



# 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

## Spring 2006, No 124 IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Activities	Page 3
Announcements	Page 4
From the BPG-L	Page 7
Abstracts	Page 10
Book Reviews	
Messmer on <i>Parliament in British Politics</i> by Norton	Page 11
Williams on <i>Britain in the European Union</i> edited by Giddings & Drewry	Page 12
Freeman on <i>Muslims and the State in Britain</i> by Fetzer & Soper	Page 13
Van Morgan on <i>Solidarity in Europe</i> by Stjerno	Page 14
Wolf on <i>The Labour Party and British Society:         1880-2005</i> by Rubinstein	Page 15
Pot Pourri	Page 16
Membership News	Page 18

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

Web Site:  
[www.uc.edu/bpg](http://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 Secretary – address on the front cover. In addition to the *Newsletter*, the BPG provides an annual annotated bibliography of books on British politics. The BPG offers the Samuel H. Beer Prize for the best dissertation at a North American university on a British politics subject, the Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Fellowship for dissertation research in the UK by a North American working on a British politics topic, and the James B. Christoph Prize for the Best Paper on British Politics at a professional conference by a Ph.D.-holding, untenured faculty member (visiting or tenure track) at an institution of higher education in North America. 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](mailto: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](mailto: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

**Please note:** *We plan to send out the NEXT issue of the Newsletter BEFORE the APSA Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. We have dropped behind our usual publishing schedule and intend to catch up by publishing two issues close together.*

**Behavior of panelists at professional conferences** – Over the years, I have had the opportunity to chair panels at various professional gatherings. From exchanges with colleagues in other academic disciplines, I have discovered that the conduct of panels varies substantially by discipline. For example, it is evidently the custom for historians to read–word for word–their papers. That would bore me to no end. I presume there is a lot of ‘dozing off’ by members of the audience.

As you will have observed, political scientists are customarily requested to offer oral summaries of their papers with a time limit established for the delivery. This enables the audience to absorb a presentation more readily, and allow time for them to ask questions.

Despite the best-laid plans of panel chairs, paper presenters often stray from the time limit established. Some decades back, I observed one of the worst instances of ‘straying’ when a panelist consumed more than 45 minutes in making his presentation. This severely cut short the time for the remaining presenters. When the panel was opened for questions from the audience, a future president of the APSA, whom I shall not identify, cut to ribbons the ‘time-hog’ for being so inconsiderate of the other panelists.

I am also put-off by panel chairs who insist on giving a biographical essay for each panelist, often offering effusive praise for one or more achievements of a panelist or panelists. As a result, time to make presentations and for questions from the audience is diminished. A panel chair may not be able to control precisely the time a panelist takes for a presentation, but the chair can control the length of introductions for a panel’s members.

**One matter explained**—In late April, the media criticized the prime minister’s wife for being attired in white during her audience with the Pope. The customary color of garment for a visitor to the Vatican on such occasions is black. Why then would Cherie Blair, a devout and knowledgeable Catholic, make this mistake? A wag has suggested to me that this may not have been a mistake. As is well known, white is the traditional color for a virgin. But Mrs. Blair has children, including one born since the family moved into Downing Street. This wag asked, “Have you not heard of immaculate conception?”

**A second matter contemplated**—Given the Government’s Cabinet shuffle in the aftermath of the local elections, one might ask: Would New Labour have done better if Clarke had been sacked before *the elections*?

**On the literary side**—Among books that recently came across my desk were two that pertained to notable British literary figures. One had as lead author, Terry Jones, a former member of Monty Python, who to my surprise is a specialist in medieval history. The book? *Who Murdered Chaucer? A Medieval Mystery*. The second book was Max Egremont’s *Siegfried Sassoon: A Life*. Sassoon is known primarily as poet who gained prominence from his poetry about WWI. He did not die until 1967. The publisher’s blurb that accompanied the book had color photographs of Egremont and his family’s ‘grand estate.’ I don’t recall receiving that type of extensive publicity, i.e., about an author, before. The biography, a hefty 639 pp., was commissioned by Sassoon’s son, George who died earlier this year.

**Nevil Johnson**—Some BPGers will be acquainted with the scholarship of Nevil Johnson, who passed away this spring. In response to a email request from me, Wyn Grant noted that “Johnson was the first Volkswagen Lecturer in German Politics at Warwick (succeeded by Willie Paterson who drove a Ford).”

-----

## ACTIVITIES

### **British Politics Group Panels at the APSA**

#### **Panel I – The Year in Review (and Business Meeting)**

**Friday, Sept. 1, 2:00 p.m.**

Chair – Wyn Grant, U of Warwick

Papers – Andrew Gamble, U of Sheffield

– James Mitchell, Strathclyde U

#### **Panel 2 – Elections and Party Competition in the U.K.: Issues, Candidates and Identities**

**Saturday, Sept. 2, 4:15 p.m.**

Chair – Florence Faucher-King, CEIPOF–Sciences Po (Paris)

Papers – 1) Jonathan Tonge, U of Liverpool,

*Protestant Zealotry or Unionist Apathy?*

*The Impact of election turnout upon the peace and political process in Northern Ireland*

2) Chip Hauss, Search for Common Ground USA, title TBA

3) Robert Jones, & Mark Shepard, U of Strathclyde, *Candidate and voter gender in the UK: stereotypes, evaluations and voting impact*

4) William A. Hazleton, Miami U, *Politics in a*

*Vacuum: Electoral Contests and*

*Communal Dominance in Northern Ireland*

Discussants – Florence Faucher-King

– Terry Royed, U of Alabama

#### **Panel 3 – Measuring Political Effectiveness: Prime Ministers, Legislators, and Leaders of the Opposition,**

**Saturday, Sept. 2, 8:00 a.m.**

Chair – Richard Haesly, Cal State U, Long Beach

Papers – 1) Conor McGrath, U of Ulster & Clive

S. Thomas, U of Alaska Southeast,

*Poachers Turned Gamekeepers: British and American Legislators with Previous Professional Lobbying Experience*

2) Kevin Theakston, U of Leeds, *What Makes for an Effective Prime Minister?*

3) Peter Catterall, Queen Mary U of London, *Making the Best of a Bad Job: The Role of the Leader of the Opposition in Britain*

4) Ray Barker, Erie Community College,

*Michael Howard’s Effectiveness as Leader of the Opposition*

Discussants – Richard Haesly & Elin Roles, U of Wales Aberystwyth

FOR UPDATES ON THESE PANELS, CHECK THE BRITISH POLITICS GROUP PANELS AT THE 2006 AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION MEETING AT <http://www.uc.edu/bpg/panels.htm>

## **Call for Reviews for the British Politics Group Newsletter**

Given the difficulties and delays in receiving books from publishers and forwarding them to potential reviewers, we have decided to announce an open call for book reviews for the British Politics Group Newsletter. If you have recently read a book on British politics (or comparative/international politics related to the UK) that you think is particularly engaging and of interest to fellow BPG members, we would encourage you to write a brief review for the BPGN. Reviews should be no longer than 1000 words, include a summary of the main arguments and methods, and assess the author(s) contribution to scholarship in the field. We would also encourage review articles, discussions of useful web resources, analyses of documentaries – any creative idea that would be useful in advancing our understanding and study of British politics broadly defined.

If you have a book review or article in mind, you should first contact BPGN Editor Tom Wolf (tpwolf@ius.edu) in order to avoid inappropriate texts and multiple submissions on the same book. As always, we retain final editorial control, including the right of rejection. We will also continue to farm out books for review received from publishers.

-----

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **Publications** –

**A) Donley Studlar** is a contributor to Lawrence S. Graham, ed., *The Politics of Governing: A Comparative Introduction* (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press, 2006).

**B) Ethics & International Affairs**, *The Journal of the Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs*, publishes essays that evaluate global institutions and policies according to the principles of justice. Its aim, unique among publications, is to close the gap between theory and practice, integrating ethical reasoning into analysis of real-world problems, such as the reform of the International Monetary Fund, rules for the preventive use of force, and the regulation of global climate change.

