



Officers

President

Wyn Grant 2004-2006
University of Warwick

Executive Committee

Philip Cowley 2006-2008
University of Nottingham

John Curtice 2006-2008
University of Strathclyde

Florence Faucher-King 2006-2008
Vanderbilt University

Justin Fisher 2006-2008
Brunel University

Mark Franklin 2005-2007
Trinity College

Andrew Gamble 2006-2008
Cambridge University

Rachael Gibson 2005-2007
University of Leicester

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

Executive Director

Terrence Casey
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology

Winter 2006, No 127

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Activities	Page 3
Awards	Page 4
Announcements	Page 5
From the BPG-L	Page 6
Movie Review: <i>The Queen</i>	Page 7
Abstracts	Page 10
Article: <i>The Curious Case of Victor Grayson</i> by Wyn Grant	Page 12
Book Reviews	
Cyr on <i>Stakeknife</i> by Ingra & Harkin	Page 13
Brookshire on <i>Neville Chamberlain</i> by Self	Page 14
Myers on <i>US-UK Relations at the Start of the 21st Century</i> edited by McCausland & Stuart	Page 15
Field on <i>Deliberative Politics in Action</i> by Steiner, Bacjtoger, Spordli & Steenbergen	Page 16
Pot Pourri	Page 17
Membership News	Page 19

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 topics 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

Oops! First, I want to apologize for misidentifying the father of Austin Ranney in the last issue of the *Newsletter*. His father was not John Ranney, but Joseph Austin Ranney, who owned a creamery in Corona, California. I am indebted to Nelson Polsby for bringing this error to my attention. My only solace in this area was to discover that a distinguished political scientist, who shall not be named, informed me that he thought Austin was the Ranney of the Carter, Herz, and Ranney textbook.

The recent off-year elections in the US reminds me of Austin's wisdom in offering an eloquent rebuttal to the famous APSA report "Toward a Two-Party System," a document that implicitly contended that the States needed a party system more similar to that in Britain of the late 1940s and early 1950s, or at least one in which a voter selecting a Democrat would choose a candidate whose ideological orientation was highly similar to that of other Democratic candidates, and Republican candidates would overwhelmingly hold near identical policy positions. The polarization evident in the US in the last several years is testimony to the defects of that contention and the wisdom of Austin Ranney's dissent.

Unrequited romance at the highest political ranks - A recent obituary and the opening of a cache of love-letters have revealed lesser known relations of two prime ministers with women who were not their wives. The first was the obituary of Lady Hutchinson of Lullington, who died September 26 at 86 years. For about a decade in the 1960s, she was seen at events with Ted Heath. Once, she referred to him in these words: "He's a most attractive and wonderful man. No woman in her heart could feel otherwise." Years later, Hutchinson volunteered to a friend, "He's become awfully fat." She admitted that Heath had never as much as held her hand. The latter does not surprise those of us that believed his only pursuits outside of politics were yachting and music.

A file at the Historic Manuscript Collection disclosed that over a 15 year period, James Ramsey MacDonald sent about 150 romantic letters to Lady Margaret Sackville. In those letters, MacDonald proposed at least three times. Despite her refusals, he continued to send poems, limericks and his vision of a romantic life they might share. The first letter was written in by the future prime minister in 1913, two years after he had lost his wife to blood poisoning.

In addition to the differences in age and social status, they held contrasting religious faiths: she was a Roman Catholic; MacDonald was reared a Presbyterian and joined the Free Church of Scotland later. Lady Sackville never married and died in 1963. One newspaper account - not *The Independent* or *The Guardian* - concluded with a sentence containing the unfortunate phrase, "after the affair petered out."

The Queen – In this issue, we have a review of this film, along with several comments from various colleagues. Some of the latter are from the BPG-L. Having these all together indicates both consensus and diverse reaction to the film.

Victor Grayson - Wyn Grant offers an article about an intriguing figure of the early 20th century British political scene.

Another scholar leaves us -Although never a member of the BPG, to my knowledge, Seymour Martin Lipset, who died 31 December 06, made several significant contributions to the study of comparative politics, especially his collaborative work with the Stein Rokkan. Lipset was 84.

ACTIVITIES

BGP Executive Committee Election Results-

From Terrence Casey, Executive Director: "The results of the BPG Executive Committee ballots are in and tallied. The winners are (in alphabetical order, not order of votes received):

Philip Cowley, University of Nottingham

John Curtice, University of Strathclyde

Justin Fisher, Brunel University

Florence Faucher-King, Vanderbilt University/
Sciences-Po

Andrew Gamble, University of Sheffield

"All told, 47 ballots were cast for a 25% 'turnout' - an unfortunate decline on last year (no lecturing students on the importance of voting for those who failed to do so!). Those elected will join Mark Franklin, Rachael Gibson, Pippa Norris, Susan Scarrow, Donley Studlar, Paul Whiteley, each of whom have one more year on their terms."

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.

Pre-2007 APSA Conference – BRITAIN AFTER BLAIR: The Legacy and the Future – A conference sponsored by the British Politics Group, Wednesday, 29 August 2007, The Gleacher Center, University of Chicago Business School, Chicago, Ill. USA.

Much like Margaret Thatcher before him, Tony Blair has dominated the 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 under Blair

The social policy of New Labour

David Cameron and the Tories after Blair

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 the Wednesday prior to the APSA Annual 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 the main APSA hotels.

Further information on the conference, including submission deadlines, can be found at the conference website (<http://www.rosehulman.edu/~casey/1/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 the APSA Annual Meeting, please contact Dr. Janet Liable, Department of Political Science, Lehigh University, 9 West Packer Avenue, Bethlehem, PA 18015 USA. Email jml6@lehigh.edu.

AWARDS

Samuel H. Beer Prize of the British Politics Group

The Samuel H. Beer Dissertation Prize was created by the British Politics Group to honor Samuel Hutchison Beer, a distinguished American scholar of British politics, 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.

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 deadline 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 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

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

[See also the BPG Conference, "Britain after Blair" under ACTIVITIES above.]

[Submission deadlines for some of these have passed, but there still may be opportunities to be members of their programs.]

Conferences –

a) The North American Conference on British Studies (NACBS) Annual Meeting in conjunction with the Pacific Coast Conference on British (PCCBS), San Francisco, California, November 9-11, 2007 – Proposals for panels on England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and the British Empire, broadly defined, are solicited. Topics for these range from the medieval to the modern, and participation by historians, literary critics, economists, sociologists, and allied disciplines are welcomed. Panel proposals treating selected themes, methodology, and pedagogy are invited, as well as roundtable discussions of topical work. North American and international scholars, as well as graduate students are encouraged to submit proposals.

