



Officers

President

Wyn Grant 2004-2006
University of Warwick

Executive Committee

Karen Beckwith 2004-2006
Case Western Reserve

Samuel H. Beer 2004-2006
Harvard University

Sarah Childs 2004-2006
University of Bristol

Mark Franklin 2005-2007
Trinity College

Rachael Gibson 2005-2007
University of Leicester

Ian McAllister 2004-2006
Australia National University

Pippa Norris 2005-2007
United Nations

Susan Scarrow 2005-2007
University of Houston

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 2006, No 126

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Activities	Page 3
Awards	Page 4
Announcements	Page 6
From the BPG-L	Page 7
Book Reviews	
Rasmussen on <i>Clement Davies</i> by Wyburn-Powell	Page 9
Bale on <i>Changing Parties</i> by Faucher-King	Page 11
Harris on <i>The Scottish Labour Party</i> edited by Hassan	Page 12
Freyman on <i>Heaven on Earth</i> by Muravchik & <i>Narratives of British Socialism</i> by Ingle	Page 13
Pot Pourri	Page 18
Membership News	Page 19
More comments on the Passing of Leon David Epstein	Page 19
Obituary of Austin Ranney	Page 22

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 front cover. BPG dues are: One year - \$20 or £14; two years - \$35 or £25; three years - \$50 or £35; graduate student dues at ½ of these rates. Lifetime membership: \$500 or £350. Dues and inquiries about membership should be directed to the Executive Director – address on 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 for the best dissertation at a North American university of 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 by a junior (untenured) faculty member at a professional conference. For further details on these awards, see the Activities section below. Inquiries about each award should be made to the Executive Secretary. Periodically, a membership directory is compiled and sent to members.

The BPG was created in the 1970s by scholars devoted to the study of British politics, who wished to stimulate scholarly work on that topic. In addition to the activities noted above, the BPG organizes panels about British topic at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association.

BPG Electronic Communications – Discussion

List – Joel Wolfe has created a discussion list for the BPG. The instructions for its use were revised in 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.

If you have inquiries about the Discussion List, contact Joel at Joel.Wolfe@uc.edu. 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

This is not the happiest time for a political scientist of my generation. In addition to the death of Leon Epstein, whose passing we noted in the last issue and for whom we print additional comments in this issue, Austin Ranney has also passed on. (His obituary is at the end of this issue.) Those of my generation may also recall the standard comparative politics textbook, Gwendolen Carter, John Herz, and John Ranney, *Major Foreign Powers* or simply 'Carter, Herz and Ranney.' John Ranney was Austin's father. Coincidentally the current issue of PS has the obituary of John Herz, who died last December at 97.

Within a day or two of Ranney's death, a less well-known American scholar, who has a notable niche in American political research also died. Frederick Mosteller, a statistician, headed the Social Science Research Council team that examined the pre-election polls of 1948. Those polls predicted a victory by New York's Governor Thomas Dewey, but he lost to Harry Truman.

Earlier in the year, Herbert McCloskey died. He may have been best known for his surveys of national convention delegates, beginning in the 1950s. Although not as prominent as Leon and Austin, McCloskey was well known among those that specialized in political parties and survey studies.

His work also recalls the efforts of political scientists to observe the workings of American national conventions that flourished, starting in the 1950s. There have been fewer studies of the British counterparts to those meetings, but the Book Review section below has a review of **Florence Faucher-King's** anthropological examination of British party conferences. As one of the relatively small number of Americans that have attended those meetings, I continue to be impressed by how those gatherings have changed during the past quarter century, not only as Faucher-King reports, but also by the C-Span broadcasts of the leaders' speeches to the assembled delegates. Those performances are in stark contrast to Michael Foote, looking rather forlorn, sitting by himself on the platform at Brighton in 1983 as various Labour speakers used

the microphone. That year the Tories were already far more media savvy as they had full banc of party notables seated behind each speaker with a new one promptly replacing anyone who departed for whatever reason. Jorgen Rasmussen will recall our attending a 'fringe' session one evening at the Liberal Assembly at which there was a heated denunciation of the Tories' use of public relations techniques instead of discussing issues in depth.

My how things have changed!

Some of you may have noticed that Naval historians have recently claimed that (*History Today*) the Royal Navy was the actual victor in the Battle of Britain. This conclusion, which strikes me as implausible, brought a flak (pun intended) of disputation from those defending the Royal Air Force as the crucial military arm in that battle. Given his comments on the RAF's crucial role in this event, I doubt that Winston Churchill, that most famous of the First Admirals, would concur with the conclusion that favors the Royal Navy. Wouldn't the Luftwaffe have demolished surface ships if the latter did not have air cover?

ACTIVITIES

BPG Call for papers, talks, panels, and roundtables – 2007 APSA Meeting –

The British Politics Group is accepting proposals for the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 30 August to 2 September 2007 in Chicago. Proposals on all aspects of British political are invited, as are those that situate UK politics in regional, transnational and global contexts. Those include, but are not limited to: the impact(s) of globalization in the UK, UK-EU relations; the trans-Atlantic relationship; UK diplomacy and international bargaining; and immigration. 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 2006.

Send proposals and queries to:

Janet Laible, Department of Political Science
Lehigh University,
9 W. Packer Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015 USA
email: jml6@lehigh.edu Tel.: 610 758 5879
FAX: 610 758 3348

Email 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.

IMPORTANT!!!! – We are also organizing a separate "Britain After Blair" conference (SEE IMMEDIATELY BELOW) to immediately precede the APSA meeting. When submitting papers for the APSA panels, PLEASE INDICATE IF YOU WOULD ALSO LIKE YOUR PROPOSAL CONSIDERED FOR THE "Britain After Blair" CONFERENCE.

BRITAIN AFTER BLAIR: The Legacy and the Future A Conference Sponsored by the British Politics Group, Wednesday, August 29, 2007

The Gleacher Center, University of Chicago
Business School, Chicago, Illinois

Much like Margaret Thatcher before him, Tony Blair has dominated the British political scene for nearly a decade. Although the date of his actual departure from 10 Downing Street remains a point of speculation, he has made it clear that he will step down prior to the next General Election. What has been the legacy of the Blair government, both in terms of politics and public policy? What are the likely directions for the future, either under the leadership of Gordon Brown or beyond? The British Politics Group is organizing a special one-day conference to explore these issues in addition to our regular APSA panels. Potential topics could include (but are not limited to):

- Political economy and economic management under Blair
- The constitutional revolution of Tony Blair
- The social policy of New Labour
- David Cameron and the Tories after Tony
- Blair and the EU: Still the "awkward partner"
- Electoral prospects after Blair: Will Labour still dominate?
- The vision and reality of devolution

- Gordon Brown as Prime Minister
- Security and personal freedom under New Labour
- Transatlantic relations under the Bush-Blair axis

The conference is being held on Wednesday prior to the APSA meeting at the Gleacher Center of the University of Chicago Business School. Located on the Chicago River, the Gleacher Center is a very short walk from both of the main APSA conference hotels.

Further information on the conference, including submission guidelines and deadlines, can be found on the conference website (<http://www.rosehulman.edu/~casey1/BAB.htm>). Review of proposals will begin in January 2007.

If you have any questions or need any further information, please contact Terrence Casey, Executive Director, BPG at casey1@rose-hulman.edu. For information on the regular BPG panels at APSA, please see previous announcement or consult the website.

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 BPG members, we would encourage you to write a brief review for the BPGN. Reviews should be no longer than 1,000 words, include a summary of the main arguments and methods, and assess the author(s) contribution to scholarship in the field. We also encourage review articles, discussion 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 content, including the right of rejection. We will also continue to farm out books for review received from publishers.

AWARDS

Samuel H. Beer Prize of the British Politics Group

The Samuel H. Beer Dissertation Prize was developed by the British Politics Group to encourage the study of British politics by graduate students in North America 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 with a British component.

We invite nominations for the 2007 award of \$300 for the best doctoral dissertation in British politics completed during the calendar years of 2004, 2005, or 2006. All nominees must have received their Ph.D. from a department in the U.S. or Canada. Either the supervising professor or a department's director of graduate studies may nominate a dissertation. Either the supervising professor or a department's director of graduate studies 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, 2007 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
Telephone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

The winner of the award will be announced at the BPG's annual business meeting at the 2007 APSA convention.

There was no 2006 recipient.

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

The British Politics Group offers this fellowship to enable a North American graduate student doing research on British politics for her/his dissertation at a North American university to conduct research in the United Kingdom. The fellowship honors Donald E. Stokes, a founding member of the British Politics Group, and co-author of the seminal book *Political Change in Britain*. 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 for the 2007 award is March 15, 2007. Applicants will be notified of the selection committee's decision on their application by May 15, 2007. Applications should be sent

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
Telephone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

The 2006 Donald E. Stokes Dissertation Research Fellowship was awarded to Ophelia Eglene, Ph.D. candidate, Department of Political Science, State University of New York, Albany. Her dissertation, *Attitudes of British Business and the London Financial Sector on the Euro*, investigates the British business sector attitudes toward British entrance into the single European currency through the lens of Jeffrey Frieden's political economic model, which hypothesizes that their attitudes will vary depending on their exposure to currency fluctuations. Ophelia used the fellowship to offset the costs of her ambitious summer research trip to London, where she intended to interview members of the various industries and multinational corporations headquartered in Britain. Furthermore, she conducted extensive research at the archives of major British companies and trade associations, the Association for the Monetary Union of Europe and

the pro- and anti-Euro national campaigns. The combination of a theoretically-grounded, yet clearly politically relevant project, with a detailed plan of how she would collect her data convinced the committee that Ophelia is a worthy recipient of the award.