### Highlights–

“The Preventive Use of Force: A Cosmopolitan Institutional Proposal” by Allen Buchanan & Robert O. Keohane

“The Global Warming Tragedy and the Dangerous Illusion of the Kyoto Protocol” by Stephen M. Gardiner

“Why Inequality Matters: Some Economic Issues” by Nancy Birdsall

“A Different Kind of Justice: Dealing with Human Rights Violations in Transitional Societies” by David Little

“Public Health or Clinical Ethics: Thinking beyond Borders” by Onora O’Neill

“Achieving Democracy,” by Thomas Pogge.

**C) Public Money & Management (PMM)** is calling for papers for the June 2007 issue, titled “Governing by Outcomes – The Experience of Outcome-Based Planning and Budgeting in the UK and Internationally.

Proposals from practitioners, policy-makers, academics and journalists are required for this special edition, which will be published to coincide with the fifth Comprehensive Spending Review due in summer 2007. Colin Talbot, co-director of the Centre for Public Policy and Management at Manchester Business School, and Caroline Mawhood, assistant auditor general at the National Audit Office, are guest editors of this special issue of PMM.

Outcomes based-budgeting, a process that bases resource allocation and control decisions on the results of expenditure, was first introduced in the early 1990s.

Theoretical and empirical work addressing issues at any level of government international, national, state and local in any country are sought. UK experience in specific sectors such as education and health are of great interest. Proposals should explore all aspects of government by outcome. Additional questions to address include:

- What are the theoretical, procedural and practical issues surrounding the whole notion of outcomes-based government?

- Is it feasible at all?
- Has it worked in the UK's case?
- Is it possible to budget and contract for outcomes or at best only outputs?
- How is performance to be measured and attribution problems overcome?
- How does performance measurement of organisations relate to evaluation of programmes?
- How have legislature and other representative bodies responded to a shift from inputs to outcomes?
- What are the transaction costs of such systems?
- Are the longer budget and planning periods adopted in the UK real or illusory?

Proposals, no longer than one A4 side of paper, should be sent to Colin Talbot by 1 August 2006 by email to: colin.talbot@mbs.ac.uk. A number of these will be selected to be made into final papers of no more than 5,000 words, including referencing, to be submitted by 1 January 2007. For further information visit [www.blackwellpublishing.com/pmam](http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/pmam)

**D) *British Politics*** – The first issue of this journal is just available. Contents include these articles:

Peter Kerr & Steven Kettell, "In Defence of British Politics: The Past, Present and Future of the Discipline,"

Keith Dowding, "The Economic Approach to the Study of British Politics,"

Mona Lena Krook & Judith Squires, "Gender Quotas in British Politics: Multiple Approaches and Methods in Feminist Research,"

Peter Burnham, "Marxism, the State and British Politics,"

Mark Bevir & R.A.W. Rhodes, "Interpretive Approaches to British Government and Politics,"

Stuart McAnulla, "Challenging the New Interpretivist Approach: Towards a Critical Realist Alternative," and

Michael Moran, "The Unanticipated Consequences of Reigning Ideas': Samuel Beer and the Study of British Politics."

Palgrave Macmillan is the publisher. For details, including subscription rates at: [www.palgrave-journals.com/bp](http://www.palgrave-journals.com/bp)

## **Conferences –**

### **A) The 2006 Conference of the PSA's Elections, Public Opinion and Parties (EPOP)**

specialist group is taking place at the University of Nottingham, 8-10 September.

The provisional programme can now be downloaded from: <http://epop06.com/programme.html>

It is, of course, subject to change between now and the conference, but currently includes more than 60 papers, along with three roundtable sessions, all of which will be of interest to members of the BPG.

We are still willing to accept additional paper ideas but now cannot guarantee in every case that we will be able to accommodate them in the programme.

The conference home page is at <http://epop06.com> <<http://epop06.com>> with booking details available from <http://epop06.com/booking.html>.

Please note that there is a late booking fee for bookings received after 31 July.

Best wishes, Philip Cowley and Cees van der Eijk (Convenors)

### **B) International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Sciences – University of the Aegean, Island of Rhodes, Greece, 18-21 July 2006**

<http://www.SocialSciencesConference.com>

The conference will examine the nature of disciplinary and interdisciplinary practices across the social sciences, as well as the relation of the social to the natural sciences, applied sciences and the professions. The focus of papers will range from the finely grained and empirical (research practices and results exemplifying one or more disciplines), to wide-ranging multi-disciplinary and transdisciplinary practices, to perspectives on knowledge and method. One of the featured themes of the 2006 conference will be interdisciplinary perspectives on gender.

I 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 the Interdisciplinary Social Sciences*, to be launched shortly. 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.

The next round in the call for papers (a title and short abstract) closes on 15 May 2006. Full details of the conference, including an online call for papers form, are to be found at the conference website - <http://www.SocialSciencesConference.com>

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

Prof. Chryssi Vitsilakis, Dean, Faculty of Humanities, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece

**C) The Georgia (USA) Political Science Association - Savannah on November 16, 17 and 18, 2006.** We welcome attendees and presenters from all disciplines worldwide. Over 200 participants from United States and overseas attended our 2005 conference. For more information, about submitting proposals and for the agenda of past conferences, please go to our web site at [www.gpsanet.org](http://www.gpsanet.org). Email: [GPSA06@GeorgiaSouthern.edu](mailto:GPSA06@GeorgiaSouthern.edu)  
Professor Harold Cline, Director of Communications, GPSA

### **Research Opportunities –**

A) THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY was founded in 1930 as a community of scholars in which intellectual inquiry can be carried out in the most favorable circumstances. It provides Members with offices, access to libraries, subsidized restaurant and housing facilities, and some secretarial and word-processing services.

THE SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES supports scholarship in all fields of historical research, but is concerned principally with the history of western, near eastern and far eastern civilizations, with particular emphasis upon Greek and Roman civilization, the history of Europe (medieval, early modern, and modern), the Islamic world, East Asian studies, the history of art, and modern international relations. The School also offers the Edward T. Cone Membership in Music Studies.

Qualified candidates of any nationality are invited to apply for memberships. Residence in Princeton during term time is required. The only other obligation of Members is to pursue their own research. If they wish, Members may participate in seminars and

meetings within the Institute. There are also ample opportunities for contacts with scholars at nearby universities.

Approximately forty Members are appointed for either one or two terms each year. The Ph.D. (or equivalent) and substantial publications are required of all candidates at the time of application. Member awards are funded by the Institute for Advanced Study or by other sources, including the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Gerda Henkel Foundation, and the Thyssen Foundation.

APPLICATION may be made for one or two terms (September to December, January to April). Further information and application materials may be found on the School's web site, [www.hs.ias.edu](http://www.hs.ias.edu), or they can be obtained from the Administrative Officer by electronic mail at [mzelazny@ias.edu](mailto:mzelazny@ias.edu). Inquiries may also be sent by post to: School of Historical Studies, Institute for Advanced Study, Einstein Drive, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. Completed applications must be returned to the Administrative Officer by 15 November 2006.

B) MELLON FELLOWSHIPS FOR ASSISTANT PROFESSORS are also offered each year to two qualified Assistant Professors. These full-year memberships are designed specifically for assistant professors at universities and colleges in the United States and Canada to support promising young scholars who have embarked on professional careers. Applicants must have served at least two, and not more than four years as assistant professors in institutions of higher learning in the United States or Canada and must have approval to return to their institution following the period of membership. Stipends will match the combined salary and benefits at the Member's home institution at the time of application, and all the privileges of membership at the Institute for Advanced Study will apply. Application materials are the same as for membership, and can be obtained from the web at [www.hs.ias.edu](http://www.hs.ias.edu) or by contacting the Administrative Officer at the address above.

**C) ACLS/FREDERICK BURKHARDT FELLOWSHIPS FOR RECENTLY TENURED SCHOLARS:**

In the academic year 2007-2008 the Institute for Advanced Study anticipates it will again take part in a program sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Frederick Burkhardt Fellowships. These fellowships support more adventurous, more wide-ranging, and longer-term patterns of research than are current in the humanities and related social sciences. Depending on the availability of funds, ACLS will provide fellowships for up to eleven recently tenured faculty, most of whom will spend a year at one of several residential research centers, including the Institute for Advanced Study. A scholar applying for the academic year 2007-2008 must normally have begun her/his tenured contract at a U.S. institution no earlier than the fall 2002 semester or quarter.