Preference will be given to complete panel proposals on a common theme. Individual proposals will be considered if several of them can be assembled to

create a viable panel, but those with individual paper submissions are encouraged to post a call for additional panelists on H-Albion or to email the program chair for suggestions. No participant will be permitted to take part in more than one session, and no more than one proposal will be considered from each applicant. Committed to the principle of ensuring the broadest possible participation of scholars from all facets of British Studies, priority will be given to those submitters that have not read papers at each of the last two consecutive meetings.

Further details for the online submissions of proposals are located at: <http://www.nacbs.org/NACBS/ann.html>

To be considered, proposals must be received by the NACBS Program Committee by Friday, February 16, 2007. General questions about panel requirements should be sent to:

Steven Pincus, NACBS Program Chair, Department of History, Yale University, P.O. Box 208324, New Haven, CT, 06520-8374. Tel. +1 (203) 432-7636, nacbs@yale.edu

b) 6th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Social Science – May 30-June 2, 2007, Waikiki Beach Marriott Resort & Spa, Honolulu, Hawaii, Co-sponsored by the University of Louisville, Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods – This meeting offers an opportunity for academics and professionals from social science-related fields to interact within and outside their disciplines. All areas of social science are invited.

Submission deadline: 24 January 2007.

To submit a proposal: 1. Create a title page for your proposal. That page should include: the title of the submission, topic area of the submission (i.e., what discipline), presentation format (see http://www/hisocial.org/cfp_.htm for format choices), name(s) of the author(s), department(s) and affiliation(s), mailing address(es), email address(es), phone number(s), fax number(s), and corresponding author, if different from the lead author.

2. Email abstract of and/or paper, along with title page, to social@hisocial.org. Receipt of manuscript will be acknowledged via email within 48 hours.

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

General contact: Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences, P.O. Box 75023, Honolulu, HI 96836 USA, Tel. (808) 946-9392; Fax (808) 947-2420; email - social@hisocial.org; website – www.hisocial.org

c) The Fourteenth Annual Conference on Learning, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa, 26-29 June 2007 – The conference will address a range of critically important themes in education today. This is a conference for any person with an interest in, and concern for, education at any of its levels and in any of its forms, from early childhood to higher education, and lifelong learning. Speakers will include some of the world's leading thinkers in the field of education.

Presenters may submit papers to the fully refereed *International Journal of Learning*. For those unable to attend the conference, virtual registration is available, which allows one to submit a paper for refereeing and possible publication in the *Journal*.

Deadline for the next round of papers (title and abstract) is 10 February 2007. For details, contact Prof. Pippa Stein, Applied English Language Studies, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa pippa.stein@learningconference.com

d) Fifth International Conference on New Directions in the Humanities – American University in Paris, France, 17-20 July 2007.

This conference is devoted to developing an interdisciplinary agenda for the Humanities. It will include keynote presentations by internationally renowned scholars and numerous small-group and workshop presentations. The deadline for proposals was 15 November 2006, but for details of the conference check the website: <http://www.HumanitiesConference.com>

Or contact Alice Craven, Chair, Department of Comparative Literature and English, American University of Paris, France at alice.craven@humanitiesconference.com

FROM THE BPG-L

Position Available – Lecturer/ Associate Professor/ Associate Professor & Reader in British Politics/ Comparative Politics – Applications for this position, beginning September 2007, with the School of Politics and International Relations, University of Nottingham are invited. **Closing date is 30 January 2007.**

Those working in British politics or comparative politics, particularly British policy studies, political parties and electoral studies are invited to apply. The School has an international reputation in comparative politics, contemporary political theory and international relations.

Depending on qualifications, the salary will be in the range of:

Lecturer scale: £28,849-£38772 per annum (Salary can progress to £46,047 per annum, subject to performance).

Associate Professor/Reader scale: £41,133-£49,116 per annum (Salary can progress to £58,631 per annum, subject to performance)

Informal inquiries may be addressed to Professor R.J. Aldrich, Tel. 0015 951 4868, email – Richard.Aldrich@nottingham.ac.uk or Philip Cowley: Philip.Cowley@nottingham.ac.uk

Englishness – Joel Wolfe sent this in October, received no reaction, but it is printed here to share these remarks, especially with members that are not linked to the BPG-L:

“I found this on the *Guardian* October 18, 2006. Given recent political controversies over multiculturalism in Britain and the FT's suggestion that significant immigration during the Blair era will present issues for the post-Blair era, I am wondering if any list members had any comment, additions, or subtractions?”

Billy Bragg's Top 10 Books on Englishness

(The singer and songwriter Billy Bragg has been producing music for over two decades. In his first book, *The Progressive Patriot*—part autobiography, part polemic—Bragg considers his own family history and childhood, the influences of thinkers and artists such as George Orwell, Rudyard Kipling, and The Clash, and reflects on how they have shaped his sense of Englishness. He also examines the historical impact of such things as the Magna Carta, the civil war, and the miners' strike on the formation of the country's national consciousness. Here he chooses his favorite books on the subject of Englishness):

1. *The Lion and the Unicorn: Socialism and the English Genius* by George Orwell. Written during the Blitz, with Nazi invasion seemingly imminent, Orwell wonders aloud if there is anything in this country worth defending, even dying for. The picture he paints of “a family in which the wrong people are in charge” still resonates, as do his attacks on an English intelligentsia “ashamed of their own country”. The most important insight he offers is that Englishness is constantly changing: “it stretches into the future and the past, there is something in it that persists, as in a living creature.” The greatest book written on the subject from a left-wing perspective.

2. *England's Dreaming* by Jon Savage. Savage was there at the beginning of punk, hanging out with the Pistols and falling for Malcolm McLaren's Situationist

shtick. Despite that, his book—the first to attempt to put punk in its proper context—gets beyond the safety pins and snakebite to shed some light on how the mediocrity of mid-70s England produced punk rock.

3. *The World Turned Upside Down* by Christopher Hill. Hill's masterpiece captures the turmoil of the one true revolutionary episode in English history, when the principle of government by consent led to the execution of the king. A great period of radical thinking was unleashed, much of it coming from below. Diggers, Ranters, Levellers and others seized the moment to agitate for full democratic accountability. All their arguments are here, alongside those of the grandees who eventually snuffed out the English revolution.

4. *The Village That Died For England* by Patrick Wright. Ostensibly the story of Tyneham, a Dorset village that was evacuated in 1943 to make way for the D-Day preparations and whose residents were never allowed to return, despite Winston Churchill's promise. For Wright, however, detail is everything and he clambers over the locked gates and barbed wire fences to discover a "deep England" of eccentric squires, quasi-fascistic communes and Neolithic pathways.

