadow Walk Court, Fletcher, NC 2873 USA

Richard Rose - 1 East Abercromby Street, Helensburgh, Scotland G84 7SP, UK.

Ben Seyd - , Department of Politics and IR, University of Kent, Rutherford College, Canterbury CT2 7NX , UK

New email addresses –

Michael Baer - mbaer@imsearch.com

Kurt Jefferson - jefferk@westminster-mo.edu

Malcolm Mackerras - m-mackerras@adfa.edu.au

Sydney Van Morgan - sydney.morgan@cornell.edu

Bill Muller - muller1938@yahoo.com

Richard Rose - prof_r_rose@yahoo.co.uk

Ben Seyd - : B.J.Seyd@kent.ac.uk

Angelia R. Wilson - Msrtswa@fs1.ec.man.ac.uk

OTHER

Dear BPG Colleagues,

As many of you know, there were special presentations honoring me for eleven years of service as BPG Executive Secretary during the reception at Deputy Ambassador Alan Charlton’s residence in Washington during the recent APSA reception. While I knew there was going to be something, I did not imagine that I would receive a tribute from Sam Beer or such presents, including a framed vintage political satirical print from the 1831 suffrage debate, a bottle of single malt Scotch whiskey, a bottle of Jacob’s Creek wine (a winery my wife and I toured in 2003), a plaque for my years of service, and a large coffee cup declaring me a “Very Important Person.” As I indicated in my response at the reception, it has been my pleasure to serve the membership during the past eleven years, continuing the good work started by Jorgen Rasmussen, Richard Rose, Sam Beer, and Stephen Blank—the organizing committee—and the other original members from 1974. We are a strong organization because we are an inclusive and a participatory one.

Every member is important, and I appreciate the good wishes I have received from many of you over the past year after it was announced that I was stepping down. Under only our third Executive Director in 32 years, Terrence Casey of Rose-Hulman Institute, that will continue. Please join me in helping to make this transition smooth by giving him and our continuing Newsletter Editor, Tom Wolf, as well as our other organizational leaders your support and cooperation. I have been honored as few can be, genuinely by the members they serve. It has been my pleasure to hold the office, and I shall continue to be active in the BPG.

Cheers,

Donley T. Studlar

Fall 2005, No 122

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Awards	Page 2
Activities	Page 4
Announcements	Page 6
Following Up	Page 9
From the BPG-L	Page 10
Articles	Page 13
Abstracts	Page 16
Book Reviews	Page 17
Pot Pourri	Page 20
Membership News	Page 23
Other	Page 23



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