Applicants must submit a research plan, typically covering a three to five year period; one of the first three years of research could be spent as a Member at the Institute, either in the School of Historical Studies or the School of Social Science.

Qualified candidates who would like to apply under the auspices of this program should visit the ACLS website, <http://www.acls.org/burkguid.htm> for a more detailed description of the terms of the fellowship and information about how to apply.

Applications for this program must be submitted through the ACLS

Online Fellowship Application system (OFA) no later than 9 p.m., Eastern Daylight Time, September 28, 2006. OFA is accessible at <http://ofa.acls.org> <http://ofa.acls.org/> or through the ACLS website. Information about this program may also be obtained from the ACLS Fellowships Office, 633 Third Avenue, 8th floor, New York, NY 10017-6795.

-----

**FROM THE BPG-L**

**Help with finding London digs** - I will be in London (LSE) for winter term 2007, and I am looking for suitable accommodation. I need a studio or one-bedroom flat that is within walking distance to LSE or on a tube line that may be convenient. The dates are

Jan. 10-March 20 (give or take a few days).

I appreciate any information. Please send it to me directly and off the list at [nzaharia@uab.edu](mailto:nzaharia@uab.edu).

Nikolaos Zahariadis, Associate Professor and Director, International Studies, Department of Government, 238 Ullman, 1530 3rd Avenue South, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham AL 35294-3350 Tel. (205) 934-3482; FAX (205) 975-5712; [www.uab.edu/its](http://www.uab.edu/its); [www.uab.edu/govt](http://www.uab.edu/govt)

**Job Opportunity** - From Janet Laible (June 13)

“This employment announcement was sent to me on a security policy list-serv—I thought perhaps someone on the BPG list might know a recent graduate/colleague/friend etc. who is interested. The advertisement is unclear as to whether US or UK citizenship is required (or whether the position is open to citizens of other countries), although legal status to live and work in the US is necessary—presumably interested parties can send an e-mail to the address listed at the end of the announcement.”

Assistant Public Affairs Officer, The British Embassy  
Position Description: The British Embassy Public Affairs Team is looking for a creative, highly motivated and pro-active Assistant Public Affairs Officer to join their 7-person group. The Public Affairs Team develops and co-ordinates a national strategy that promotes (among other things) the UK Government's climate change policy, and implements and evaluates public diplomacy activity in support of that strategy in the local area. The team works with academics, civic leaders, specialist media, government, and others to promote the UK Government's strategic priorities. It also works closely with the US-wide network of Press and Public Affairs Officers.

Qualifications: Minimum of 3 years professional experience preferred; Ability to take the initiative, work independently (but collaboratively) with light management supervision; Proven track record of excellent communication skills, team working and project planning and delivery; Research, analytical skills, and some knowledge of British Government policies and public diplomacy a plus; Enthusiasm, as well as a sense of intellectual curiosity, will also be valued.

All candidates must have a pre-existing legal status to live and work in the US, and will be subject to background checks and security clearance.

To apply: Resume and a cover letter with salary history should be submitted in a .doc (word) file format to [dcjobs@fco.gov.uk](mailto:dcjobs@fco.gov.uk). Please note in the subject line of your email "Assistant Public Affairs Officer"

**Recognition opportunity for graduate students**—

Erin Ganley of Oxford University Press' Journals division informs us (19 July 06) as follows: We are currently promoting an Essay Prize sponsored by the journal *Twentieth Century British History*. We would greatly appreciate if you could post the announcement below on your list. Thank you so much.

Oxford Journals is pleased to invite entries to Twentieth Century British History's (TCBH) annual Essay Prize. The aim of the TCBH Essay Prize is to encourage a high standard of scholarship amongst postgraduate research students. The competition is open to anyone currently registered for a higher research degree, or who completed one no earlier than October 2003.

The author of the winning essay will receive:

- a) Publication of the winning essay in *Twentieth Century British History*
- b) A cash prize of £300
- c) £200 worth of OUP books
- d) One year's free subscription to *Twentieth Century British History*

The closing date for submissions is 1 September 2006.

Full details and an Essay Prize entry form can be located here: [http://www.oxfordjournals.org/our\\_journals/tweceb/essay\\_prize06.html](http://www.oxfordjournals.org/our_journals/tweceb/essay_prize06.html)

The most recent winner of the TCBH Essay Prize was Dr Dolly Smith Wilson from the Texas Tech University, USA with her paper: *A New Look At The Affluent Worker: The Good Working Mother In Post-War Britain*.

To read Dr. Wilson's paper for FREE online, please visit: <http://tcbh.oxfordjournals.org/content/vol17/issue2/index.dtl>

Erin Ganley, Assistant Marketing Manager, Journals  
Oxford University Press

2001 Evans Road | Cary, NC 27613

Tel: 919-677-0977 x 5163

Fax: 919-677-1714

E-mail: [erin.ganley@oxfordjournals.org](mailto:erin.ganley@oxfordjournals.org)

<http://www.oxfordjournals.org>

**BPG-L Dialogue** (Comments printed as received)

**Collective Responsibility**—Alan Ward raised this issue (June 12), as follows with responses to his inquiry and his concluding comment.

Can someone tell me if it's reasonable to say that in Britain every member of the government—Cabinet ministers, non-Cabinet ministers and parliamentary secretaries—is considered to be bound by collective responsibility, meaning s/he can't speak out in public

against Cabinet policy without resigning. That's my sense of the matter, but I'd like it confirmed.

The Australian federal Cabinet handbook says non-Cabinet members are not bound by a Cabinet decision if they were not present for the discussion, although I doubt that a Prime Minister would tolerate vocal dissent from a non-Cabinet minister on a serious matter, whether s/he was present for a Cabinet discussion or not.

*Alan Ward, College of William and Mary*

-----  
Yes, though 'friends of the minister' can of course speak volubly to the media, off the record....

*Eric Shaw, University of Stirling*

-----  
Difficult one to answer this... It depends on the time period analysed and on the political circumstances/case/individual speaking out. Since the 1970s Cabinet ministers, non-Cabinet ministers and parliamentary secretaries have been considered to be bound by collective responsibility (see David Ellis chapter in Geoffrey Marshall's (ed.) *Ministerial Responsibility* (1989). However, Ellis notes that powerful individuals or political circumstances that might prevent sanction (the need to hang on to key people... of increased relevance today?) enable the convention to be circumvented. The opposition and media and the public have to want it...

In the case of Scottish politics (don't ask me about the World Cup...I can appreciate and understand the arguments of both sides!) there was the fairly recent case (2002 or 2003) of Mike Watson holding on to ministerial rank (as well as a Ministerial Parliamentary Aide - Janis Hughes) even though there was much criticism at the time that they had circumvented the Executive line on Glasgow hospital closures. For more on this see James Mitchell and the Scottish Monitoring team in Robert Hazell's 'State of the Nations 2003' (2003)

*Mark Shephard, Strathclyde University*

-----  
Yes, as far as I understand it, you are absolutely correct, Alan: ALL Ministers and PPS's - the 'payroll vote' - are constitutionally obliged publicly to support (or at least not publicly criticise) decisions and policies once ratified by the Cabinet. Of course, there is invariably scope for 'coded' speeches which make veiled criticisms.....

*Pete Dorey, Cardiff University*

The short answer is yes. Cabinet collective responsibility (a constitutional convention) is taken to mean that members of the Cabinet have to publicly support all governmental decisions which have been reached in Cabinet, even if they privately disagree.

"Ministers inform and explain, apologise, take remedial action, or resign in support of the convention of ministerial responsibility. This is not an area regulated by statute, rather practice has developed according to precedent and guidance. Most recently, that guidance has become formalised in the Ministerial Code, issued by the Prime Minister at the beginning of a new administration.

The responsibility of individual ministers for their own conduct and that of their departments is a vital aspect of accountable and democratic parliamentary government. Ministerial responsibility is often described as a constitutional convention, yet it is a convention difficult to define with certainty and which, to a large degree, depends on the circumstances of each individual case.