5. *England, Half English* by Colin MacInnes. MacInnes was an Australian who brought an outsider's view to post-war London. He sat in the bars and cafes of Soho writing articles on the emerging teen culture and the impact of West Indian immigration on the staid English character. This collection of articles, written originally for magazines such as the *New Left Review*, offers insights into both the roots of swinging London and of our multicultural society.

6. *England: The Light* by Stuart Clarke. Stuart Clarke is a photographer who, in his own words, sets out "to show a landscape that is quite beautiful without the need for football, industry and people—but is better for their existence." This engaging collection of photographs was mostly taken during Euro 2004 in Portugal and constitutes a dazzling celebration of fandom, accompanied by text in English, German, Portuguese, and Swedish.

7. *England in Particular* by Sue Clifford and Angela King. A marvelous compendium of the peculiar. Want to know how to participate in the Haxley Hood game or master the ancient art of fen skating? This is the book for you. Every oddity of the English landscape is here, from cabbies' shelters to deserted villages, countryside customs to city superstitions.

8. *The Making of the English Working Class* by E. P. Thompson. The founding text of English social history. Thompson shows how the ordinary people of England were not content to wait for political reforms to

be handed down to them from above, but were actively fighting for their rights throughout the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

9. *A Song for Every Season* by Bob Copper. The Copper family tended sheep on the Sussex downland for generations, and built up a vast collection of folk songs which they sung in the fields while working and in the tap room while relaxing with a beer. Discovered by the BBC in the early 1950s, their material formed an important part of the folk revival. Bob Copper's memoir of his family's life on the Downs at Peacehaven is accompanied by songs from the family collection.

10. *The Strange Death of Tory England* by Geoffrey Wheatcroft. It cheers me up just to write that title, never mind read the book.

MOVIE REVIEW

*(After viewing the film, *The Queen*, we asked for volunteers to review the movie. Bill Jones volunteered. His review is below, followed by remarks from other BPGERS. Some of which were circulated on the BPG-.)*

The Queen

Stephens Frears

Anyone interested in the role played the Queen in Britain's constitutional monarchy will find this a fascinating film. It is, in addition, both beautifully acted – Helen Mirren must be a shoo-in for an Oscar for her remarkable role as Her Maj – and wonderfully shot. In the British system the monarch has the duty to warn and encourage as well as be consulted but in the film roles are extraordinarily reversed.

The action begins with the death of Diana in August 1997 and the story revolves around the reactions of the Royal Family to this event plus the role of the new Prime Minister, Tony Blair, in urging upon them course of action which they are not inclined, through their traditions and upbringing, to take. The Royals' initial reaction – cocooned in Balmoral – was to deploy the traditional stiff upper lip and play it by the protocol book. Diana, who was not a popular member of 'The Firm,' was not technically a member of the Royal Family, as she had been relieved of her HRH as a result of the divorce in 1992. Consequently, the Royals argued, there was no requirement for a state funeral or to lower the flag to half-mast at Buckingham Palace. The Duke of Edinburgh – well played by James Cromwell, the rangy farmer from 'Babe' – was convinced the boys needed to get out in

the Scottish hills and stalk deer in order to take their minds off things. Meanwhile the scenes of mass grief began accusingly to take place in London and the tabloid headlines to appear of a heartless, dysfunctional royal family. A crisis was emerging which arguably threatened the survival of the monarchy as an institution.

This is where Tony Blair – the second remarkable performance, this time by Michael Sheen – comes in as the mediator between the Royals and a grieving nation. His finely tuned politician’s antennae have picked up that something is happening in the wake of Diana’s death that the Royal Family – still locked in the repressed manners and feelings of the early 1900s – are unable to detect and to which they are wholly ill equipped to react. The Royal advisors, most of whom had little time for the histrionic Princess, seemed to be even more blind and insensitive. If this version of Blair’s interventions is anywhere near accurate, he may well have saved the monarchy’s bacon during this episode. Whether it was or is worth saving is another matter entirely.

Writer Peter Morgan has not provided so much a plot; rather he has interpreted a signal event in British political and social life in a way which is wonderfully subtle and insightful about the Royals, about Blair and late 20th century British society. Many of the scenes, for example, where Tony and Cherie first meet the Queen, are exquisitely and wittily observed; the Queen’s eventual broadcast to the nation a tour de force by Mirren. Good as the other actors are – Sheen, Cromwell, Helen McGrory as Cherie, Roger Allam as Robin Janvrin, Sylvia Sims as Queen Mother (yes, Sylvia Sims!) Alex Jennings as Prince Charles – Helen Mirren is transcendent as Elizabeth II just as she was as Elizabeth I. There is never a moment when you don’t believe she is the Queen, as completely does she inhabit her character. And the triumph of the role and indeed of the film is that while the royals shamefully do not rise to the occasion, we are able to understand and empathize with their failure. *Bill Jones*

Alan Ward, I’ve now seen this film and I think its central thesis is correct – the royals’ attachment to their sense of protocol, their reluctance to honor someone who had opted out of the family, and Blair’s efforts to make them aware of what was happening. Most of the settings, of Scotland and the royal residences, particularly are superb. And the film brought back to me the extraordinary phenomenon of a country going into collective insanity over the death of a young woman of no particular ability who died in a messy car crash with her playboy boyfriend. I still don’t understand this. I also think the film is correct in depicting Blair as a respectful monarchist, not withstanding the hostility of the people around him.

That said, there’s a great deal wrong that a decent British director should have corrected. First, all we’ve seen of the Queen suggests that she isn’t the rather hard-hearted bitch presented by Helen Mirren in the first part of the film. For example, I know of no evidence to suggest that it would be in character for her to be disrespectful to the Blairs, for any reason at the investiture. Second, the Blairs lived at 11 Downing St. during the crisis, not in a flat borrowed from the set of East Enders. The notion that this couple, the PM and his QC wife with three or four thousands pounds p.a. between them who live in the PM’s quarters, eat in a 1920s kitchen just off a scruffy living room with no domestic help is absurd. (Cherie, wielding frying pan, calls to Tony, “Come on Tony or the fishfingers will burn.” To end an argument he appears to be losing, Tony picks up a tray of tea things and says, “I’m going to wash up.”) For dramatic effect, the lifestyles and behaviors of both the Queen and the Blairs are parodied unmercifully. There was surely enough drama in the situation to go around without this. Third, why bring in an American actor to play the Duke? He’s an extremely good actor in the U. S. – think “LA Confidential” and “Six Feet Under” – but not, one would think, a box office draw here or in the UK, and his attempt at a royal accent was awful. More seriously, like the Queen and Blair too, his behavior is an awful parody. (“I’ll take the boys out to shoot something so they won’t think about the death of their dear mother in a 120 mph crash in a Paris tunnel with her boyfriend. Let’s have some tea.”) It’s as though the film were made for American cable TV. Lastly, and not a criticism, I was intrigued that whilst my wife made me return my Virginia car license because they began with the letters JRK (think Jerk), the Queen doesn’t mind it on her Range Rover. She doesn’t seem to rate Q1.