The 2006 Stokes Committee included chair, Dr. Richard Haesly, California State University, Long Beach, Dr. Bonnie Meguid, University of Rochester, and Dr. Elin Royles, University of Aberystwth.

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

The annual James B. Christoph Award for the Best Conference Paper on British politics presented by a junior faculty member honors the late James B. Christoph, a founding member, eminent scholar of British politics, and former president of the BPG. For the 2007 award, the paper (or poster) must be presented at a conference in calendar year 2006. All conference papers on British politics, whether solely on Britain or comparative, are eligible. The author/presenter must have (A) already received her/his Ph.D. at the time the paper is presented; and (B) been a non-tenured, full-time (tenure track or visiting) or part-time faculty member at an institution of higher education in North America at the time of presentation. The award is \$200, and the decision will be made by a three-person committee of established scholars who are BPG members. Four copies of the presentation should be sent to the BPG Executive Director. The submission deadline for the 2006 competition is April 1, 2007

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
Telephone: (812) 877-8281 Fax: (812) 877-8909

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Publications – David M. Farrell & Ian McAllister,
The Australian Elector System: Origins Variations and Consequences (Sydney: University of New South Wales, 2006).

Conferences -

A) Political Studies Association (PSA) 57th Annual Conference: “Europe and Global Politics,” University of Bath, April 11-13, 2007, hosted by the Department of European Studies and Modern Languages. Academic Convener, Richard Whitman – psa2007@bath.ac.uk. Local conveners: Dr. Simona Taiani and Dr. Gian Luca Gardina. Postal address: Political Studies 2007 Conference, Department of European Studies and Modern Languages, University of Bath, Bath BA2 7Ay, UK. Deadline for submission of proposals: 30 September 2007.

B) Second International Conference on Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, University of Granada, Spain, 10-13 July 2007

<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 trans-disciplinary practices, to perspectives on knowledge and method.

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*. If you are unable to attend in person, virtual registrations are also available which allow you to submit a paper for refereeing with 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 22 October

2006. Full details about the conference, including an online call for papers form, may be found at the conference website (above).

Dr. José Luis Ortega Martín, Vice-Dean of International Relations, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Granada, Spain

C) Symposium on the Humanities: Finding a Place in Changing Times, Columbia University, New York City, 24-26 February 2007 <http://www.HumanitiesSymposium.com>

This symposium is hosted by the International Conference on New Directions in the Humanities and the *International Journal of the Humanities* in conjunction with the Center for Comparative Literature and Society at Columbia University.

The aim of the symposium is to address the ambiguous status of the Humanities today, a situation that could be called a crisis. Key questions for discussion include:

- * Purposes of the humanities: systemic, critical, emancipatory?
- * Perceptions of the humanities: Why are they regarded with suspicion? What is it to be elite but marginal?
- * Higher education in the humanities and elementary education for the poor—how do we bridge the gap?

Deadline for submitting proposals – 31 October 2006. A title and short abstract is required and will be reviewed within a week of submission.

Presenters may choose to submit written papers and presentations to the fully refereed *International Journal of the Humanities*. If one is unable to attend the symposium, virtual registrations are also available, which allow one to submit a paper for refereeing and possible publication in the journal, as well as access to the online version of the journal.

Full details of the conference, including an online call for papers form, are available at the conference website listed above.

Submitted by Tom Nairn, RMIT University and Gaytarie Chakravorty Spivak, Columbia University, New York City, USA

FROM THE BPG-L

Rankings of 20th Century Prime Ministers –

The historian/journalist Frances Beckett, writing in the BBC's *History Magazine* has ranked the twenty prime ministers on a 5 point scales, giving Baroness Thatcher, the only woman, the top spot, followed by Clement Attlee, both with scores of '5.' Neville ranks at the bottom of the table, sharing a score of '0' with Anthony Eden.

Wyn Grant offered this comment on Beckett's ratings: "I think that Lloyd George is under rated on this list while Heath and Wilson are over rated. It's impossible to rate serving prime ministers in this way. I was doing some radio on this latest ranking this morning (29 Aug 06?) and we were asked to name who was the best prime minister we never had. RAB Butler's name came up, but I always felt he lacked the steel for the job, which is why he didn't get it."

Here are rankings from Beckett's assignment and a 1999 BBC poll and a 2000 BPG one. The 1999 and 2000 surveys did not include Blair. Data for those sets are from Kevin Theakston & Mark Gill, "Rating 20th Century Prime Ministers," University of Leeds, *POLIS Working Paper No. 19* (July 2005).

Beckett	1999	2000
Thatcher 5	1 Churchill	Churchill
Attlee 5	2.Lloyd George	Attlee
Heath 4	3 Attlee	Lloyd George
Churchill 4	4 Asquith	Thatcher
Macmillan 4	5 Thatcher	Macmillan
Campbell-B 4	6 Macmillan	Asquith
Salisbury 3	7 Salisbury	Wilson
Lloyd George 3	8 Baldwin	Salisbury
Baldwin 3	9 Campbell-B	Heath
Wilson 3	10 Wilson	Baldwin
Blair 3	11 Heath	Macdonald
Callaghan 2	12 Callaghan	Callaghan
Balfour 2	13 Bonar Law	Campbell-B
Bonar Law 1	14 Macdonald	Chamberlain
Macdonald 1	15 Douglas-Hume	Balfour
Douglas-Hume 1		
Major 1	16 Balfour	Major
Eden 0	17 Major	Douglas-Hume
Chamberlain 0	18 Chamberlain	Bonar Law
	19 Eden	Eden

Research Opportunity – Scholar-in-Residence Program, 2007 – EU Center of Excellence, Texas A&M University

The EU Center of Excellence (EUCE) at Texas A&M University is extending an opportunity for a scholar to conduct research in College Station, Texas, in 2007 (spring and/or summer). The EUCE is the only official center in the U.S. Southwest with funding support from the European Commission. The program is designed to provide an opportunity for European scholars to participate in academic-educational and cultural activities and intellectual life at Texas A&M University. It is also designed to allow the scholar-in-residence to expand professional contacts and foster productive working relationships with scholars at the host institution specifically and in the United States more broadly. It will also strengthen the expertise in EU and transatlantic affairs and offer cross-cultural and international perspectives in support of the international ambitions and programs of the host institution and the community as a whole.

Scholars are expected to participate in campus and community activities (including guest lectures) that would benefit from the scholar's expertise, serve as a resource person for and consult with faculty and students on research, and produce and submit a manuscript to be considered for publication by the EUCE. The scholar-in-residence is not expected to teach regular courses.

Any individual from Europe who has an affiliation with a European institution of higher education, research center, think tank, etc. is eligible. The individual should have a Ph.D. or Masters degree or be a doctoral candidate, or the individual should have demonstrated and have documented expertise in the area of the proposed subject.

The EUCE Scholar-in-Residence Program encourages applications in fields that are aligned with the core themes of the EUCE: Energy, Environment, and/or Climate Change (available, efficient, secure, and renewable and sustainable energy resources and use, sustainable agriculture, climate change, etc.); Safety and Security (soft security challenges, cross-border diseases, food safety and public health, etc.); and Education, Innovation and Knowledge (related to the themes above or beyond and the concept of the knowledge-based economy).

Applications are open to scholars in any discipline. The proposed research should include a clear European and transatlantic dimension, and include current affairs and an international and/or regional (e.g. U.S. Southwest approach, and/or comparative framework, and a policy component (not only a focus on scientific research). The EUCE will also consider applications that are not directly aligned with the themes above, but the applicant will need to show how he or she will contribute to the goals of the scholar-in-residence program and the mission of the EUCE.

Proposals/applications will be judged based on the following criteria: quality of scholarship (including scholar's demonstrated expertise in research and writing and the originality of the proposed research project) and potential impact of the project (including the relevance of the research topic to the EUCE mission and alignment with the fields of study encouraged by the EUCE or how it will support its mission if not directly aligned with these fields, clarity of stated fulfillment of expectations and contributions, and the proposed manuscript to be produced and submitted to the EUCE).

The grant covers round-trip airfare, accommodation and subsistence amounting up to \$8,660 for up to three months of consecutive research at Texas A & M University and campus and community activities.

The deadline for submission of proposal/application is November 17, 2006 (once per year). Applications must be submitted by email to the EUCE at lcarranza@tamu.edu with the required application material. The final award will be announced in December of 2006.

The scholar is invited by and reports directly to the EUCE as the grant maker regarding fulfillment of expectations. The applicant, however, is in principle required to contact and obtain an agreement with an academic college to serve as an academic host for the scholar in advance of submitting the application (although exceptions to this principle may be considered by the EUCE and the review committee after the deadline if the proposal is of high quality and the applicant has not been able to secure an academic host.

The resident scholar must submit a brief report to the EUCE on research activities and activities under the grant within one month after ending the stay at Texas A

& M University, and must submit a complete manuscript to the EUCE following its guidelines for manuscripts by September 15, 2007.

Payment regulations require the award recipient to complete immigration documentation using the GLACIER program, the online tax compliance system used by Texas A & M University. If the award recipient does not have a social security number or a tax ID, he or she will have to apply for one before receiving payment from Texas A & M University.