There is a distinction between individual ministerial responsibility and the collective responsibility that each minister has to support the government of which he/she is a member."

From OONAGH GAY & THOMAS POWELL  
Individual ministerial responsibility- issues and examples:

<http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/rp2004/rp04-031.pdf>

A more cynical view:

"The idea behind cabinet collective responsibility is that cabinet ministers represent in public (which, in practice, means represent to the media) a decision or policy which has been made by the entire cabinet. As such, the individual minister is now a spokesman for government policy. Therefore, even if a minister finds that the policy clashes with his or her conscience, he or she should refrain from criticising it. If this is not possible, it is the minister's duty to resign.

This seems harsh, but it is based upon the idea that a minister is a member of the government (obvious, I know). Therefore, the minister has to support the government. Once a decision has been made, the cabinet members have a responsibility to uphold that decision, and any dissent should be private. It is a sound idea and, I think, a necessary one, to avoid policy decisions becoming slanging matches in the press.

The interesting thing about cabinet collective responsibility is that it seems to have neither precedent nor real examples ..... The classic example given is that of the resignation of Lord Michael Heseltine over the Westland Affair. This was in 1986. Westland Helicopters was failing and there were American and European companies bidding to take over the company. The view of Margaret Thatcher and some of the then cabinet was that the American company should take over; Heseltine disagreed and so resigned. However, later speculation was that he resigned in order to challenge Thatcher's leadership (he did stand against her in the leadership contest of 1990). Therefore, Heseltine is not really an example of cabinet collective responsibility at work. Similarly, Geoffrey Howe resigned under this doctrine in 1990, claiming he could no longer support the government's policy on Europe. However, it later became clear that he resigned so that there would be a serious leadership contest in 1990." [http://www.everything2.com/index.pl?node\\_id=1303523](http://www.everything2.com/index.pl?node_id=1303523)

And for more academic (and real world) approaches to such questions, from an Australian perspective, see Mulgan, Richard (2002) 'On Ministerial Resignations (and the Lack Thereof)'. *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 61 (2), 121-127. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1467-8500.00279>

Also: Weller, Patrick (2003) 'Cabinet Government: An Elusive Ideal?'. *Public Administration* 81 (4), 701-722. <http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.0033-3298.2003.00368.x>

In 2003, as I recall, Blair allowed Clare Short to stay in the cabinet, despite public opposition to the Iraq War. However, she later resigned. It seems the constitution is becoming more and more flexible!

"Collective responsibility is a concept, or doctrine, according to which people are to be held responsible for other people's actions by tolerating, ignoring, or harboring them, without actively collaborating in these actions. This concept is found mostly in the Old Testament (or Tanakh) ....." [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collective\\_responsibility\\_%28doctrine%29](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collective_responsibility_%28doctrine%29)  
*David Baker, University of Warwick*

---

As I recall there have been exceptions to this general rule of collective responsibility. In 1932, Ramsay Macdonald's cabinet "agreed to differ" in public on the question of tariffs. And in 1975, Wilson permitted members of his cabinet to disagree with one another outside of the House of Commons during

the referendum campaign on EEC membership. But these exceptions are so well known and rare that they probably only serve to emphasize the general rule of unanimity of expressed opinion.

This rule seems to be supported by political expediency as well as constitutional propriety. Even in a presidential system like the US, the press the political opposition alike probe continually for any disagreement within the administration, knowing that this suggests an interesting weakness. Bush seems to have a rule against public disagreement that is as rigid as that of any prime minister.

*Frank Myers, Stony Brook University*

-----

Thank you to those who responded helpfully to my query about collective responsibility in the UK. I'm working on Cabinets in Australia right now and was interested to have the rule in Britain confirmed. Let me add a couple of notes from things I've come across.

All parliamentary systems with Westminster roots claim to observe Cabinet collective responsibility, but there's no clarity about what this means. It's usually taken to mean, in part, that ministers must resign before they can dissent from government policy in public, but does this apply to Cabinet ministers or all members of the government? In Britain, it appears from your e-mails, and in India too, it means all ministers and parliamentary secretaries, but the Australian federal Cabinet handbook says that non-Cabinet ministers and parliamentary secretaries are not bound by a Cabinet decision if they are not present for the discussion. The New South Wales guide to Cabinet conventions says parliamentary secretaries are not bound by collective responsibility, although "they may be influenced by it." I think neither statement adequately describes Australian practice because it would be unusual for an Australian Prime Minister or Premier to tolerate vocal dissent from a junior member of the government, whether present for a Cabinet discussion or not.

There are examples of formal exemptions from collective responsibility for even Cabinet members in Australia. If a Prime Minister or Premier has to appoint independent or minor party MPs as ministers in order to secure a majority in the lower house, those ministers may be allowed to dissent in public from certain government decisions. This occurred in colonial New South Wales in the nineteenth century, before parties were established and when Cabinet formation was difficult, and it's happening again. In 2002 Premier Mike Rann, with a Labor minority, formed a government in South Australia by appointing an Inde-

pendent and a National party member to Cabinet. These ministers signed agreements, in the public record, to support the government on confidence votes but were allowed to oppose it on certain issues. Labor won a majority in the 2006 general election but Rann retained these two ministers on the same terms.

No government in Australia has gone so far as the Labor Prime Minister of New Zealand, Helen Clark, in 2005. Labor had only 52 seats in the 121 member house so Clark needed the support of three minor parties. She gave two ministerial posts, the Foreign Minister and Revenue Minister, to minor party leaders without even appointing them to Cabinet. They agreed to support the government on confidence votes and matters affecting their own departments, but reserved the right to vote against the government on other matters.

So much for Section 3.20 of the New Zealand Cabinet Manual which says, "The principle of collective responsibility underpins the system of Cabinet government. It reflects the democratic principle: the house expresses its confidence in the collective whole of government, rather than individual ministers." There's provision in Section 3.23 for parties in coalitions to establish "agree to disagree processes," allowing different party positions to be stated in public, but once a decision has been reached all ministers are required to implement it. There's nothing in the manual to say that a minister need not sit in Cabinet.

My sense is that collective responsibility doesn't rise to the level of a constitutional convention in New Zealand, which is what R.S. Parker concluded about the rule in Australia in 1980. He wrote, "To my mind it is just a rule of political prudence for ministries that want to stay in office." I'm inclined to agree.

*Alan Ward, College of William and Mary*

-----

## ABSTRACTS

**Adam Gopnik, "The Life of the Party: Benjamin Disraeli and the politics of performance," *The New Yorker* (July 3, 2006), pp. 72-76 & 78-79.**

This is, in part, a review essay of two recent biographies of Disraeli: Christopher Hibbert, *Disraeli: The Victorian Dandy Who Became Prime Minister* (Palgrave, \$29.95) and William Kuhn, *The Politics of Pleasure: A Portrait of Benjamin Disraeli* (Free Press, £20).

Gopnik sprinkles his commentary with striking

remarks: "One reason Disraeli is such an appealing subject is that, unlike other romantic adventurers, he had a successful career and a happy life." "Any responsible historian can see that Disraeli couldn't have happened. But it did."

Brief but persuasive assessments are made about Disraeli's religion, education, marriage, political style, sexual orientation and political philosophy. The piece manifests the excellent writing that one expects in *The New Yorker* as it offers a brief introduction to those unacquainted with Disraeli and fresh insights to those well familiar with the 19th century Tory leader. *T.P. Wolf*

-----

## BOOK REVIEWS

**Philip Norton, *Parliament In British Politics* (Houndsmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005) xii & 289 pp; Further Reading List, Bibliography & Index, Pb. \$31.95.**

This institutional study of British Parliament is a rewritten and re-titled version of a much earlier edition, published in 1993 under the title: *Does Parliament Matter?*. Its author is an eminent professor and scholar, and who is also a sitting member of the House of Lords. The contents this time are similarly organized, though updated and expanded. This includes updated discussion of Parliament's evolving, post-1993 relations with The European Union, Europe's human rights convention, and the devolved regional assemblies of Britain's Celtic national fringe.