I won’t bore you with the “History Boys,” which is a more interesting film.

Frank Myers - From this side of the Atlantic, I thought it was an extremely interesting film, especially for Mirren’s performance (not to mention the spectacular Scottish scenery). But also the portrayal of Tony Blair seemed accurate and informative to me, as well as the general atmosphere of Downing Street and environs. On the other hand, I’m curious to know what those who are closer to the scene think of the portrayals of the Queen Mother and Prince Philip. I had always thought of the Queen Mother as having a good sense of humor, but she doesn’t come off that way in the film. Am I wrong there? And it seemed to me unfortunate that Prince Philip was portrayed as such a fool and that his character was given the job of presenting so much of the argument on behalf of the Queen’s emotional reserve and stoicism, which made it difficult to take very

seriously. From my readings and conversations with people over the years, it seemed that the Abdication Crisis was central to the formation of the Queen's stoical character—that her personality was shaped as a kind of antithesis to that of Edward VIII. When seen in that light, her suppression of feelings and spontaneity would have a positive aspect. The film did make a reference to this, but in too passing a fashion for most people (especially young people) to catch its significance. I thought the film might have presented her stoicism and distance more clearly in this light rather than as the attitude of the narrow-minded fool that Prince Philip was made out to be. These observations come from some distance away, so I'd like to hear from those who are more familiar with the principals.

Mark Shepard –What struck me about the film, *The Queen*, is how very little we actually know about the monarchy, and how much people (hopefully none of us?!) read as fact from 'entertainment' films. Unlike with politicians where we invariably have so much more information to juxtapose alongside a film depiction, the film, *The Queen*, left me squirming in my seat as I felt I did not have enough 'reality' or context to counterbalance my thoughts on what I was being told this film, which then makes me wonder how people who are not interested in politics – what do they make of political depictions? To what extent is cinema (enigma code anybody?) and the truncated/international requirements of the film influencing public opinion and worst still depiction of political history and elite understanding...

Note: Mirren and the Scottish scenery were undoubted highlights of the film. While I have not met Mirren or the Queen, I have climbed a few munros this year, and can attest to the breathtaking and unparalleled beauty of the Scottish highlands.

Robin Melville – May I add, having had the experience of seeing *The Queen* and the new "Prime Suspect" in the same day that it's quite amazing to see Mirren's range.

Howard Elcock- I had the slightly odd experience of seeing the movie the day after I had met the (real) Queen at a CPRE reception. This experience increased my admiration for Helen Mirren's acting – she is really like the real Queen!!

If you haven't seen this movie yet, GO!!

Henry Steck - I agree, if you haven't seen it, do so for all the reasons colleagues have mentioned. My question to those who have seen it and who have a better grasp of these things, according to my reading, is that the Queen et. al. resisted Tony Blair quite steadily until the Blair character said words to the effect that "it is my

constitutional responsibility to advise you..." Is it true (well, the textbooks say it is) that at this point she had no choice in the matter? To some extent the film suggests that the Queen had rather more leverage than textbooks now lead us to believe. Of course, the Diana business is and was quite without precedent and had its own dynamics. It is the constitution that I am curious to hear about.

Tom Wolf – Assuming that the Blair's role in the film was generally a reflection of what actually happened, a couple of political matters arise. First, was it ironic that a Labour prime minister had the sensitivity to advise a monarch that her reluctance to yield to popular wishes was an error? One might expect a Conservative politician to be protective of the Queen, as Churchill, unwisely, did during the abdication crisis in the 1930s. But, should one expect a Labour premier, especially one whose wife apparently loathed the monarchy, act to support that institution? Still, we also know that according to their memoirs and other sources, Labour PMs have cherished their interaction with the Queen as much as have those from the Tory ranks.

Second, this predicament arose in the first half-year of Blair's premiership when one might presume he would be both unlikely to comprehend the political gravity of the situation, and reluctant to act upon that insight if he did. Yet, a few years later when confronted with a more conventional political issue, Iraq, he manifested less acumen, choosing a path that was contrary to popular wishes, despite substantial reasons to believe that the American president's rationale for the invasion was seriously flawed. Did his powers of political assessment decline over that half-decade?

Of course, the issue in 1997 and that in 2002-2003 were substantially different. In the latter instance, Blair was apparently influenced by his religious values, a factor not evident in the aftermath of Diana's death.

In recent days, the film has received a great deal of attention in the US. The cable channel A&E broadcast a documentary on the making of the film. Among those commenting was Robert Lacey, a biographer of the Queen. He praised the film. Peter Morgan, who wrote the film script, said that once he viewed the situation to be a conflict between Number Ten and Balmoral, the writing moved along promptly. He said the crisis was driven by the media, a perspective that I did not perceive in the film.

During her January visit to the States, Cherie Blair said she had seen the film but her husband had not. Her only criticism of the film was that the actor who played her husband was shorter than the one that portrayed Prince Charles. She noted that in fact her husband, who stands six foot, is notably taller than the Prince of Wales.

ABSTRACTS

The following are from the American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, August 31 – September 3, 2006:

“Michael Howard’s Effectiveness as Leader of the Opposition,”

This paper examines the circumstances under which Michael Howard became leader of the British Conservative Party in November 2003, and analyzes his effectiveness as Leader of the Opposition through the general election of 5 May 2005. Howard inherited a party bitterly divided over its leadership, its policy direction, and its future. After immediately establishing his credibility as a fearsome debater at the dispatch box in parliamentary debates with Prime Minister Tony Blair, he established a vision for Britain in his “British Dream” speech. While staying true to Conservative principles of fair play, choice, and expanded opportunity, he offered a framework for the policies the Tories would put before the British people at the 2005 general election.

Ultimately, the Conservative Party’s 2005 Election Manifesto emphasized six themes: 1) More Police, 2) Cleaner Hospitals, 3) Lower Taxes, 4) School Discipline, 5) Controlled Immigration, and 6) Accountability. The main argument of this paper is that those themes were chosen because they represented areas of policy where Howard had provided an effective critique of government policy and had established a realistic alternative. This paper details Howard’s effectiveness in holding the Labour Government of Tony Blair to account.