For application materials, visit the EUCE website <http://eucenter.tamu.edu> and to the "Grant Seekers" link under the Resources section. If you have any questions, please contact Lucero Carranza by phone at (+1) 979-862-6700 or by email at lcarranza@tamu.edu.

Applications will be reviewed by an on-campus committee and the EUCE will not be in the position to respond to inquiries regarding the relevance of a certain proposal or ideas for a proposal beyond the information in this announcement.

Conferences –

A) International Conference in UK Political Ideologies, University of Liverpool, 7-8 July 2007.

Papers are invited for this conference, which will focus on political ideologies in the UK. Issues will include contemporary perspectives on social democracy/democratic socialism, conservatism, liberalism, nationalism, environmentalism, feminism and the extreme right. In addition, papers are welcome on the relationship of politics and religion, political ideology and political theory and political ideology and public policy.

Proposals for panels are also welcome, although these may have to be changed by conference organizers. Papers from all levels of academia are encouraged, as are papers from non-academics with particular interest in these areas.

Further details are available from, and proposals should be sent to Dr. Kevin Hickson, School of Politics and Communication Studies, Roxby Building, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZT or k.hickson@liverpool.ac.uk by Friday November 3, 2006.

Proposals should be no more than 300 words.

Conference website: www.liv.ac.uk/polcomm/icpi.htm

B) Workshops of BISA Working Group on British Foreign Policy

To register for either of these, contact Tim Oliver
t.l.oliver@lse.ac.uk

1) Tony Blair and the Making of UK Foreign Policy – London School of Economics, Friday 10 November 2006, 2:00-6:00 p.m.

The aim of the workshop is to explore a range of issues, such as Blair's relations with the Cabinet, ECO, intelligence services, Parliament and public opinion in the realm of foreign affairs. What did Hutton and Butler have to say about his way of policy-making, and what legacy do they leave? How has Blair's own personality and beliefs influenced the making of British foreign policy? And what has been the impact of the Blair-Brown relationship? How accountable has Blair's foreign policy been?

Details:

Meet in the Graham Wallas Room, Main Building, LSE

1330 – Registration

1400 – Welcome

1415 – Opening lecture: Brandon Donnelly & Stuart Weir, authors of *Not in Our Name*

1500 – Q&A

1530 – Break – refreshments

1600 – Roundtable discussion: Professor Chris Brown (LSE), Dr. Bastian Giererich (IISS), Dr. Ann Lane (Defence Academy) & Dr. James Gaskarth (Plymouth)

1700 – Q&A to Roundtable

1800 – Adjournment

2) Tony Blair and UK Foreign Policy Priorities – University of Birmingham, Friday 20 March 2007, 2:00-6:00 p.m.

The workshop will explore issues such as what influence Blair has had on Britain's key bilateral and multilateral relations, especially with the EU and the USA. What ideas have driven Blair's approaches to these relationships? Can we discern a 'Blair Doctrine' that has refashioned UK foreign policy? Why did Blair commit the UK to the Iraq War?

Details:

1330 – Registration

1400 – Welcome

1415 – Opening lecture – Dr. Anthony Seldon, biographer of Tony Blair

1500 – Q&A

1530 – Break – refreshments

1600 – Roundtable discussion: Professor Dave Allen, Loughborough, Dr. Inderjeet Parmer, Manchester, Dr. Peter John Sherman, Melbourne, Dr. Julie Smith, Cambridge, & Dr. Richard Whitman, Chatham House

1700 – Q&A to Roundtable

1800 – Adjournment

BOOK REVIEWS

Alun Wyburn-Powell, *Clement Davies: Liberal Leader* (London: Politico's Publishing, 2003), xviii & 300 pp., Bibliography, index, six appendices, forward by Lord Hooson. ISBN 1 902301 97 8; Cl. \$59.95.

Clem Davies is remembered by few of today's British politics specialists. He didn't write his memoirs, didn't publish any diaries, and hasn't been the subject of a biography. So why undertake that labor now more than four decades after his death?

Wyburn-Powell offers two reasons: 1) Davies played a key role in bringing Churchill to power in 1940 and 2) Davies was a major figure in maintaining the Liberal party during its nadir in the 1950's. This biography makes a convincing case for both claims. Davies was active in the various dissident groups that flourished in the Commons in the 1930s; in this regard he was merely one among many, several much more prominent than he. As Wyburn-Powell sets forth in detail, however, when it came to the crunch—the debate on the motion to adjourn in May 1940—Davies was the man. He helped transform the motion into a vote of confidence, lined up a number of dissenting votes sufficient to produce a sizable rebellion, rounded up an audience to hear the key oration of Leo Amery denouncing Chamberlain ("you have sat here too long for any good you may be doing, in the name of God, go!"), and pushed Labour to hold out for Churchill as the new Prime Minister and not settle for Halifax. In addition to setting forth the key events, Wyburn-Powell provides comments from several important political figures, both at the time

and later, who cited Davies as the pivotal force.

As for keeping the Liberal party in being, Davies' role went well beyond simply being the Leader from 1945 to 1956. Despite its small size the Liberal party was divided (as it always seems to have been) between left and right wings, both in the Commons and in the country. Davies had to hold these wayward factions together. Lady Violet Bonham Carter (Asquith's daughter) and Archibald Sinclair, the previous party Leader who narrowly had lost his seat in the Commons in 1945, continually badgered Davies to form a pact with the Conservatives, which would have driven off such lefties as Megan Lloyd George, daughter of the other World War I Liberal Prime Minister.

The crucial temptation came in 1951, after the Conservatives returned to power. Churchill offered Davies a seat in the Cabinet. Following two meetings with Churchill, Davies decided to discuss the offer with the party Executive. Wyburn-Powell is a bit ambiguous on the outcome. On the one hand, he says that Davies, on a personal level, "was desperately tempted to accept the offer." On the other hand, after reporting to the Executive, Davies left the room to facilitate free discussion. He "had all but decided to decline by the time he saw his colleagues." The vote was 11 to 1 (Lady Violet the only one to favor accepting) to reject the offer. Nonetheless, Davies could have remained in the meeting and argued strongly for acceptance and might have won a majority in favor. That course of action almost certainly would have destroyed the Liberals.

That Davies never seriously considered arguing for acceptance probably is correct. Admittedly, it was nearly a decade after the events when I talked with him about them. At that point he dismissed the offer with the comment that he would have been an object of disdain in a Conservative cabinet. Every time he dissented, somebody would say, "Aye, there sits the bloody Liberal."

Wyburn-Powell says that he sought both to produce a reference work and an enjoyable biography. This leads to a false step. Although he freely admits that he never met Davies (he was only four years old when Davies died), he persists throughout in referring to him as "Clem," because this is what

everyone called him. This tends to produce an inappropriate "chummy" tone at times. Would you write a biography of Churchill and refer to him as "Winnie"?

Nonetheless, the book is scholarly, both in its research and its content. The main caveat is that Wyburn-Powell relies very heavily on the recollections of Davies' son, Stanley. When Wyburn-Powell interviewed him, he was infirm and in his 80s; he died before the biography was published. That said, reliance on Stanley didn't produce a white-wash. Not one of the many people I interviewed from the time period of Davies' Leadership ever so much as hinted that he had a drinking problem. Wyburn-Powell goes so far as to include a photo of the car Davies wrecked while driving under the influence.

Davies left no diaries or draft memoirs. His papers seem to be extensive, however, including considerable correspondence and Wyburn-Powell had full access to this material. Furthermore, he makes good use of other archives.

One key event, however, remains a mystery. In 1950 the Liberals decided to fight the general election on "a broad front," offering 475 candidates. For a premium of £5,000, Lloyds agreed to pay for all lost deposits over 50, up to 250. When the Liberals lost more than 300 deposits, they were able to recoup £30,000 from Lloyds. Even so, the Liberals offered only a few more than 100 candidates in the 1951 general election. What might the number have fallen to had the party not been insured in 1950? Who talked Lloyds into this unwise coverage? Wyburn-Powell doesn't say. If he couldn't find out, given the material to which he had access, we probably will never know who this "hero" was.

Wyburn-Powell faults Davies for being too garrulous, for getting carried away at times with his own rhetoric. Although he possessed administrative abilities, he wasn't very good at translating his values into policies and devoted little attention to party organization. Frank Byers, another of the forgotten men of this time, is accorded some well deserved praise for dealing with these matters. Although Wyburn-Powell provides a few concluding comments on the transition from Davies to Jo Grimond, he doesn't remark on the irony of this change in

Leaders. Grimond has been hailed as a much more dynamic, radical Leader, the one who truly was crucial in keeping the party afloat. Like Davies, however, Grimond had no interest in party organization. Donald Wade and Lord Banks had to play the role that Byers played under Davies.

So there are others who should not be forgotten, given their crucial contributions. Wyburn-Powell is correct, however, that Clement Davies deserves a biography. But for his actions the history of twentieth century Britain, both politically and as a nation, in all likelihood would have been a great deal different. And Wyburn-Powell shows why this is true. *Jorgen Rasmussen, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Iowa State University*

Florence Faucher-King, *Changing Parties: An Anthropology of British Political Party Conferences* (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), x & 315 pp., Index, Bibliography, ISBN 1-4039-0462-6, Cl. \$74.95.