In this study, Lord Norton introduces the reader to the historical evolution and many roles of Parliament. He accepts the commonly held wisdom that Parliament is normally, in this age of party government, not in charge of its own law making agenda. Nonetheless, he goes on to make the case that both Houses of Parliament carry out independent and significant functions in British politics. In their policy approval mode, both Commons and Lords, in reviewing government-sponsored policy, may influence the final form of such legislation. Further, Parliament is significant for fulfilling such additional functions as recruiting and training new generations of politicians. Also, by being in a position to investigate and redress grievances, Parliament provides a legitimating link between citizens and government.

The author organizes his exploration of these issues by dividing his discussion of Parliament into two major parts. Part I investigates Parliament's relationship

with government. At the core of this discussion are three excellent chapters on the role of Parliament in the various stages of the policy process. As suggested above, Lord Norton is careful to make it clear that in the development and making of law, Parliament is not normally master in its own house. He distinguishes between "policy making" legislatures such as the American Congress, where legislation and agendas are determined independently from the executive branch, and other "policy-influencing" legislatures like Britain's Parliament. Lord Norton repeatedly describes the Houses of Commons and Lords as exercising a 'persuasive' (rather than 'coercive') role in refining government policy, while they are nearly always approving it.

Part II of the book is a similarly useful discussion of Parliament as a representative institution for individual citizens and organized interests in British society. Parliamentarians perform a necessary role beneath (and perhaps in spite of) the radar of party attention, by pursuing, and if necessary, defending the interests of individual constituents. Parliament is, as Lord Norton indicates, the "buckle between citizen and government". He similarly pursues an analysis of the rise of organized interests in British political life, and their relationship with Parliament, though he does not include discussion of the evolving organizational and tactical innovation of such interests in recent decades as they seek political influence.

What is largely missing in this classic institutional analysis is separate discussion of the individual parliamentarian and what motivates his or her behavior. Considerable insight is offered by Lord Norton into the types of power, norms, and processes which exist in the institutional setting of members, and which offers some insight into their professional behavior. But why do new politicians make the decision to navigate the process of party recruitment? How do election campaigns reflect a candidate's perspective? Does that perspective survive a successful candidate's arrival into the calculus of politics at Westminster? Why are parliamentarians willing to vote against their leaders from time to time? There are no chapters dedicated to the Member of Parliament as an individual actor. This book is an excellent introduction to the many facets of Parliament, but without any special focus on Parliamentarians, a reader may be tempted to assume that only Parliament and party, and not politicians, matter in British politics. The book is excellent for undergraduate courses in British politics or comparative legislative analysis. *William B. Messmer, Drew University.*

**Philip Giddings & Gavin Drewry, eds., *Britain in the European Union: Law, Policy and Parliament* (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2004), xi & 277 pp., Index, Bibliography, Pb. \$24.95**

*Britain in the European Union* explores how Westminster responds to EU rules, evaluating the Parliament's relationship with EU institutions, and then relating policy to committee scrutiny. The book was published in 2004, and so missed the EU's constitutional referendums in France and the Netherlands. A little delay would have given the authors answers to their questions as to whether the public was taking notice of the EU's plans, and whether parliamentarians are taking notice of public perceptions (Giddings and Drewry 2004, 254). The answer to the first question seems to be yes and not just in Britain, while the second seems to be no, though it is not easy to tell in Britain.

As with many recent texts on British politics, *Britain in the European Union* is an edited text, chapters written by various people sandwiched between the editors' introduction and conclusions. The result is an interesting and thought-provoking mix of perspectives on a fairly dry topic.

The first analytical chapter, a very well-constructed essay by Miers on Britain in the EU: 1973-2001, provides a good description of the evolution of the three pillars of EU rules, which place supranational and national decision-making in parallel. The description seems heavily mechanical and gives a sense of inevitability to EU intrusion. Miers, however, discusses the standard criticism that the EU decision-makers are remote and intrusive, but the work suggests deeper problems, where the EU is unaccountable and indifferent to concerns of average citizens. This kind of problem is seen in Eurobarometer questions, which ask, 'do you want a constitution,' but never, 'what kind?' EU elites make rules without considering the desires of citizens.

Reading the chapter raises many issues calling for additional study. First, it is difficult to talk about the UK alone: are its experiences unique, or do they parallel those elsewhere? Second, the chapter does not address the quality of changes. If EU directives are affecting individual lives, is this good or bad? Third, the chapter addresses the deepening versus widening issue, but starts at 1973, missing pre-entry politics. Schaad's *Bullying Bonn* (2000) argues widening was one of Britain's challenges to the customs union being formed by the Six. Having an

earlier historical starting point changes the problems of 2000 into a 50-year old strategic game.

Chapter 3, by Page, discusses EU Membership and Britain's constitution. Page starts with European Court's decisions seeking to fashion a community by judicial interpretation, coupled with limits imposed on what Parliament can address. The issues here are fundamental to notions of sovereignty. If jurists say that the 1972 Treaty is binding, does it bind specific or general policies? If we examine this from the three pillars discussion in Chapter 2, which considers areas where nations retain decision-making power, how relevant is this constraint, and is it subject to challenge? If a Labour government decides to follow the Social Charter, should this be seen as binding on later governments, contrary to earlier constitutional laws? Danger: Lawyers at work!

Chapter 4, by Barnes, addresses the problems of scrutinizing EU legislation. This chapter provides what would be a very good summary of committee work for upper-division classes on British politics. Chapter 5, by Miller and Andrews, discusses governance, institutional reform and enlargement, laying the foundation for what an EU constitution should look like and why. This chapter is perhaps the most political, addressing the implications of adding Eastern Europeans to the mix. The problem emerging from the discussion is that the EU has lost its appeal. Voting for the European Parliament is declining, and people look to the East for more enthusiasm, but how long can this last? Miller and Andrews say in effect that Parliament is just not interested enough to pay much attention to the EU or EP generally, just the big issues. Yet, it seems that Parliament's own policy control is being nibbled away. The subsequent failure of the EU Constitution makes the idea of a policy disconnect between the voters and MPs a significant issue: transparency alone will not do it.

Chapter 6, by Lourie, addresses the Social Charter, thankfully going beyond 'the Tories no, Labour, I guess so...' of general policy to sections on specific areas, such as parental leave and part-time work. A key issue is whether policy adjustments would have been easier if Britain had been on the Social Charter from the outset, or to come in later. Given the distance Britain had to come to accommodate the Charter, it may have been difficult in any event.

Chapter 7, by Giddings, also takes on a key economic concern, the EMU. The chapter provides a rich discussion on the monitoring process, but no mention of the EU process of EMU, which pressed

for union as a political act rather than financial policy, e.g. creating the Central Bank without setting guidelines for its basic goals.

Chapter 8, by Ware and Wright, provides insights into 2nd pillar challenges from the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The discussion on overlapping missions, linking NATO and EU policies is an excellent summary, particularly the implications of how the UK treats broader strategic relationships as having greater importance than those with the EU.

In Chapter 9, on immigration and asylum, Drewry, Grimwood and Wood reverse the situation, exploring a situation where British foreign policy is heavily influenced by evolving EU policy. Further, the roles of the bureaucracy and of Parliament, where there is a clash of interests between carrying out rules and also a significant political controversy, provide an excellent focus for analysis.

Wright's Chapter 10, on devolution, provides an informative discussion on the role of scrutiny of EU directives associated with Scotland and Wales. This reviewer would have liked more comments on subsidiarity (discussed in Chapter 2) and on the West Lothian question, but Wright provides a solid presentation on other issues.

In the final chapter, Giddings and Drewry summarize many of the issues raised in earlier chapters, asking, as noted above, whether anyone is taking notice. The text provides considerable ammunition for discussing democratic deficits and similar issues, with concerns appropriate to both sides. Inadvertently, it also provides a paradox, such that much of what the EU does significantly affects British policies, yet at the same time seems somewhat irrelevant for the day-to-day politics of the UK.