After exploring the enormity and dimensions of Howard’s task as Leader of the Opposition, this paper concludes that he deserves enormous credit for leading the Conservative Party out of the political wilderness, and that he effectively established a credible alternative to New Labour. While the current leader of the Conservative Party, David Cameron, has recently been given much credit for the revival of his party, Michael Howard’s contributions should not be underestimated. *Ray Barker, Erie County Community College*

“Gender, candidate image and electoral preference,”

Studies show that voters make judgments about politicians – their competence, honesty, warmth, and so on – on the basis of physical appearance, and that

those judgments can influence voting behaviour. This raises the possibility of two different gender gaps 1) female and male candidates may be evaluated differently, ultimately affecting their relative electoral performance; 2) female and male voters may react differently to candidate images. We explore this using a stacked dataset of evaluations of 36 UK MPs by 368 undergraduate students, and find evidence of both gender gaps. First, we confirm the persistent finding that voters assign ‘warmth’ traits to female and ‘strength’ traits to male candidates. Such stereotyping has an interesting impact on electoral preference: male candidates were judged more by warmth, female candidates more by strength, suggesting that stereotypical traits were taken for granted. Second, we find male voters more likely than female voters to see male candidates as stronger, and to prioritise strength in voting. Our results also support the view that gender and appearance heuristics are relied on most by those with little other basis for judgment, such as non-partisans. Hence, while gender effects on voting are weak when averaged across the whole electorate, they could be much stronger for (expanding) sub-groups of voters. *Robert Johns & Mark Shephard, University of Strathclyde* [A variation of this paper will be published in *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*.]

“Poachers turned Gamekeepers: British and American Legislators with Previous Professional Lobbying Experience,”

Considerable attention has been paid to former legislators who have moved on to lobbying jobs. This paper looks at the reverse situation – professional lobbyists who then become legislators, in both the United States and the United Kingdom. One of the oddities of this phenomenon is that while the majority of the relevant literature is from America, there is actually a higher proportion of lobbyists-turned-legislators in the UK. We report here on the results of a pilot study which we undertook, the results of which have encouraged us to complete a fuller study which is currently ongoing. The paper considers the lobbying, electoral and legislative phases of our respondents’ careers. Do former lobbyists make (more) effective legislators? Does the experience of having acted as lobbyist enhance a person’s ability to serve as an elected official? In some ways, they should be expected intuitively to bring to their new role characteristics similar to those of legislators-turned-lobbyists.

As former lobbyists, they will be familiar with policy making processes, they will have existing relationships with other legislators and civil servants, they ought to have some policy expertise. But, on the other hand, their past experience as lobbyists may also bring disadvantages – for instance, in terms of commitment perceptions, having an existing poor relationship with some other legislators, and a lack of business/social experience outside the political world. *Connor McGrath, Independent Scholar, & Clive S. Thomas, University of Alaska Southeast*

“Campaigning Through Organizations and Markets: Campaign Outsourcing and the Transformation of Party Organization,”

Over the past several decades, political parties throughout the developed world have transformed their approach to election campaigning. This transformation manifests itself not only in campaign activities (market research, media management, internet campaigning, etc.) but also in campaign organization. Specifically, campaign functions have increasingly been “outsourced”: transferred away from party organization and their full-time staffs into the hands of individuals and firms outside the political parties. In thus reorganizing their campaigns, parties are also reorganizing themselves. This paper turns to economic theories of the “boundaries of the firm” to suggest a theory of the determinants of the “boundaries of party” – that is, a theory of the outsourced campaign. It draws on evidence from campaigns in Britain, Germany, and the United States in assessing the plausibility of its account. *Jennifer K. Smith, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*

“What Makes for an Effective Prime Minister?”

Former prime minister Harold Wilson always used to say that the ability to sleep soundly and a sense of history were the main essentials of a successful prime minister. Edward Heath thought that the ability to keep your head in a crisis was the key quality. Political scientist Simon James suggested that successful prime ministers needed ‘the combined skills of prophet, conciliator, tactician and sheepdog.’ What aspects of prime-ministerial personality, skill or style matter and make a difference to politics and government? What qualities have served well or poorly in Number 10 Downing Street? This paper applies the model developed by Fred Greenstein in this book *The Presidential Difference* to analyze prime-ministerial performance and the strengths and weaknesses of

British prime ministers since 1945 in terms of (1) their proficiency as public communicators, (2) organizational capacity, (3) political skill, (4) policy vision, (5) cognitive style and (6) emotional intelligence. There is at least as much to be learned from their failures and limitations in these terms as from their successes and strengths. The variation and comparisons possible between the different prime ministers from Attlee to Blair across a 60 year period – evaluating their strengths and weaknesses in terms of Greenstein’s model – provide insights into the reasons for success and failure in prime ministerial leadership in Britain. In terms of Greenstein’s categories, the ‘perfect’ prime minister would possess an unlikely combination of skills and attributes: the communication flair of a Churchill, Wilson or Blair; the organizational abilities of a Heath or Attlee; skills as a political operator to match a Macmillan or Callaghan; the policy vision and drive of a Thatcher; the brain power of a Wilson; the emotional stability of an Attlee. As Ivor Jennings long ago pointed out, ‘none of our recent Prime Ministers has had all the required qualities and it is unlikely that all of them will ever be concentrated in one person.’ The paper concludes that Greenstein’s model helps to identify key leadership abilities, characteristics and skills, but that the context and circumstances in which those skills and abilities are displayed cannot be neglected when assessing prime-ministerial effectiveness. *Kevin Theakston, University of Leeds*

“Protestant Zealotry or Unionist Apathy? The Impact of election turnout upon the peace and political progress in Northern Ireland.”

Recent elections in Northern Ireland have witnessed a realignment of the unionist and nationalist electoral blocs. The relatively moderate and ostensibly pro-Good Friday Agreement (GFA) Ulster Unionist Party (UUP), for so long the dominant force within unionism, has been eclipsed by the Reverend Ian Paisley’s anti-GFA Democratic Unionist Party (DUP). For most commentators, the rise of the DUP confirms its ability to harness Protestant disaffection with the GFA. Accompanied by the electoral rise of Sinn Fein, which has overtaken the SDLP within the nationalist bloc, there has been much discussion of the supposed rise of the ‘extremes’, facilitated by the recognition and legitimation of ethnic bloc division under the attempted consociational power sharing arrangements under GFA.