This is a fascinating book, both in terms of findings and format. It is based on over half a decade of participant observation – a research method that demands not just dedication but the kind of social skills that academics (at least those outside the British Politics Group) are not always renowned for possessing. The author – who is French by birth and upbringing but who has worked for long periods in the UK and is now based at Vanderbilt in the US – has made the most of the time she spent at the conferences of British political parties, large (Labour and Conservative), medium (the Lib Dems) and the small (the Greens). Faucher-King uses her experience not just to build an argument, but also to provide us with short vignettes written in the present tenses to help us understand and even to feel that we were there with her.

Behind *Changing Parties* is the conviction that rational choice frameworks which stress individuals and incentives, while useful, can only ever tell part of the story, because it finds it difficult if not impossible to tap into the collective and symbolic aspects of politics and participation. These are, of course, precisely the phenomena that Faucher-King's borrowings from anthropology—and particularly the study of ritual—can help with. The way things are

done—and (as she, like Lewis Minkin before her, shows) manipulated—helps produce an event that is functional, if vaguely unsatisfying for many of those involved, even in the twenty-first century. The more mainstream the image being projected, the more fixing goes on, yet even in the stage-managed productions that are Labour and Conservative conferences there are opportunities for the delegate to 'feel the connection with previous generations of party activists and locate himself within a tradition and a transcendent "we".' In as much as parties embody eternal truths for their most dedicated supporters, the author argues, they are reproduced and cemented not only by detailed boning up on party policy but by participation in affectively-charged performances and ritual.

That said, as the title implies, Faucher-King's focus is on change. She is not the first to explore the increasing media saturation of conferences: James Stanyer has written a fascinating book on the subject. Nor is she the only analyst to note that the annual event (normally but not always beside the seaside) is often the culmination of what Richard Kelly memorably called a 'hidden system' of preceding events. But no one before her has caught in quite so much eye-opening detail what she calls the "marketization" of new spheres of activity [the] corporate branding' that now goes on, especially when it comes to Labour, which in recent years has left the Conservatives trailing (sometimes badly) in its slipstream in this respect. And, notwithstanding her objections to rational choice reductionism, Faucher-King also deals well with why people—and parties—still bother with conferences, as well as the questions of culture, legitimation and other functions more familiar to those with an anthropological bent.

Certainly, anyone who wants to see how anthropological work really can generate and tackle fresh questions in political science should go read this book. But even those interested only in British party politics will come away with a new perspective on a ritual that they might mistakenly have thought of as all-too-familiar or even outworn. Given the extent to which the approach of the 2006 Labour conference turned up the heat on Tony Blair, this has to be important. *Tim Bale, University of Sussex*

Gerry Hassan, ed., *The Scottish Labour Party: History, Institutions and Ideas* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, distr. in U.S. by Columbia University Press, 2004), ix & 255 pp., Index, pb. \$24.00.

A significant contribution to the study of British and Scottish politics, *The Scottish Labour Party* is a collection of essays by leading historians, political scientists, and journalists dealing specifically with the history, political culture, and socio-economic context of Scottish Labour. As Hassan points out in the introductory chapter, critiquing the lack of analysis regarding Scottish Labour despite the substantial attention paid to Labour as a whole, this work is devoted to moving beyond a primarily historical treatment. With the establishment of the Scottish Parliament and dominant position Labour occupies in Scottish politics, Hassan argues for the necessity of a more thorough treatment of Scottish Labour. The goal of the work is neither to advance a single thesis nor provide a definitive study of Scottish Labour. Rather, it is a step in the direction of addressing the inadequacy of past studies of the Scottish Labour Party.

Hassan's introductory chapter, following his compelling critique of previous research, identifies the significant difference between Scottish Labour, British Labour, and New Labour through a fascinating study of its political culture grounded in quantitative evidence, rejecting the more romantic notions that Scottish Labour is somehow more socialist than New Labour nor traditional socialism.

Following this introduction, the work is organized into four parts with chapters contributed by some of the leading researchers in Scottish politics including Christopher Harvie, Richard Finlay, Fiona Mackay, John MacCormick, and Peter Lynch. Part I explores the historical development of Scottish Labour, with Finlay assessing Labour's relationship to the trade union movement and revolutionary socialism from 1888-1945 and Bob McLean dealing with the postwar corporatist consensus, divisions within Labour over the national question (especially with regard to the SNP threat in 1974), the left-wing takeover of the party in reaction to Thatcher and the subsequent defection of the SDP, and finally Labour's recovery in the 1990s and its embrace of

devolution. Part I is concluded by Christopher Harvie with an astute assessment of the economic developments and fluctuations in Scotland during the twentieth century and the role of Scottish Labour in this context.

Part II consists of three essays from Paula Surridge, Jane Saren and James MacCormick, and Fiona Mackay. All three essays are primarily quantitative in nature with Surridge's essay exploring the relationship between the electorate and Scottish social base of the party. Saren and MacCormick's chapter analyzes the shifting loyalties and context within the Scottish Labour heartlands from the 1987 Westminster General Election to the Scottish Parliamentary election of 2003. Finally, Mackay offers her expertise in the area of gender and politics with a study of women's representation in Scottish Labour with a brief historical overview and a detailed analysis of the 2003 Scottish Labour Party in the context of the devolved parliament.

The national question and the autonomy of Scottish Labour in the context of British Labour are assessed in Part III. Douglas Fraser's "New Labour, New Parliament" addresses the issues that Scottish Labour faces with regard to devolution. Perhaps due to Fraser's background as a journalist and political editor for the *Herald*, this chapter is primarily qualitative and, though less scholarly in its treatment of the subject, is a fascinating exploration of the dynamics of devolution and the challenges it poses for Scottish Labour. Ian MacLean's chapter follows with a primarily historical analysis of Scottish Labour in the context of the wider British Labour Party in which MacLean challenges the notion that Scottish Labour, and Scottish voters, are significantly to the left of British politics. Nicola McEwen's "Pragmatic Nationalists" also takes an historical approach and seeks to define the relationship between Scottish Labour and nationalism. McEwen asserts that with devolution and the inevitable fragmentation of the nationalist movement, Scottish Labour faces a dilemma with maintaining credibility with Westminster by de-emphasizing the "Scottish card." Peter Lynch and Steven Birrell's institutionalist analysis of the degree of actual autonomy enjoyed by Scottish Labour is of particular interest as it addresses the organizational and membership problems that the party currently faces.

The final section of the work consists of articles from Hassan, Mark Irvine, and Michael Keating and deals with Scottish Labour and its relationship to the trade union movement, socialism, globalization, and European integration. Hassan's chapter is primarily a biographical study of Gordon Brown and traces his transition from revolutionary New Leftist and editor of "The Red Paper on Scotland" in the 1970s to his current commitment to reformist social democracy and tensions with Blair and New Labour. Irvine's essay explores the Scottish Labour-trade union relationship—perhaps a stronger connection than the relationship on a UK level. Irvine's analysis adopts an historical perspective that addresses the divisions in both movements during the 1970s and 1980s, the ability of both to work together and exploit the Conservative rout of the 1990s, and the future possibilities of tension and cooperation in the devolved parliament. Finally, Keating's "Socialism, Territory and the National Question" briefly addresses the difficulties faced by Scottish Labour in dealing with "class, ideology and territorial demands, while facing competition in all three dimensions" (p. 233). Employing a more theoretical approach, Keating evaluates socialism and social democracy in the context of globalization, European integration, and the changing character of the nation-state.

In the context of the Scottish Parliament, despite the more recent and fairly limited Scottish Tory recovery from their 1997 rout, the role of the SNP as the leading opposition party, and the loss of votes in PR Regional Lists to the SSP and Greens, Scottish Labour, due to its success in first-past-the-post, remains the dominant force in Scottish politics. It is absolutely essential for scholars of British politics to seek to understand the distinctive nature of Scottish Labour and move beyond a simply historical treatment of the subject or romanticized images of the ILP and Red Clydeside. This work, as Hassan points out, is certainly not the definitive study of Scottish Labour nor is it guided by an overarching thesis or theoretical framework that may unite the diverse, and sometimes contradictory, position of its contributors. Yet, it is a substantial contribution to the study of Scottish politics and is certainly a foundation for future studies of the Scottish Labour Party. *Sterling Harris, University of Louisville*

Joshua Muravchik, *Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism*, (London: Politico's, 2004), 418 pp., Index, Cl. £25; Stephen Ingle, *Narratives of British Socialism*, (Houndmills & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 195 pp., Bibliography, Index, Cl. \$68.00.

In his 1910 essay, entitled "*Notre Jeunesse*," Charles Péguy sought to defend the French Third Republic from its critics in the *L'Action française* by drawing a distinction between the regime's mystique (its foundational ideal and vision) and its *politique* (its actual practices and supporters). Péguy's point was that both the vision and the actuality of any regime might be legitimately criticized, but if monarchists wished to denounce republicanism by comparing it unfavorably to monarchy, they needed to compare like with like: either their ideals or their practices with one another, but not the vision of monarchy with the actuality of the Third Republic. The two realities exist in incommensurate realms.