Finally, the book can be a useful research tool. Even readers who find some of the technical issues tough sledding will appreciate the list of web sites in Appendix B, and also the select bibliography. *John H. P. Williams. East Carolina University*

**Joel S. Fetzer and J. Christopher Soper, *Muslims and the State in Britain, France, and Germany* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), xv & 208 pp., Bibliography, Index. ISBN 0-521-82830-9, Cl., \$60; 0-521-53539-5, Pb, \$14.99.**

This short study provides a clear and sensible investigation of why certain European states are more willing than others to accommodate the claims of Muslims for religious recognition and support. Of

the states selected for comparison Britain is the star, going a good deal farther than the other two in making concessions to Muslim religious practice (though not enough to satisfy the authors) than either Germany, winning second place, or France, their model of what not to do. The authors examine each state's policies on accommodation of Muslim religious practice and teaching in the public schools, state funding for Islamic schools, and regulation of the building of mosques. The country chapters are useful reviews of some well-known episodes (the *foulard* affair, for example) and a number of events that are less well-known (educational policies in Bremen). The case studies are supplemented by opinion surveys in the three countries that pose specific questions about religious accommodation. These show that mass opinion on issues related to Muslim religious practice is shaped mostly by the education and religiosity of the respondents and became discernibly less accepting of Muslim demands after 9/11.

The authors devote considerable attention to explanatory strategies, identifying three leading "theories" that have been used to account for state policies toward immigrant, ethnic, or religious minorities. They find resource mobilization, state structure (or political opportunity structure), and ideological theories useful but incomplete. Their contribution to the discussion is to suggest that traditional patterns of state-church relations in each country have decisively affected Muslim, dominant group, and state expectations of proper modes of religious regulation. This seems obvious enough that it is surprising that the authors are able to show that most studies of the subject have either ignored these matters altogether or under-estimated their effect. They rather easily demonstrate that despite the strong secular trends in all three countries the fact that Britain has an established church, Germany a plural religious establishment, and France a separationist doctrine has significantly channeled the development of policies towards Muslims. The other factors (especially resources and state structures) are important, but their impact is largely mediated by the church/state institutional legacy.

Well done as far as it goes, this book has a limited ambition. The authors ask only how states have responded to the "religious needs" of their Muslim populations. The more welcoming the response the better, they obviously believe, but they do not support their position with systematic evidence. It reflects rather their normative stance as persons of faith (p.

xi). Indeed, they tout Muslims as persons who take their religion seriously, in contrast with many Europeans who are Christians in name only. The authors imply but do not actually claim that more accommodation will lead to less extremism among Muslim minorities and that there is, in any case, little cause to worry about this devout religious community. The chapter on Britain tends to gloss over incidents in which Muslims have violated British political norms. The Bradford book-burning during the Rushdie affair is described as a “symbolic protest” rather than a dramatic disavowal of Western traditions of free speech. French problems with their Muslim population, on the other hand, are depicted as in part a result of heavy-handed state policies and receive far more coverage. What is missing in a book published in early 2005 is consideration of the consequences of the different modes of religious accommodation on offer for Muslim political, cultural, and social behavior. There is no discussion, for example, of what goes on in the Islamic schools and mosques that have flourished under British multiculturalism that the authors admire and urge be extended and emulated. A reader of *Muslims and the State* would be ill-prepared for the events of 7/7 in London; which is not to say that a scorecard of terrorist and illiberal activities should be taken as confirmation of the superiority of particular integration schemes. These must be assessed along other dimensions as well, especially what the values of liberal societies require with respect to the treatment and the behavior of minorities. The authors may be too optimistic that a ready acceptance of Muslim religious claims will lead to a peaceful settlement between church and state similar to the previous accords they rightly stress. What they seem to assume, but remains to be demonstrated, is that the Islam pressing for acceptance in Western Europe today is simply a religion *comme les autres*. Gary P. Freeman, *University of Texas at Austin*

**Steinar Stjernø, *Solidarity in Europe: The History of an Idea* (New York & Cambridge U., 2005), xiii & 392 pp., Bibliography, Index, Cl. \$75.00**

Steinar Stjernø's *Solidarity in Europe: The History of an Idea* presents a comprehensive and cogent survey of the concept of solidarity in European social and political thought from the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twenty-first. The empirical portion of the book is based on an analysis of the programs of an impressive array of European

social and Christian democratic parties (and later in the book, Communist and fascist parties). Tables concisely synthesize the conceptual, time series and cross-national comparative conclusions of the book. Stjernø's coverage of the topic is well organized to address the three arenas in which he asserts the concept of solidarity is relevant: “the academic discourse of social scientists and social philosophers, the political discourse of social democratic and socialist ideology, and the Christian discourse of social ethics” (p. 21).

British politics enthusiasts will appreciate the section analyzing the language of solidarity in Labour Party documentation from the first party congresses through the Blair Era. “The British case of solidarity rhetoric is simply that both a Marxist and a social democratic idea of solidarity were only faintly reflected in a few party programmes, and that the term solidarity has been missing in party programmes during the hundred years and more that the Labour Party has existed” (163-4). Stjernø attributes the lack of a solidarity discourse in Britain to “the hegemony of liberal ideology in the UK, the absence of Marxist influence in the Labour Party, and perhaps the early Christian influence in British socialism as well” (p. 164). In comparing the British case with the others he reviews, Stjernø argues for three “clusters” of solidarity discourse: a Scandinavian pattern of early, frequent and continuous use of the term, a Southern European pattern of more recent usage, and a British “pattern” of absence.

The “varieties of solidarity discourse” portion of the book is followed by an explicitly comparative section in which Stjernø juxtaposes social democratic party platforms in eight countries, demonstrating the gradual attenuation of the concept from early Marxist collectivist, class-oriented and revolutionary understandings of the term. In Catholic, Protestant and Christian democratic thinking, on the other hand, solidarity has been invoked more eclectically to emphasize different themes, such as empathy for the plight of the third world, gender emancipation, eco-friendliness, respect for diversity, and even European integration.

My only reservation with Stjernø's analysis concerns his methodology. As students of party politics well know, party programmes are highly influential in some cases and purely symbolic in others. Thus, it's not clear that the presence (or absence) of the term solidarity in these platforms and manifestos correctly reflects the word's usage in broader social discourse

or even more narrow political debates during the periods covered. To his credit, Stjernø corrects for this possible bias by comparing programme phraseology to speeches, public pronouncements and other documents.

While the topic of Solidarity in Europe is probably too narrow for a general political science, history or area studies course, the book is a welcome and informative complement to recent treatments of European party development, in particular *The Rise of Christian Democracy in Europe* by Stathis N. Kalyvas and *The Political Mobilization of the European Left, 1860-1980: The Class Cleavage* by Stefano Bartolini. *Sydney Van Morgan, Institute of European Studies, Cornell University*

**David Rubinstein, *The Labour Party and British Society: 1880-2005* (Brighton, UK & Portland, Ore.: Sussex Academic Press, 2006), x & 228 pp., Index, Bibliography, Pb. \$29.95.**

For devotees of Labour, the cover alone of the paperback edition may be worth the price of this book. There one finds Keir Hardie, sitting by a fireplace, dressed in a suit reading a newspaper; Clement Attlee attired in trousers, dress shirt, tie and waistcoat, pipe aside of the mouth pushing a lawnmower; and Tony Blair wearing red-and-black exercise attire, tossing a red-and-white basketball with similarly dressed teenagers behind him on a basketball court. The three photographs encapsulate the differences among the three party leaders and the cultural changes in British society over the 20th century.

In eight chapters of about 25 pages each, Rubinstein offers an impressive overview of the Labour Party. It is impressive, both for the felicity of the writing and for the skill with which it incorporates the main developments and personalities that have dominated the party for 125 years. Rubinstein is not reluctant to disagree with previous explanations pertaining to Labour's triumphs and travails, citing contrary analyses by others or offering his own. One with which he differs is George Dangerfield's reason for the declines of the Liberals. (p. 38) For the leading Labour figures, Rubenstein draws upon memoirs, biographies and other sources, including several of recent vintage to demonstrate why those individuals behaved in key situations - that behavior, sometimes due to personality traits.