This paper acknowledges the severity of electoral bloc divisions in Northern Ireland, in terms of the lack of cross-community voting. Nonetheless, it suggests that the switch in party fortunes within each bloc owes much to differential rates of turnout, a distinct from the mass mobilization of militancy within either ethnic bloc. In particular, the rise of the DUP owes less to its mobilization of Protestants than to the disengagement of many Unionists from the electoral process. These contentions are tested by examination of recent electoral contests in respect of a) aggregate voting data, b) bloc turnout and the performance of the parties within each bloc relative to turnout, and c) the extent of vote transfers across the bloc divide. This paper argues that aspirations for the bolstering of a moderate non-confessional centre need to be replaced by the search for median political positions with each bloc in order to understand political change. *Jonathan Tonge, University of Liverpool*

ARTICLES

“The Curious Case of Victor Grayson”

Wyn Grant, Warwick University

Every year at the Modern Records Centre at Warwick University, we have a meeting of our Advisory Board which is chaired by former Unison general secretary, Rodney Bickerstaff. The archivist arranges a small display of materials that have recently been acquired by the Centre which is the depository for the records of the CBI and TUC, as well as major employers' associations and trade unions and the Crossman diaries. We also take in papers from leading figures in the labour department.

Rodney and I were delighted to see among the displayed papers a couple of letters on the notepaper of the British Socialist Party (a forerunner of the Communist Party of Great Britain) written by Victor Grayson. This had been acquired from his granddaughter. The content of the letters was not particularly interesting, although I was fascinated to see how precise and yet elaborate Grayson's handwriting was. I was inspired to purchase a second hand copy of David Clark's book, *Victor Grayson: Labour's Lost Leader*.

Grayson was born of working class parents in Liverpool, although there were stories, for which there is some circumstantial evidence, that he was

placed with the family and that in fact he was the illegitimate child of someone from an aristocratic family, possibly Winston Churchill. Grayson was an individual of some talent and started training as a Unitarian Minister, but abandoned religion for socialism. He was clearly a charismatic figure, attractive to women, although bisexual himself, and an excellent platform speaker in a period when that was the key political skill. His ability to use biblical analogies went down well with nonconformists when in the age of twenty-five he stood for election to the House of Commons in what was seen to be the safe Liberal seat of Colne Valley. In a three cornered fight, standing as a 'Labour and Socialist' candidate without the backing of the Labour Representation Committee who saw him as something of an upstart, he won a sensational victory.

Grayson did not fit well in Commons. He was not a team player, did not attend or vote much and was suspended for disrupting the House in a protest over unemployment. However, outside Parliament he was seen as a standard bearer of the left and was much in demand as an orator, although his growing alcohol problem meant that he was often unable to perform. In the first general election of 1910 he lost Colne Valley. He stood very unsuccessfully in a London seat in the second general election of 1910. He earned a living from political journalism from Robert Blatchford's *Clarion* and was involved in forming the British Social Party where he was out maneuvered by the ILP.

He married a woman from a solid middle class background who was an actor and joined her on a tour of Australia. He was a strong supporter of British entry into the First World War, joined the army in New Zealand, was wounded on the western front, injured and invalided back to Britain and discharged, in part because of this drink problem. His wife died in childbirth at the end of the year.

His financial circumstances had been difficult, but now underwent a miraculous transformation. He had been in penury, but now he did not even bother to collect his war disability pension. He moved into an expensive apartment in London and received fortnightly payments from Maundy Gregory who sold honours for Lloyd George. It would appear he was blackmailing Gregory, perhaps both over selling of honours and over Gregory's homosexuality.

One day in 1920, after an incident in which he had been roughed up in the Strand, he was collected by two men who took him away with his belongings. He was seen by someone, who knew him well, landing on an

island up river on the Thames where Gregory had a bungalow. Gregory, who is known to have been implicated in the murder of his mistress, probably had him murdered and somehow disposed of the body without a trace. The apparent involvement of the security services may have been of assistance to him in that respect.

Clark has a different account. He believed that, just as happened with Gregory after he served his prison sentence for selling honours, Grayson was given safe passage to Australia and eventually returned to England and worked as a school teacher, mainly in Kent. This is largely based on a number of Elvis-like sightings of Grayson, although perhaps the best piece of evidence is that someone collected Grayson's war medals at the outbreak of the Second World War in 1941. Clark believes that it is likely that Grayson was killed in an air raid in Chelsea in 1941.

Why I find this unlikely is that Grayson made no attempt to contact his mother (to whom he made what was clearly a valedictory visit a few days before his disappearance) or his then six year-old daughter. He was clearly attached to his daughter who lived with his parents-in-law. He was on good terms with them and visited them and his daughter in Bolton from London every weekend. Clark thinks that Grayson decided his daughter would be better without him, but I do not find that plausible.

The Grayson story is a curious footnote in British 20th century history which has been the subject of a television programme and a radio play. Interest in it has been revived by current investigations into allegations that honours have been offered in return for party donations which are being investigated by the police who have interviewed the prime minister in the course of their enquiries. For an article on Grayson and the current controversy see: <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/funding/comment/0.1739943.00.html>

(Editor's note: *I read the Guardian article, cited above. It's a 26 March 2006 piece by Nick Cohen and explores the issue of politicians selling favors, mainly in the Gregory case, but elsewhere as well.*)

BOOK REVIEWS

Martin Ingra & Greg Harkin, *Stakeknife: Britain's Secret Agents in Ireland* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 2004), 266 pp., Glossary, Pb. \$19.95.

This is a readable but unsatisfactory book, and these two points are related. The story is told in very informal narrative form, with specific chapters identified as the testimony of either or both of the authors. Martin Ingram is the pseudonym of a retired British intelligence officer who went public with allegations of abuse in fighting the Irish Republican Army (IRA) in Northern Ireland. Greg Harkin is a journalist who has worked for the newspaper *The People*.

The substance is inherently gripping as well as important to students of political science and the wider public. At the same time, the form and style of this book gives pause, and the coauthors are both a very long way from either dispassionate scholarship or truly rigorous analysis.

The book describes graphically the intense, lethal armed conflict between the British government and the IRA in Northern Ireland. The focus is the activities of two directly involved agents. Brian Nelson worked for the Force Research Unit (FRU) in support of loyalists.

The second man was codenamed "Stakeknife" and led the Nutting Squad, an IRA internal security force that tortured and killed suspected informers. Stakeknife, whose real name is Freddy Scappaticci, turned on his IRA comrades and began working for the British in the 1980s. The book describes efforts of MI-5, the British intelligence organization, spurred by frustration, to work with the British Army and loyalists in targeted assassinations. The program led to more extreme activities by both sides in this historically very deeply-rooted tale of ethnic hatred and revenge.