This distinction is important not just for ideological debate but also for sound social analysis. Consider the current discussions about the demise of socialism. It is indisputable that socialist movements are undergoing a profound crisis at present. The closing decades of the 20th century witnessed the collapse of "actually-existing socialism" in the Soviet Union and the retreat from communist economic (if not political) arrangements in the People's Republic of China. During roughly the same period, European social democratic parties, including Britain's Labour party, began to jettison most of their commitments to egalitarian reform, policies which had characterized revisionist socialism throughout the century. In one way or another, both socialist traditions had come to accept, if not embrace, the inevitability of the market and private ownership. This is a well known story, the stuff of liberal triumphalism. But as Péguy's essay reminds us, we need to be careful about which aspect of socialism—its critique of capitalism or the governments and parties which constitute it as a movement—current analyses are consigning to the dustbin of history. To be sure, the connection between an ideology and its "material force" is a close, if complex, one. Nevertheless, there is a meaningful analytical distinction to be made between

assessing the validity of an idea and assessing the success of its proponents. Unfortunately, both of the books under review fail to maintain this analytical distinction in their respective treatments of socialism, and this leads them into some fundamental confusions.

Joshua Muravchik's *Heaven on Earth* is a tendentious screed about the failure of socialism throughout the world. For Muavchik, this story is a personal one. The failure of the socialist vision is associated with the failure of individual socialists as human beings. The book narrates the story of socialism through a series of potted biographies of *inter alia* Gracchus Babeuf, Robert Owen, Karl Marx and Freidrich Engels, Eduard Bernstein, Vladimir Lenin, Clement Atlee, Julius Nyerere and Mao Zedong—all of whom are depicted as somehow flawed, and often despicable, characters. All of the old personal demerits and canards are dragged out once again. Indeed, the author is at pains to reveal new reasons, however trivial or mean-spirited these might be, for us to dislike these people. Muravchik insinuates that the idea of socialism is not credible because (some) socialists are unlikable.

The story of socialism is personal for Muravchik in another sense as well. He begins the book with the self-disclosure of having been raised in a family committed to the socialist movement, beginning with his grandfather who was a member of the leftist Socialist Revolutionaries in Russia prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, and continuing with his father who was a member of the Socialist Party in America. Joshua joined the Socialist Party and served as the national chairman of its Young People's Socialist League in the late 1960s and early 1970s. So, we are meant to presume, here is someone who possesses first-hand knowledge of the evils of socialism. What the author does not disclose is how—along with many other Cold War anti-communist socialists at the time (“Trotsky's Orphans” in Michael Massing's memorable phrase)—he joined Scoop Jackson's Coalition for a Democratic Majority and subsequently became part of the movement of “neo-conservatism” that merged in the mid 1970s. He has been a resident scholar at the neo-conservative American Enterprise Institute since 1987. Like many neocon intellectuals, Muravchik specializes in American foreign policy, so *Heaven on Earth* is something of a scholarly

departure for him. In fact, the book is one of the few theoretical works produced by the current generation of the neocons. Like Hegel's owl of Minerva, it presents the movement critically reflecting upon the ruins of its intellectual foundations. Perhaps a better analogy is that of the enterprise of the writers of the Christian gospels of the late first century who sought to indict Judaism in their texts and thereby effectuate a complete break from that earlier, and in their eyes superseded, religious tradition.

This analogy is in keeping with the spirit of the book, whose central themes is that socialism is a false religion. The work is replete with religious metaphors. Indeed, Muravchik begins with the observation, “Socialism was the faith in which I was raised.” (p. 1). Later he confides, “I became an apostate in my thirties and began to grope my way back to Judaism.” (p. 2). Like many other converts to a new religion, he is impelled by zealotry which cannot accept any ambiguity in matters of faith. The author's sole offer of a definition of “socialism” is left to a footnote, in which he explains that he does not differentiate among the various socialist traditions such as “communism” and “social democracy.” This conceptual Catholicism provides the cover for his terminological legerdemain by which all socialism is reduced to Marxism and ultimately to Stalinism. In the end, Muravchik's socialist straw man connotes any form of totalitarianism, including fascism. The “acrobats of logic” by which he tries to demonstrate that fascism is socialism will be readily recognizable by any teacher of mediocre undergraduates.

Just as Muravchik's conception of socialism is too diffuse, so too is his indictment of it. As a religious person, an accusation that socialism rests upon faith rather than science can hardly serve Muravchik. Rather, he suggests that socialism has failed to deliver on its promise of “heaven on earth”—but, then, this is a vice shared by most other religions. And Muravchik is at a loss in explaining why this is so. Given his own faith tradition, it is difficult for him to argue that socialism cannot work because it is contrary to a sinful human nature. (The archetypal anti-socialist philosopher Lezsek Kalokowski is not constrained by Muravchik's religious commitments. Therefore he can write, “capitalism is human nature at work—that is, man's greed allowed to follow its

course...”.* Muravchik appears tempted to offer this explanation, such as when he insinuates as much in his cautionary tale about an Israeli kibbutz in the book’s epilogue. But this argument, so contrary to Jewish ethical precepts, is an afterthought that is never explicitly articulated in the main body of the text. Nor can he legitimately condemn socialism for its excessively moralistic idealism, for the neo-conservative perspective to which he subscribes advocates its own type of moralistic idealism as the basis for American foreign policy. And Muravchik is on the hyper-idealistic wing of the neocon movement.

Not until the last few pages of the book is Muravchik’s real indictment of socialism revealed. It is a false religion because, unlike “unearthly faiths” which prescribe a moral code, socialism “lacks any internal code of conduct to limit what believers may do.” (p. 344). Thus Muravchik arrives at a critique of which is *au fond* a theological one. We have entered the world of Dostoyevsky, where if there is no God then everything is permitted. However, the most casual empiricism reveals this proposition to be false. But by conflating socialism with Stalinism, Muravchik blithely can ignore such religiously-based socialist tendencies as Christian socialism, as well as the ethnical basis of much of the socialist movement throughout its history. (Even Kolakowski is intellectually honest enough to give socialism its moral due in this regard. While ultimately rejecting its utopian idealism on prudential grounds, he acknowledges that ethical socialism is committed to the pursuit of social justice which, however vague an ideal, nevertheless is tied to the concept of human dignity. The two are linked, writes Kolakowski, because the “concept of social justice is needed to justify the belief that there is a ‘humanity’—and that we must look on other individuals as belonging to this collectivity, toward which we have certain moral duties.”) Naïve perhaps, but much of the socialist tradition has hardly been amoral.

Could it be that Muravchik means to condemn socialists not for their lack of positive moral precepts (thou shalt) but for their lack of negative ones (thou shalt not)? It is true that some socialists have acted without moral restraint in the pursuit of heaven on earth. Of course, this could also be said of some

believers of almost all of the world’s religions in the name of God. The history of religious fanaticism is a bloodstained one. We should remind ourselves that cultural traditions, whether religious or political, are not defined by their zealots. This lesson is especially important today for those proponents of American empire who use the vision of the “class of civilizations” to justify themselves. Any distinction between positive and negative precepts would also be quite hypocritical for an advocate of “shock and awe” as an instrument for bringing forth the benefits of Pax Americana. But, then, such inconsistencies are of little import to neocons, who are not particularly known for self-awareness.

The theological aspect of Muravchik’s interpretation of socialism goes even further. To argue, as he does, that socialist theory is flawed is not by itself to give an explanation for why socialist movements have collapsed. Intellectual and cultural traditions have survived, indeed flourished and their followers multiplied, despite fundamental theoretical errors. Is Muravchik actually suggesting that it is the idolatrous nature of the socialist faith which has inexorably led to its ultimate demise? Are we somehow meant to discern the hand of Providence in the smiting of the communists and the conversion of the social democrats?

Stephen Ingle’s *Narratives of British Socialism* thankfully offers an essential corrective to Muravchik’s moral myopia. The book traces the influence of fictional literature on the course of British socialism since the late 19th century, emphasizing the contributions of the ethical imagination found in the works of Shaw, Wells and Orwell. The novels and plays written by these and other socialist authors exposed the unconscionable conditions of the British working class; they presented visions of a morally superior socialist future; and they offered warnings of how such a utopia might go badly awry.

Sadly, Ingle’s work suffers from a lack of theoretical ambition. Much of its literary analysis is rather pedestrian, offering little more than potted summaries of plots of the fiction under discussion. Of course, Ingle is a political scientist (at the University of Stirling), not a literary theorist. But then one might have expected a more penetrating and theoretically grounded analysis of the trajectory of British social-

ism than this book provides. Where Ingle does seek to make a contribution theoretically lies in his argument about the importance of fiction in politics in general, and particularly in socialist politics. His concerns about the construction of literary truth will undoubtedly be of greater interest to philosophers and literary theorists than to political scientists. Nevertheless, his main point—that fiction can make abstract ideas more concrete, and hence more immediate and compelling to its audience—is well taken and well argued. However, this point tends to conflate socialism as a set of ideals with socialism as an actually-existing political movement. Ingle appears to be sensitive to this distinction between ideas and actuality; he attempts to resolve it by introducing the empirical findings of survey research which he conducted on the influence of the works of Shaw, Wells, and Orwell on Labour MPs and party activists. However, his study is rather unsatisfactory as a piece of rigorous social scientific research. Shaw, Wells, and Orwell undoubtedly influenced the moral discourse of British socialism, but Ingle offers little concrete, immediate or compelling evidence of the impact of their ideas about socialism on the organizational and political success of British socialists.