Chapter 1, "The Background, 1880-1900" traces the early formative period that led to the creation of the party, including why some strands of socialist thought and leadership prevailed and others didn't. Chapter 2, "Labour in Peace and War, 1900-1918" examines the emergence of the party and its support of Asquith's Liberals. Chapter 3, "Labour Between Two Wars, 1918-1939," presents both the ecstasy of Labour forming its first government and the partisan agony of the following years until the onset of WWII. Chapter 4, "Labour in War and Peace, 1939-1951," which avoids a recounting of battlefield events while stressing the experience that Labour members gained from ministerial duties and the public's increased acceptance of Labour policies directed to assisting the ordinary citizen. Both factors enabled Labour to win the 1945 election and to implement its program, although not as fully as its leftwing wished. Chapter 5, "Years of Strife, 1951-1964," covers the period that raised the question, "Must Labour Lose?" Those years witnessed bitter infighting within Labour while Conservatives appeared to have the program that the public wanted, despite the disastrous Suez War. Chapter 6, "Progress and Decline, 1964-1979," is largely devoted to the leadership years of Harold Wilson, essentially a private man, but a masterful tactician in retaining his party's preeminence and keeping the party from disintegrating. His years as prime minister were contentious, but the economy performed better than is commonly believed. The frequently negative assessment of Labour in these years may have been abetted by the publication of the diaries of three cabinet members, Tony Benn, Barbara Castle, and Richard Crossman, although Wilson's own account [1971] – without the warts – preceded the appearance in print of the three ministers' memoirs. (p. 127). The dreary 1970s came to an end with the defeat of James Callaghan's government. Chapter 7, "Strife and After, 1979-1994," an era dominated by Margaret Thatcher offers little about her. Instead, the text explicates the factional struggle that beset Labour and the efforts of Michael Foot, Neil Kinnock, and briefly, John Smith to revive the party. Chapter 8, "New Labour, 1994-2005," is devoted to the Blair years, and resting on fewer scholarly assessments and a shorter historical perspective is less definitive than the prior chapters.

Occasional humorous observations enliven the text: In the last decade of the 19th century, it was asserted that socialist sympathizers in the north of England spread their message by "pasting advertising labels on

the backs of unsuspecting cows.” (p. 12) In 1964, “[t]he Labour leader was a trained economist, the Conservative prime minister worked out economic problems with, he admitted, the aid of matchsticks.” (p. 122) Neil Kinnock’s prolixity: “[E]ven his closest friends wince at his tendency to stretch a succinct statement into an elasticated tangle.” [p. 159, citing Peter Kellner. Brackets in original.]

The role of women in the party is a sub-theme of the book, including institutional changes that affected them, as well as the observations and contributions of such women as Beatrice Webb, Barbara Castle, and Shirley Williams.

In the “Preface,” the book’s central theme is offered: “The essential argument of this book is centre-left and left-wing politicians reflect their society more than they shape it.” (p. ix) A strength of Rubinstein is his persistent attention to the significant, but less obvious outcomes of elections, noting that the number of seats won by the parties did not always reflect their portion of the total vote or the loss or gain of votes from the previous general election.

This work compares well with Henry Pelling’s *A Short History of the Labour Party* and may replace it as the standard brief treatment on Labour’s evolution. *T.P. Wolf, Indiana University Southeast*

-----

## POT POURRI XLVII

**Nelson erection found to be shorter** – “While the stature of Britain’s greatest naval hero is immense, a monument to his achievements has come up short. Restorers working on Nelson’s Column have carried out the first scientific measurement of the landmark and discovered it is 16ft smaller than generally believed. Instead of towering 185ft above Trafalgar Square, they found the granite Corinthian column, complete with a 17ft statue of Admiral Horatio Nelson, rises a mere 169ft 5in.” [Citing Anil Dewar, “Nelson’s Column is 16ft shorter than everybody thought,” *The Telegraph* (internet version), 12/07/06.)

**Latest judicial development** – In case, you missed the announcement, we offer this information: The Bow Street magistrates court, first established in 1735 is no more, having been closed early in July. The site has been purchased by an Irish property developer, who it is said will build a hotel there.

Among the notable personages that inhabited the place were Henry Fielding, the second magistrate, who was succeeded by his blind half-brother, known as “the Blind Beak of Bow Street.” Among those that appeared before the bench of justice were Casanova, Roger Casement, Oscar Wilde, William Joyce (‘Lord Haw Haw’), Jeffrey Archer, Jonathan Aitken, and the Kray twins.

[*As we all know, Rumpole practiced his profession at the Old Bailey.*]

**The book scene** – Chance that a Briton has bought a book “solely to look intelligent”: 1 in 3. (According to a recent *Harper’s Index*.)

**Prophecy of the anti-Marketers fulfilled or get your butter from the Kiwis now!** – The British quota for New Zealand butter was recently struck down by EU officials as being in violation of EU rules. This ruling arose from a protest by a German dairy trader. The ruling, which does not become until September, was issued by Peter Mandelson, who previously had banned the importing of Chinese made brassieres (the ‘bra wars’) into the EU.

**A gap in the NHS?** – An April news article claimed that access to British dentists has become so tight that in a recent week 6,000 do-it-yourself crown-and-cap kits had been sold to consumers. (*No indication that the sales of sweets or ice lollies had declined.*)

**More on the dental scene** – An unemployed man in Whiston, England, who had six teeth extracted faced a bill for about \$5,000 when the clinic as which he was treated moved from the public health service to private status before his dentures were made and installed.

**Sport has no constraints!** – The British and World marbles championships were held recently in a Crawley, England pub.

**If at first, you don’t...** - In May, a Waterford, England man attempted suicide by tying a rope to his neck with the other end to a tree and then drove off in his car. The rope broke, but the impact caused the man to lose control of the car, which crashed into a tree, killing the man.

**Will this eliminate the need for Blair’s nuclear generators?** – Researchers at the University of

Birmingham announced they have powered a fuel cell by giving chocolate waste in *Escherichia coli* bacteria, which converted the sugar into hydrogen.

**Plus ça change, plus c'est la même chose** – “After luncheon I drove down to the House of Commons. Questions went quickly and nothing of interest occurred until the Prime Minister came in, when the Conservatives stood up cheering and waving their order-papers. This seemed to irritate the Opposition, who felt obliged to do the same thing, rather aggressively both for [the Rt. Hon. J.H.] Thomas and Ramsay MacDonald.” (*The House on Monday, May 3, 1926 as recorded by Duff Cooper in his autobiography.*) *Old Men Forget* (1953) at p. 148.

**Maggie still gets no respect – even in the ‘blues’** – In a list of characteristics of ‘blues’ song, posted on the internet was this:

“3. Blues are simple. After you have the first line right, repeat it. Then find something that rhymes.”

Such as:

“Got a good woman with the meanest dog in town.  
He got teeth like Margaret Thatcher and he weighs about 500 pounds.”

**Justice prevails once again** – Some months ago, an insurance company in Norwich reached a settlement with an employee who claimed she had injured herself when she stumbled over a pile of insurance claim forms in her office.

**Different horses for different courses** – “It was a strange fate of irony that led so sincere a Socialist [Arthur Ponsonby] into the House of Lords. His party were wise to send him there, where he proved as successful as he had proved unsuccessful in the Lower House. The atmosphere suited him. Their Lordships liked him, he was at home.

“With Philip Snowden exactly the reverse occurred. To him the interruptions of his opponents while he was speaking were as the flick of the whip or the prick of a spur to a racehorse. They stirred him to further effort, they roused him to put forth all his powers. A matter of taunts and jeers, he loved to goad his audience to fury and would smile with grim satisfaction when his thrusts went home. Faced by the complacency of the Upper House he was lost.” (Duff Cooper, *Old Men Forget*, p 125.

## Around the EU -

**A) German research scores again.** [A young woman, who was in the editor’s high school class sent him an email with the following information.] A newspaper article by Jonathan Hayter reported that a five-year study, conducted in Germany, of 200 men found that a 10-minute ogle at women’s breasts (covered of course) was the equivalent of a half-hour workout in a gym (not the German *Gymnasium*). Those that ogled had lower blood pressure, fewer heart attacks, and lower pulse-rates compared to those that did not gaze at female breasts. The female doctor that directed the study claimed “There is no question that staring at women’s breasts makes men healthier ...by doing so consistently, the average man can extend his life four to five years.” [When asked by his former classmate what a woman could do to experience a similar extension of life expectancy, the editor suggested gazing into the eyes of one’s male companion – or a male passerby.]