Stakeknife himself personifies violence of a cynical variety. His nickname could be a metaphor on various levels for the vexing struggle. A 'steak knife' must be sharp if the meat is to be carved. A 'stake' implies commitment as well as position, which can be undercut by the knife of disloyalty.

The book is free of the trappings and structures of scholarship. There is a Glossary but no footnotes, bibliography, or disciplined analysis. Publication by an established university press is therefore curious.

This is a tabloid tale, with lots of blood, carnage, and emotion, but no serious policy analysis. The moralistic tone of both authors is irritating and simplistic, given the nature of the sort of warfare they discuss.

Samuel H. Beer became a generally acknowledged great scholar of British and American politics through his capacity to combine conceptual discipline, historical knowledge and insight, human sensitivity and fair regard for the usefulness of quantitative techniques. Truly impressive scholarly research and analysis on this level regarding Northern Ireland is sorely lacking, despite several published efforts. *Arthur Cyr, Carthage College*

Robert Self, *Neville Chamberlain: A Biography* (Aldershot & Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), xi & 573 pp., Index, Sources, Cl. \$59.95

Robert Self's *Neville Chamberlain: A Biography* is an exemplary work, meticulously researched and carefully written, within a manageable 451 pages of text. The acclaimed editor of the four-volume collection of *The Neville Chamberlain Diary Letters* and *The Austen Chamberlain Diary Letters*, Self is eminently qualified to write this biography which is extensively researched in many archival collections and includes eighty-three pages of endnotes, mostly of primary material. Self places his interpretations in context of that of other scholars, both in his brief "Preface" and his very tactful comments when analyzing controversial episodes.

Neville Chamberlain was the second and less favored son of the powerful, aloof Joseph. He was slighted in childhood, mistreated at school, and when relatively inexperienced launched into a risky and ultimately failed family business venture while older half-brother Austen was beginning to flourish politically. Of this famous family triad, only Neville became prime minister. However, he is mostly remembered for that terribly flawed premiership.

Self devotes one-third of his biography to those three years as prime minister, 1937-1940, focusing, as did Chamberlain's government, almost exclusively on foreign and military issues. Chamberlain advocated a two-prong policy: Rearmament, and better relationships with Germany and Italy. Chamberlain was faced with political, financial, and production problems in rearmament, and although he was "the greatest single force in shaping British defense policy between 1934 and 1939" (p. 235), his concern with coherence and cost-effectiveness led him to concentrate on air rearmament. Self focuses much more on Chamberlain's foreign policy, which was dominated by him, not his foreign ministers Eden and Halifax. Until Germany's occupation of Prague, Chamberlain believed he could work with Hitler and Mussolini, just

as he mistakenly believed de Valera's promises over Irish concessions. After a November 1937 meeting with the French premier, Chamberlain was sure that he and Britain were the leaders of the Anglo-French team. Chamberlain had long distrusted the US and Roosevelt, especially perceiving him isolationist during the 1937 Japanese aggression into China, and he disdained Stalin throughout the entire period.

Self basically agrees with Chamberlain's claim to be the realist in 1938—that given the circumstances, Britain, France, and Czechoslovakia could not then win a central European war, and that Chamberlain was a skilled and successful negotiator in his first and third meetings with Hitler. Self does fault Chamberlain for believing this would produce permanent peace, for his slow recognition of Hitler's expansionist goals after Munich, and for his failure to press for ties with the Soviet Union prior to war. Chamberlain's two-pronged rearmament and appeasement policy was fluid in application, with immediate appeasement usually more dominant than long-range rearmament.

During that war's early months, Self points out that "the crucial perception at the time was that Chamberlain lacked the necessary dynamism, flexibility of mind and sense of critical urgency required of a successful war leader" (pp. 389-90). Moreover, Chamberlain critically misjudged that Germany was incapable of attacking in the West and that Germany's economy could not withstand a long war, so a "waiting war" would be to Britain's advantage. Whereas Self's analysis of Chamberlain's foreign and defense policy may place the author between the revisionists and the counter-revisionists for the prewar period, Self is clearly critical of Chamberlain's failure as a wartime prime minister.

Yet Chamberlain's life and career are not just about his being premier. He had a happy marriage to Annie, and he enjoyed fishing, shooting, and gardening. He was a fine administrator and a social reformer, sharing his father's boldness. After an effective business career in Birmingham, he entered municipal politics, becoming an energetic Lord Mayor with innovations in health, housing, and town planning. Appointed head of the wartime Department of National Service, then dished by Lloyd George, whom he never forgave, Chamberlain entered national politics, rose rapidly, and became a major cabinet minister during two decades of mostly lackluster contemporaries. Self-confident, arrogant, and hard-working, Chamberlain dominated much of the political

process, whether within his portfolio or interdepartmental, such as the formulation of the Local Government Act of 1929 and the negotiations at the 1932 Ottawa Conference. Becoming Conservative party chair in 1930, he squelched the Beaverbrook-Rothermere rebellion against Baldwin 1929-31. He forced and coordinated the National Government's defence program into that of rearmament. Dealing with economic issues as Chancellor of the Exchequer, he perceived that he understood such international issues better than leaders of the United States and France. Increasingly impressed with his own abilities, Prime Minister Chamberlain was determined to dominate foreign policy. Known to contemporaries as arbitrary, he nevertheless worked within the cabinet system, famously over Anthony Eden's challenge in 1938 and later during the Sudetenland crisis. Increasingly, however, Chamberlain lived within a tight political world of supporters, within a bubble we would now say. Actually, one flaw of Self's book is that sometimes he writes of Chamberlain's thoughts and actions in a bubble and fails to explain adequately other figures or to describe clearly the issue Chamberlain faced (i.e., the specific features of the Ottawa agreements).

Self praises Chamberlain's total political career. Concerned about practical reforms for the people of Birmingham and then of Britain, while Minister of Health (1924-29), Chamberlain engineered the Local Government Act of 1929, which included restructuring and expanding the previous Poor Law benefits. As party chair, originator of the party's research department, and critical supporter of Baldwin, Chamberlain was the strength of the National Government throughout the thirties. As Depression-era Chancellor of the Exchequer, he overstressed balanced budgets but began moving Britain toward a managed economy through import duties, reorganization of industry, and attempts at regional policy. After losing the premiership though remaining party leader, Chamberlain became an effective Lord President of the Council, and gave strong and valuable support to Churchill.