Like Muravchik, Ingle views socialism (or more precisely, in Ingle's case, British socialism) to be in terminal decline. For Ingle, its demise is due not to socialism's inherent theoretical flaws but rather to the weakening of commitment to the socialist vision inspired by Shaw, Wells, and Orwell. Ironically, argues Ingle, this loss of faith is the result of the success of socialist-inspired policies throughout the 20th century in overcoming the impoverishment and dehumanization of the British working class. As social democratic programs lifted the working class out of poverty, its members become more assimilated into the wider, more materially successful, and largely "classless" British society, thereby undermining the proletarian communities and identities which had previously sustained the socialist movement. This thesis is not a new one. Since the 19th century, leftwing socialists have been critical of the corrosive effect on revolutionary consciousness wrought by reformers seeking to ameliorate conditions and stabilize capitalism. Beginning in the 1950s, social

democratic reformers on the right of the Labour party seized upon the "embourgeoisement thesis" to push for a thorough revision of what they saw to be hopelessly anachronistic and increasingly unpopular socialist worldview. There is indeed some truth in this, but, as I argue below, it is not the whole story of socialism's current malaise.

Ingle links the eclipse of the socialist vision of Shaw, Wells, and Orwell with the postmodern cultural turn of the late 20th century, a consequence of which has been the replacing of narrative fiction in the form of written texts (such as novels) by visual ones (such as films). His book thus concludes with an examination of four movies reflecting the changes in British working-class life from the 1960s to the 1990s. Ingle uses the 1960s films "Room at the Top" and "This Sporting Life" to depict the varieties of working-class response to the erosion of proletarian values and social cohesion in an increasingly affluent and mobile postwar society in Britain. The ultimate conclusion to this process is portrayed in the 1990s movies "Brassed Off" and "The Full Monty", which Ingle interprets as showing that "The proletarian community and its values have been damaged perhaps beyond repair: not by the Thatcherism of the 1980s, but by the consumerism inaugurated by the 1960s." (pp. 161-162). Maybe this is the intended message of both of these films, and maybe not. (But after all, the movies are works of fiction not reports of empirical observations. We should not conflate the two, however congenial the themes of narrative imagination might be to our social analysis.) If so, then they confuse the cause with its effect. The victory of Thatcherism has probably contributed more to the *suave qui peut* self-regarding mentality of many in the de-industrialized north of England than it is the result of it. Put differently, this turn has much less to do with the past success of British socialism than with the contemporary resurgence of an aggressive and transformed capitalism, which is now increasingly postindustrial, global, and neoliberal.

Socialism is defined dialectally by what it opposes, namely capitalism. As mystique, it is an ideal informed by a critique of capitalism and a hope for an alternative future. As *politique*, it is a movement pursuing strategies aimed at replacing or fundamen-

tally transforming capitalism. As long as we live in a capitalist world, and as long as that world is imperfect, the socialist ideal will always resonate among the dispossessed. Only the crassest of apologists for capitalism could maintain that socialism is wrong because triumphant capitalism is an unalloyed good. (Even Kolakowski acknowledges that “the market does not automatically solve all pressing human problems.”) The totalizing logic of the market only makes the possibility of resistance to the regime of capital all the more imperative, however difficult it might be to express itself. The films of Ken Loach, which unfortunately are not considered by Ingle, address precisely this point.

Socialism, we have said, is a reaction to capitalism. As capitalism changes, so too does socialism. The contemporary disarray of socialism of which both Muravchik and Ingle write is a reflection of the changes in capitalism produced by the crisis in capitalist accumulation following the exhaustion of the “golden age of capitalism” in the mid 1970s. The Fordist mode of production during the early postwar period provided the material and ideological foundation for the class settlement which characterized the social democratic regimes in many advanced industrial and democratic countries. As Ingle correctly sees but Muravchik does not, socialist-inspired programs helped to stabilize and strengthen capitalism through Keynesian techniques of demand management. But in the long run (after Keynes himself had died) these techniques proved unsustainable. They tended to undermine capitalist accumulation by empowered working class economic and political movements which challenged the power of capital, and by generating inflationary pressures which devalued accumulated capital. Capitalism’s reconfiguration, aimed at escaping the resulting profits squeeze by means of weakening working class movements and hollowing out the social contract, began three decades ago. This new form of capitalism is characterized by the ascendancy of neoliberalism politically and globalization economically, both of which have exacerbated the trend of de-industrialization. The circumstances depicted in “Brassed Off” and “The Full Monty” are the consequences of this capitalist counter-offensive.

As a movement, socialism has indeed been eclipsed by a resurgent, post-Fordist capitalism. But this is hardly the end of the socialist narrative. For just as aspects of socialism contributed to the postwar capitalist boom, so the success of capitalist accumulation in detaching itself from the social state means that its neoliberal and globalized form is rapidly recreating the economic and social conditions of the late 19th century—instability, inequality, poverty, social dislocation—which generated socialist movements in the first place. One can decipher a correspondence between those previous national developments and the current worldwide global justice movement, including the leftward drift in Latin American politics. While the traditional working class within advanced industrial societies is shrinking, the proletariat is not. Accompanying the decline in manufacturing employment has been a concomitant proletarianization of service and professional occupations, massive entry of women into the work force, the casualization of work, and dramatic inward migration. And throughout the world, globalization is transforming peasants into proletarians. We find ourselves in many ways in the same position today as did socialist movements in each country at the dawn of industrialism, but this time it is on a global scale.

Capitalism was restructured in response to its impasse in the 1970s; socialism today is undergoing restructuring in response to its own impasse caused by restructured capitalism. Although it may now call itself many things other than “socialist”, the impulse of people to defend themselves and their communities from capitalism’s “creative destruction” is not yet at an end. It will never be so long as the regime of capital continues to rule.

Today, the socialist *politique* is moribund in Britain and throughout the world. Perhaps we are witnessing the beginning of the movement’s revival, although in some altered form. Its animating spirit is ineluctably bound, Janus-like, to the hegemony of capital. The spectre of socialism continues to haunt the world. [*This and other Kolakowski quotations in this essay are from Leszek Kolakowski, “What is Left of Socialism?” in *My Correct Views on Everything* (South Bend: St. Augustine’s Press, 2005).] Jeff Freyman, *Transylvania University*

POT POURRI XLIX

The ‘march of science’ – agricultural sector – The British Egg Information Service has announced that imminent availability of a ‘smart egg,’ which would enable the user to determine when the egg was hard, medium or soft-boiled. An invisible ink on the egg shell is designed to turn color, indicating the condition of the contents.

Protecting ‘Nessie’- Recently released files from the days of the Thatcher government reveal that administration was seriously concerned that poachers posed a threat to the ‘monster’ in Loch Ness. (Also in those files was a letter from Swedish officials, seeking advice on how to protect Sweden’s own monster in Lake Storsjo.)

Medical law – A British worker was recently awarded three-months paid leave plus medical expenses upon proving his supervisor used colloquial terms in reference to the worker’s posterior during an angry office argument.

Medical concern for those north of Hadrian’s Wall – The NHS office in Dundee has distributed a pamphlet, “Good Defecation Dynamics” for the estimated one-third of the population that endures bowel and bladder problems. Among other therapies, the publication offers preferred breathing techniques and the proper, upright posture for effective elimination, recommending that one keep the mouth open as ‘you bulge and widen,’ and suggesting support for the feet, such as ‘a small foot-stool.’

Faulty government equipment? – A teacher in Bristol has sued the government for £1,000,000, claiming she was dismissed for complaining, among other things, that her classroom chair emitted a humiliating ‘farting’ sound whenever she sat upon it.

Around the EU –

Medical progress – A three-year study at a Copenhagen hospital has found that the drug Ecstasy may cause depression in pigs.

Diversity in the middle of the Continent? – Can we expect France to be soon lead by a female? And a ‘Royal’ one at that? And can Germany expect a gay Chancellor in its future?

Municipal government among the Dutch: Zoological progress? – A zoo in Appeldoorn, Netherlands has announced a cooperative venture with a park in Borneo to create an Internet video connection to provide companionship for rare orangutans at each site. A spokesperson for the Dutch zoo expressed hope that the animals might develop mutual affection by pushing buttons to feed those at the opposite location. If this occurs then mating may result if transportation could be arranged

‘Hang it all’! – The EU has determined that a British farmer must discontinue his lucrative business of providing gallows for Zimbabwe and other governments. His single gallows sold for about \$22,000, and the Multi-Hanging Execution System, conveniently mounted on a trailer had a price of approximately \$185,000.

Around the former Empire –

Nutty research? – Researchers in Ontario, Canada have drawn criticism for spending \$135,000 (US) to study how changes in the natural environment affects the sex drives of squirrels.

The police ‘disarmed’ – In New Zealand, law enforcement officials have been ordered to drop ‘dangerous driving’ charges against an armless driver when he demonstrated competency in steering with his left foot. Speeding charges remained on his record.

More medical law – In Canada, the judicial system has ruled that a woman, due to her fragile health, although divorced for seven years should still receive spousal support, despite Canada’s non-fault divorce law.

Informal punishment? – The lawyer for a man convicted of burglary and assault in Christchurch, New Zealand pleaded for leniency, noting that the target of the crime were senior citizens who beat and tied up the burglar. His counsel noted that his client had become the ‘laughingstock’ among other prisoners and would ‘never be able to hold his head up in criminal company again.’

The ‘questionable’ warns its citizens – The government of Nigeria, a source of countless scams, has warned its citizens traveling abroad, claiming that Europe is the site of many scam artists, especially pickpocket thieves. Perhaps, not surprisingly, no mention was made of email fraud, a tactic often associated with Nigeria.