**B) Feline Assistance to the Authorities** – In Cologne, the life of a newborn baby, left on the doorstep of a house was saved by the persistent meowing of when the homeowner opened the house door to determine why the cat was meowing.

**C) Medical news with cross-cultural links:** German fertility or a seminal venture – Twelve women in the Washington, D.C. area have discovered that each was the recipient of the sperm from the same German donor, identified as 401. The dozen mothers and their children, who are half-siblings, now meet regularly. The donor has retired from that role, but there is a waiting list for his stored sperm. [No indication as to the EU policy on this matter.]

**D) Shouldn’t this be French, rather than Spanish cuisine?** – A restaurant in Barcelona, whose meals cost the equivalent of \$240 each and are praised by food critics has a lengthy waiting list for such delicacies as strawberry walnut mayonnaise, *foie gras* ice cream, cocoa butter with crispy ears of rabbit, and Kellogg’s Paella (Rice Krispies, shrimp heads & vanilla-flavored mashed potatoes.)

**E) This WAS French - and French justice prevailed** – The father of a French tennis player was given a lengthy prison sentence for putting tranquilizers in the drink of his daughter’s opponent, causing her death. The deceased was among 27 young women those drinks were spiked.

**F) Ein clever Polizei?** – In Trier, Rhineland-Pfalz, a 52 year-old police commissioner robbed a bank. When other police officials found his abandoned escape car, they discovered it was it belonged to the commissioner's girlfriend. One of the investigating officers observed that even the dumbest criminals customarily use stolen cars.

**From the Celtic Fringe -**

**A) Across the Irish Sea** - Question: Why are Irish jokes so simple? Answer: So the English can understand them.

**B) Church/State relations if the BEEB is State** – While serving as the BBC's advisor on Roman Catholic matters, Father Andrew Agnellus received a letter from a producer, asking how he might ascertain the official Church view on heaven and hell. Father Andrew replied with a memorandum of a single word: "Die."

**C) More on Church-and-State** – The town council in Dudley, England has told a local Methodist church that it must pay an "advertising fee" of approximately \$130 for the cross on church grounds since the cross represents an advertisement for Christianity.

**D) Never underestimate Irish cunning!** –An Irish newspaper recently printed this account, abbreviated here:

After midnight, robbers entered a bank in Ireland. Instead of finding one or two large safes, they found numerous small ones. When they opened one of these they discovered what they presumed to be vanilla pudding. The bank's audio-tape recorded one robber noting that they would at least have something to eat. They found no money or jewelry, but did open all the small safes and consumed the contents before departing with queasy stomachs. The next day's newspaper headlines read, "Ireland's largest sperm bank robbed early this morning."

**Around the Former Empire** –

**A) Party politics in India** – In 2005, a Hindu nationalist party rechristened Valentine's Day as 'Prostitution Day.

**B) Birth control practice in India** – Percentage of free condoms distributed in India used for activities other than sex – 75%.

**C) Going to the Dogs?** - Canines are often used in police work, but the care for those dogs varies from nation to nation as illustrated by President Bush's visit to India, where he was accompanied by 17 Secret Service Labradors and German Shepherds, each of which has its own rank, such as lieutenant. Delhi police also used dogs in the security for the visit, but the housing for the two groups of canines differed. The American ones were put up in five-star hotels, their Indian counterparts were housed in kennels.

**D) Long live the queen, but...**On the Queen's Birthday, April 21, the BBC World Service interviewed a journalist from Australia and one from Canada. The former noted that support for the monarchy was about 50/50 in 'Oz-land.' The latter indicated that there was little enthusiasm in Canada to change the statute of the monarchy. Observing that the reporter was from Quebec, he was asked if a French queen would be preferred there. The answer? "Oh, my God, no!"

**E) Not the law but please obey** – Gymnastics Australia has instructed cheerleading teams to use less-revealing uniforms. This ruling was not justified on 'indecent' grounds but on the assumption that the extensive display of cheerleaders' bodies would make overweight girls feel badly and lead to eating disorders.

-----

## **MEMBERSHIP NEWS**

**Kudos** –

**Karen Beckwith**, Flora Stone Mather Professor, Department of Political Science, Case Western Reserve University

**Vernon Bogdanor** appeared on C-SPAN April 21, explaining the constitutional status of the British monarch. The program was recorded in the U.K. on April 18.

**Philip Cowley** was cited in a May 10th Associated Press article "Opposition urges British PM to 'Go Soon,'" noting that Labour backbenchers were unlikely to cease their criticism of Blair until he completed arrangements with Gordon Brown on the succession issue.

**Alexandra Dobrowolsky** & Ruth Lister have been awarded the Jill Vickers Prize/ Prix Jill-Vickers by the CPSA for this paper, for which we include the selection committee's comments:

“Social Exclusion and Changes to Citizenship: Women and Children, Minorities and Migrants in Britain,”

“In this paper, Drs. Dobrowolsky and Lister analyze the current state of citizenship in Britain in light of the rise of political discourses and practices that seek to remedy social exclusion. Reviewing the welfare politics and their retrenchment under the leadership of Tony Blair, they unpack the implications of social exclusion in two highly contested areas: 1) recent welfare restructuring; and 2) immigration and asylum. They examine the centerpiece of New Labour’s social exclusion agenda and welfare reform strategy where the figure of ‘the child’ has emerged as a focal point in a changing citizenship regime ‘the child’ as a citizen-in-becoming and the future citizen-worker. This has serious repercussions for women in general, racial and ethnic minority women as well as im/migrant women in particular.”

**David Farrell** appointed Head, School of Social Sciences, University of Manchester.

**Rachel K. Gibson** appointed Chair in New Media Studies, Department of Media and Communication, University of Leicester

**Pippa Norris** from early May will be taking two year’s leave from Harvard to become the new Director of the Democratic Governance Group at the United Nations Development Program in New York.

The Group works on the following issues (see <http://www.undp.org/governance/>):

- Strengthening parliaments;
- Promoting sustainable electoral systems and processes;
- Protecting justice and human rights;
- Developing E-Governance and access to information for citizens' participation;
- Building stronger communities through decentralization, local governance and urban/rural development,
- Promoting governance to enable realization of the UN Millennium Development Goals;
- Supporting gender mainstreaming in governance.
- Encouraging public administration reform and anti-corruption policies

*(We post details for contacting her below.)*

**Donley T. Studlar** will be on sabbatical leave for the 2006-2007 academic year in the Department of Political Science, University of Aarhus, partly under auspices of a Fulbright grant

**New Addresses** –

**Karen Beckwith**, Flora Stone Mather Professor, Department of Political Science, Case Western Reserve University, 223 Mather House, 11201 Euclid Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, 44106-7109

**Rachel K. Gibson** – Media Studies, Department of Media and Communication, University of Leicester

**Pippa Norris**, Director, Democratic Governance Group, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme, 304 East 45th Street, Room 101B, New York, NY 10017. Tel. (212) 906-5604; Fax (212) 906-6471

**New or Changed Email Addresses** –

<b>Karen Beckwith</b>	karen.beckwith@case.edu
<b>Pippa Norris</b>	Pippa.Norris@UNDP.org
<b>David Baker</b>	dave_on_line@hotmail.com

**Other** –

**David Baker** has taken early retirement from the University of Warwick due to health matters. His new email address is directly above.

**Not-exactly membership news** – Former Executive Secretaries (not ‘Directors’) inform us that **Harrison Miller**, who recently lost the Democratic U.S. Senatorial Primary in Virginia was once a member of the BPG. Miller became a wealthy lobbyist and ran for Congress unsuccessfully some years ago. *(This information raises the question of why one would desert the BPG for money and a career in politics.)*

-----

# **Spring 2006, No 124**

## **IN THIS ISSUE**

Editor's Remarks	<b>Page 2</b>
Activities	<b>Page 3</b>
Announcements	<b>Page 4</b>
From the BPG-L	<b>Page 7</b>
Abstracts	<b>Page 10</b>
Book Reviews	<b>Page 11</b>
Pot Pourri	<b>Page 16</b>
Membership News	<b>Page 18</b>



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