Child abuse? – Although physicians have condemned the practice and predict eventual cartilage and other physical damage to him, a four-year old boy in India ran 40 miles in about seven hours under the supervision of his coach. The boy began distance running at the age of two.

Across the Irish Sea or tales from the pub – not strictly political science, but...

Martinis – McQuillan walked into a bar and ordered martini after martini, each time removing the olives and placing them in a jar. When the jar was filled with olives and all the drinks had been consumed, the Irishman started to leave.

“Scuse me,” said a customer sitting nearby, who was puzzled over what McQuillan had done, “what was that all about.?”

“Nothing,” said the Irishman, “Me wife just sent me out for a jar of olives!”

Flying accoutrements – An Irishman arrived at J.F.K. Airport and wandered around the terminal with tears streaming down his cheeks. An airline employee asked him if he was already homesick.

“No,” replied the Irishman. “I’ve lost all me luggage.”

“How’d that happen?” asked the airline employee.

“The cork fell out!” replied the Irishman.

Interpersonal relations – Into a Belfast pub comes Paddy Murphy, looking like he’d just been run over by a train. His arm is in a sling, his nose is broken, his face is cut and bruised, and he’s walking with a limp.

“What happened with you?” asks Sean, the publican.

“Jamie O’Connor and me had a fight,” says Paddy.

“That little shit, O’Connor?” says Sean. He couldn’t do that t you. He must have had something in his hand.”

“That he did,” says Paddy. “A shovel is what he had, and a terrible lickin’ he gave me with it.”

“Well,” says Sean, “you could have defended yourself. Didn’t you have something in your hand?”

“That I did,” replied Paddy. “Mrs. O’Connor’s breast, and a thing of beauty it was, but useless in a fight.”

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Kudos –

Frank Myers – recipient, ‘President’s Award for Excellence in Teaching,’ campus-wide award, Stony Brook University. **J.Christopher Soper** – recipient, ‘Howard A. White Teaching Award,’ recognizing exceptional teaching. The BPG ‘operative’ in the Dutch hinterlands informs us that **David Farrell** spoke on electoral systems in the Netherlands to a new

political movement, the Citizens Assembly.

A bit more about Leon Epstein –

A) **How to remember Leon:** At his request there was no funeral or memorial service for Leon. His Wisconsin colleagues are creating the Leon D. Epstein Graduate Fellowship in his honor. Anyone wishing to contribute should make out a check to the University of Wisconsin Foundation, marked In Memoriam Leon Epstein, and send to Graham Wilson, Department of Political Science, 110 North Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1389.

B) **Leon on retirement**, which he recommended:

“You can read as much of the New York Times as you want each day.” “Don’t worry about not getting a chance to speak. Colleagues will be at conferences or away for some other reason and ask you to speak to their classes.”

C) **Remarks by U.S. Senator Russell Feingold** (D-Wisconsin) in the Congressional Record (August 3, 2006):

“Mr. President (of the Senate), today, I wish to honor the memory of Leon Epstein, someone who contributed a great deal to the University of Wisconsin and the study of political science, and someone I was proud to know.

“Leon, who pass away on Tuesday, was a native Wisconsinite who gave back to our State through his dedicated work both as a scholar and an administrator at UW. Born in 1919 in Beaver Dam, he went on to study at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where he earned the B.A. and then an M.A. in economics. He spent virtually his entire academic career on the Madison campus, where for 40 years he was a beloved fixture in the political science department – a department from which I was proud to graduate. He made an impact on countless students as he taught introductory courses and supervised doctoral dissertations for four decades.

“Throughout his life, Leon remained dedicated to his own research and independent work. He received many prestigious fellowship grants and published six books. He was widely recognized for his book *Political Parties in Western Democracies*, which received the first book award from the Political Organizations and Parties Section of the American Political Science Association. He also served as president of the Midwest Political Science Association, the British

Politics Group, and the American Political Science Association.

“Leon also held the position of dean of the College of Letters and Sciences from 1965 to 1969. In every capacity, Leon earned the respect and friendship of those with whom he worked. He was someone I admired, both for who he was and for the many outstanding contributions he made to the study of political science. He leaves behind a great legacy. People will study his work for many years to come. And those of us who knew him will remember a man of tremendous character who gave so much to a university and a State that he loved. He will be greatly missed.

D) From the website of the University of Wisconsin, Department of Political Science: Leon D. Epstein died on Tuesday, August 1, as a result of injuries suffered in a fall at home two days earlier. He was a scholar of international repute in the realm of political parties, a central figure in the postwar re-creation of the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, as well as a former president of the American Political Science Association and a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Leon was born on May 29, 1919, in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, though he grew up in Beaver Dam, a town where, as he wryly noted, the great enemy of the locals in his youth was not the rising fascist or communist states of the wider world but the Wisconsin DNR, the Department of Natural Resources, known locally as the “damned near Russian”. He came to Madison, to the University of Wisconsin, in 1936 to begin his graduate career, a career that would be closely entwined with that university ever after. He received a B.A. in Economics from UW-Madison in 1940, an M.A. in Economics in 1941, and then left for military service.

Stationed overseas and spending two years in Britain during the war, Leon used any spare time to immerse himself in the details of British politics, managing to cap his war-time service with a term at Oxford. Returning to the U.S., he enrolled for a Ph.D. in Political Science at the University of Chicago, obtained in 1948. After Chicago, he accepted a one-year teaching post at the University of Oregon for 1947-48, returning to the Department of Political Science at the University of Wisconsin at Madison the following year. He would remain on the Madison faculty until his retirement in

1988. While still at Chicago, he met and married Shirley (Galewitz) Epstein to whose care he was devoted in his later years and who preceded him in death in 2001.

The official history of the Department of Political Science at UW-Madison notes that “the resurrection of comparative politics really began in 1948, with the recruitment of Leon Epstein and Henry Hart.” Oddly, in that context, his dissertation was a judicial biography of William O. Douglas—on grounds that this was the quickest route to a Ph.D.!—and he actually presented the sub-fields of political theory, public administration, and public law at his prelims. But the Political Science Department at UW was flexible in its wishes and needs; Leon had acquired a substantial acquaintance with British politics; and Frederic Ogg, who had long taught both Britain and the Continent, was retiring. So comparative politics was where Leon began.

The Political Science Department was in the process of reorienting itself to feature research and publication as central to promotion, and Leon produced articles on British Politics for the *American Political Science Review*, *Political Science Quarterly*, and *Public Administration Review*. A year back in Britain on a Ford Foundation grant then generated his first book, *Britain: Uneasy Ally* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954). Though it was already clear that, in Leon’s own words, “as a comparativist, I was an Americanist”: He was one of those scholars who found the sub-field distinction between ‘American Politics’ and ‘Comparative Politics’ to be not just artificial, but intellectually harmful.

As if to underline this perception, Leon’s next book was actually *Politics in Wisconsin* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958). Besides testifying to the breadth of his interests, it reaffirmed his general approach: Close observation in person, striving toward theoretical generalization. He followed that by bouncing back across the Atlantic with *British Politics in the Suez Crisis* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1964), and that book confirmed his status as a leading American student of British politics.

Yet the notion of ‘comparativist as Americanist’ was best affirmed in his hugely influential *Political Parties in Western Democracies* (New York: Praeger, 1967). In this landmark in the comparative study of political parties, Leon inserted the United States directly into the

comparison with the major states of Europe, an approach for which he had always argued. In the process, he addressed the central themes of a leading alternative, Maurice Duverger's *Political Parties* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1951), either modifying or dissenting from nearly all of it. For Leon, the world had become a different place from the one in which Duverger's argument arose, so that American political parties were less like backward outliers, more like modern incarnations of an evolving institution that was more attuned to contemporary society than the Duverger model could ever be.

By then, Leon had long since become Associate Professor (1951), then full Professor (1958), then Chair of the Department (1960-63). By the time *Political Parties in Western Democracies* appeared, he was actually Dean of the College of Letters and Sciences, one of the largest such enterprises in the country. Leon held that position during times of great turmoil on the Madison campus, 1965-1969. He is remembered as bringing the same personal qualities to that post as he had brought to the Political Science Department and to his own work, namely, an unflinching thoughtfulness, a determination to treat everyone evenhandedly, a willingness to listen, and above all a desire to see the university—and hence scholarly life—prosper.

By all accounts, Leon handled a difficult job with great skill, making him a logical candidate for Provost or Chancellor in the longer run. Yet as Bernard Cohen, a departmental colleague who later followed that route into the Provostship, notes, Leon did his duty but found that he did not really enjoy it—"He had more than a few meetings drowned out by shouting protesters on the Hill"—and returned instead to the Political Science Department. Characteristically, given his way of working and thinking, his next book was *Governing the University: The Campus and the Public Interest* (New York: Jossey-Bass, 1974).

In the years after his return to the Department, Leon became President of the Midwest Political Science Association, 1971-72, then President of the American Political Science Association, 1978-79. His presidential address of that year, "What Happened to the British Party Model?" [*American Political Science Review* 74 (1980), 9-22] returned to the British-American comparison, this time in the context of scholarly perspectives on it, and offered a gentle scolding to

professional colleagues for their attachment to models that either appealed because they suited the prejudices of their proponents or that were already outdated in the face of the social change around them.

His final book, and the other one to have a lasting impact on the discipline, arrived in 1986 and continued his evolution toward thinking about American politics within the comparative framework. This was *Political Parties in the American Mold* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1986), and this time it sought a self-consciously American model, with which other party systems could potentially be compared. Arguing that American politics, and especially the party system at its core, could not be understood either by way of some abstracted European model or in terms of a model derived from its own distant theory, Leon developed the metaphor of political parties as 'public utilities' to elucidate the American case. In this, a distinctive political culture, a distinctive constitutional structure, and, most particularly, the central place of primary elections as the key intermediary institution, came together to create an American resolution.

Leon retired in 1988, but his presence remained a major thread of continuity in the Political Science Department. He continued to read—and argue—widely. He attended department and campus events, listened patiently, and always had a question, often one attempting to take the speaker back to basics. Most importantly, he continued that style of personal collegiality and positive intellectual tone that was so important in giving the Department its reputation as an eclectic but supportive environment. Accordingly, writing about Leon's passing is difficult in a diagnostic way: Everyone has his or her own favorite 'Leon story'. All, however, feature the same man: Ever courteous and always thoughtful; committed to the application of intelligence to social life, whether it be British politics, university administration, American politics, or career advice; reliably concerned that the central mission—of the Department of Political Science or the University of Wisconsin—remain front and center, guiding policy decisions.

Leon was in robust good health at the time of his death. He quit playing tennis competitively only three years ago, having decided (again characteristically) that his game no longer measured up to his standards. Nevertheless, he had thought carefully about his own

eventual demise, leaving instructions that there be no funeral and no memorial event. He himself recognized the support of graduate students in his will, however, and his colleagues have decided that creation of a Leon D. Epstein Graduate Fellowship would have struck him as an acceptable memorial. Anyone who wishes to contribute to that memorial can send a check made out to the "University of Wisconsin Foundation" and marked "In Memoriam Leon Epstein" to Professor Graham Wilson, Chairman, Department of Political Science, 110 North Hall, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706-1389. *Byron E. Shafer, University of Wisconsin-Madison*, drawing from Bernard Cohen, Charles O. Jones, Frank Sorauf, John Witte, and Crawford Young.

Austin Ranney (1920-2006) – Austin died July 24, 2006. He was a good friend of Leon and several others in the BPG. Some of you will recall Austin's presentation at a BPG panel at an APSA Annual Meeting in Chicago years ago. His subject was the Nuffield studies on the British general elections, authored and co-authored by his friend David E. Butler. Admitting that he was perhaps the only person, other than David, who had read all of the volumes (to that point), Austin summarized the findings and significance of the tomes with the wit and insight that characterized his writing and speech.

Austin's major contribution to the study of British politics was his *Pathways to Parliament: Candidate Selection in Britain* (1965). He also edited *Britain at the Polls: 1983* (1985). Along with David E. Butler, Austin wrote or co-edited several books that touched upon British political topics: *Referendums: A Comparative Study of Theory and Practice* (1978), *Democracy at the Polls* (1981), *Electioneering: A Comparative Study of Continuity and Change* (1992), and *Referendums around the World: The Growth of Direct Democracy* (1994). (My two years of high school Latin invariably made me want to say, "No, no, it's 'referenda,'" but I never expressed that to either Austin or David, who offer a defense of 'ums' in the opening page of their 1978 book.) *T. P. Wolf*

Here is the obituary that Nelson W. Polsby and Ray Wolfinger prepared for the website of the Political Science Department at U.C. Berkeley:

"Austin Ranney, the eminent political scientist and leading American authority on political parties and elections died, peacefully, at his home in Berkeley on July 24, 2006. He was 85 years old and for a number of years had been battling the debilitating effects of congestive heart failure and diabetes. Ranney's doctoral dissertation, *The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government* (1954), and his Jefferson Lectures at Berkeley, *Curing the Mischiefs of Faction* (1975), are major explorations of the role that parties play in the overall scheme of the American political system. The broad-gauged view adopted by these studies, theoretically informed but also rigorously disciplined by wide-ranging empirical study, was typical of Ranney's style of work, which extended to important contributions on democracy and the party system, referendums, presidential primaries, the measurement of party competition, the impact of television on elections, and the recruitment of candidates for public office, among other topics. His collaborators in some of these projects included Willmoore Kendall of Yale University and David Butler of the University of Oxford.

"In the discipline of political science, Ranney's benign, constructive influence can be found nearly everywhere from the time he received his Ph.D. from Yale in 1948 right up to his retirement from the faculty of the University of California, Berkeley, in 1991, and beyond. At one time or another he was president of the American Political Science Association, book review editor, then managing editor of the *American Political Science Review*, program chairman for the Association's annual meeting, member of the Association's council and its executive committee, and chairman of the Task Force on the Future of the Association. Little wonder that he was among the first recipients of the Association's Frank Goodnow Award for service to the profession. For many years Ranney was also a major influence on the work of the Social Science Research Council, serving as chairman of its Committee on Governmental and Legal Processes and member of the board of directors and its executive committee. His pioneering work on the selection of parliamentary candidates in Britain, recorded in *Pathways to Parliament* (1965), led to his election as a corresponding member of the British Academy, and he was an officer of the American

Academy of Arts and Sciences, of the International Political Science Association, and of Pi Sigma Alpha, the political science fraternity. Two of the universities from which he graduated, Northwestern (B.A., 1941; Doctor of laws, 1995) and Yale (Ph.D., 1948; Doctor of Social Sciences, 1985), awarded him honorary degrees, as did SUNY Cortland (Doctor of Laws, 1986), located in the town of his birth. He also earned an M.A. (1943) from the University of Oregon and was awarded the Wilbur Cross medal of Yale University for outstanding professional achievement by an alumnus of the graduate school. He was a Guggenheim Fellow and later served on the Foundation's Educational Advisor Board, and a fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.

"Ranney's teaching career included professorships at the University of Illinois (1947-63), the University of Wisconsin, Madison (1963-76), and the University of California, Berkeley (from 1987) where he was a notably successful chairman of the political science department. He also served on the senior staff of the American Enterprise Institute in Washington, D.C. from 1975 to 1985 and on the editorial board of the AEI journal *Public Opinion*. He visited on the faculties of Yale, Georgetown, and the University of California, Davis.

"Ranney, a loyal unhyphenated Democrat, was frequently called upon by his party. He was active in the Humphrey campaign of 1968 and served subsequently on the party's commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection (the McGovern-Fraser Commission). His other public service included a long term as trustee of the Institute for American Universities of Aix-en-Provence, chairmanship of the Governor's Commission on Registration and Voting Participation in Wisconsin, membership in the Presidential-Congressional Commission on the Political Activity of Government Employees, and as an official observer of referendums in the Trust Territories of the Pacific-Micronesia, including the Marshall Islands. This last experience yielded a book, *Democracy in the Islands* (1985), written with Howad Penniman. In retirement he presided over the University of California, Berkeley's Committee on Human Subjects and served on the board of directors of the Cal Retirement Center.

"J. Austin Ranney, Jr., was born September 20, 1920, in Cortland, New York. At an early age he moved with his family to Corona, in southern California, where he grew up doing chores at the family creamery.

A debate star in high school, he was offered a debate scholarship to attend Northwestern University as an undergraduate. After his M.A. year at the University of Oregon, he did graduate work at Yale. While at Yale, Ranney did some teaching at Wesleyan University nearby and fell under the influence of E. E. Schattschneider, then the leading student of political parties in the profession. Ranney enjoyed saying that he was the Wesleyan department's first—and only—Ph.D.

"While he discovered his lifelong intellectual agenda at that time, Ranney never subscribed to Schattschneider's strong majoritarian views. His early contributions to the literature were respectful, but highly skeptical of the famous APSA Report, "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System" (1950), which expressed many of his mentor's ideas. Ranney, a student of social psychologist Angus Campbell at Northwestern, had already assimilated a sociologically-grounded perspective that undergirded his critique of the rather mechanical assumptions about human behavior to be found in the "Report".

"Ranney was widely renowned as a mentor and prized as a colleague. His gifted Ph.D. student (at Wisconsin) Douglas Rae (now a Yale professor), pointed out that to a remarkable degree "Austin understood the interface between ideas and empirics." His agreeable, self-deprecating good humor drew students to him wherever he taught, and his acute analytical sensibilities, cheerfully undogmatically applied to their work, invariably improved their minds with a minimum of pain. He was a man of eclectic enthusiasms that he loved to share with friends, embracing the local football teams, collegiate and professional, fine wine, good music and Civil War history, where his deep expertise led him briefly to appear on a national quiz show. It gratified Austin that in his lifetime he saw the rehabilitation of U. S. Grant's reputation as a Civil War general.

"Ranney married twice, to the late Elizabeth MacKay with whom he had four sons, Jay, Douglas, and Gordon, all of Madison, Wisconsin, and David, of Cupertino, California, who survive him along with three granddaughters. His second marriage in 1976 was to Nancy Boland Edgerton who, with her sons Scott of Molalla, Oregon, and Bruce, of Reston, Virginia, also survives him, as does his sister, Harriet Watkins, of La Junta, Colorado." *Nelson W. Polsby and Raymond E. Wolfinger, University of California, Berkeley*

Fall 2006, No 126

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Activities	Page 3
Awards	Page 4
Announcements	Page 6
From the BPG-L	Page 7
Book Reviews	Page 9
Pot Pourri	Page 18
Membership News	Page 19
More comments on the Passing of Leon David Epstein	Page 19
Obituary of Austin Ranney	Page 22



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