Neville Chamberlain is rated near the bottom of successful twentieth-century prime ministers, ahead of only Balfour, Douglas-Home, and Eden (*BPG Newsletter*, Winter 2005). Unfortunately for him, there is no rating of successful cabinet members. If there were, readers of Self's biography of Chamberlain would place him near the top. *Jerry H. Brookshire, Middle Tennessee State University*

Jeffrey T. McCausland & Douglas T. Stuart, eds. *U.S.-UK Relations at the Start of the 21st Century* (Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2005 pb.) x & 215 pp., ISBN 12-58487-217-9, no price; hard copies may be ordered from: www.StrategicStudiesInstitute.army.mil/

A relationship must be special indeed that lead the British prime minister to stake his reputation and that of his government on a policy originally championed by an organization calling itself The Project for a New American Century. It is not clear that either side is now benefiting substantially from British participation in the Iraq War, which probably cost Blair's party seats in the 2005 election while adding little to the over all defense capability of the US. What keeps this relationship going?

The book under review explores this question in a series of brief but trenchant and argumentative essays that were originally presented as papers by British and American specialists at conferences on each side of the Atlantic on the topic of "The Future of the Special Relationship." It is divided into four sections, each devoted to a specific aspect of the relationship: economic, political-legal, diplomatic, and military. Each section contains two essays, one each by an American and a Briton, followed by a panel chairman's summary. All of the authors speak with authority gained by experience and responsibility in their subject areas.

This format is designed to encourage confrontation and comparison of diverse perspectives, and the authors respond with vigor, producing lively essays marked by detail, rich sourcing, and forceful argument. The book offers no comfortable consensus. Even the most elementary facts of the relationship are disputed. For example, the opening chapter by Ray Raymond traces the origins of the relationship to "the Federalists' foreign policy of the 1790s" and argues that it has been a feature of UK/US foreign policy throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. But on page 175, Charles Dick states that these 200 years were characterized by suffused hostility between the two countries, and that the "special relationship was a product of the combined endeavor to defeat Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan. In origin it was thus a relatively recent phenomenon."

If there is a common theme running through these essays, it is that the special relationship runs deeper than the personal chemistry that exists between the leaders of the two nations, however much the media concentrate on the Bush-Blair friendship and compat-

ibility. Michael Calingaert (US) and Raymond (UK) both emphasize the economic and especially financial interconnections between the two countries as a unique combination that strengthens the economic performance of both. Whether the UK's membership in the EU helps or hinders this influence is not entirely clear. Both Calingaert and Raymond argue that EU membership draws Britain away from the Anglo-Saxon model of relatively low governmental regulation thereby weakening the special relationship. But they regard this as a challenge to be met rather than an insuperable obstacle.

Defense policy is another area where extensive links at many levels tie the two countries together. Leo Michel provides a sober summary of evolving strategic doctrines in both countries, showing how cooperation is built into the very functioning of missile defense and of the operations of the Trident submarines.

Yet deep and extensive as these pressures for cooperation may be, the authors do not slight the strains evident in UK-US relations. Charles Dick's review of defense policy argues that Britain gains so much more than it gives in defense that the long term future of the relationship is problematic.

In the area of foreign policy, the relationship is unbalanced in the other direction, according to Nicholas Childs. Blair's influence in persuading Bush to seek UN approval before attacking Iraq, "is not to be dismissed, especially given how otherwise deaf and impervious to the arguments of outsiders this particular US administration generally is" (p. 131). The essay by Philip Stephens supports this. In the run up to Iraq, in spite of all the public proclamations of friendship, the Bush team seems to have regarded Britain as a tool rather than a partner.

Nevertheless, as the earlier chapters show, economic relationships bind the countries together, encouraging cooperation regardless of relations at the highest political level. That emphasis is one of the book's important contributions.

A book of this sort, with fifteen authors and a variety of perspectives and topics, presents problems for a reviewer. It would be too easy to criticize for topics omitted or treated too briefly. Nevertheless, I believe that a section on the interaction of the defense industries would have added an important dimension. Britain, after all, has its own military-industrial complex whose connections to its American counterpart warrant exploration.

The book lacks an index, which reduces its utility considerably. It is also so poorly bound that pages fall out as one reads along. In spite of these defects, the book is a valuable contribution to this timely and important subject. *Frank Myers, Stony Brook University*

Jurg Steiner, André Bacjtoger, Markus Spörndli & Marco B. Steenbergen, *Deliberative Politics in Action: Analysing Parliamentary Discourse* (New York & Cambridge University, 2004, vi & 199pp., Index, Bibliography, cl., \$70.00, pb., \$28.99.

Consociational democracy theory suffers from a major flaw. Theorists argue that four institutional arrangements are necessary *but not sufficient* conditions for consociational democracies to survive. Necessary conditions include proportional representation, grand coalitions, federalism, and multiple veto points, all of which are designed to maximize minority voices. In addition, theorists have argued that a "spirit of accommodation" is needed among elites: they must be willing to talk, to share, and give way on matters of utmost importance to minorities. Unfortunately, the only way to know if a spirit of accommodation exists has been to see whether a consociational system has survived. It has been impossible to empirically define consociational systems or to explain why some succeed and others fail.

This book attempts to fill this gap. It offers a quantitative analysis of "parliamentary discourse" in four different countries, chosen for their differences of institutional design ranging from maximally consociational to maximally confrontational: Switzerland, Germany, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

The central tenet of the book is that democracies in fragmented societies survive on the basis of their quality of deliberative politics. How well do opposing sides listen to each other? Do they accommodate each other? Do they listen to truths spoken by opponents, and seek the societal good, or do they use discourse simply to advance their own claims? This question of the quality of political discourse has implications for all sorts of democracies, of course, not just consociational ones, and thus the empirical framework set down here might be useful for assessing the prospects for democratic transitions and for evaluating the health of democratic systems in general.

Steiner and his collaborators develop what they call a "Discourse Quality Index" (DQI) to measure quantitatively the nature of political speech. Based on Habermas' discourse ethics (discussed in the book's second chapter), the DQI measures how well a particular spoken passage (in this case, speeches made in the legislatures of each country under study) conforms to the principles of good discourse outlined by Habermas; thus, the DQI measures the quality of political communication. High quality is defined as being logical, respectful, seeking the common good,

aiming for consensus, and being receptive to counterarguments.

From a research methods perspective, the index was well developed, having gone through several enumerations over several years. However, I am troubled by the final coding process. In the final validation exercise, two of the authors sat down separately to code the quality of a 1998 House of Commons debate on women that lasted five hours. The two coders rendered judgment on 504 distinct contributions to the debate, agreeing 461 times, for a 91.4% reliability. That level of agreement is good, but the fact that the authors themselves did the coding, rather than turning the coding over to someone not familiar with the theory they were exploring, raises problems of investigator expectations affecting the results. When the authors used untrained undergraduates, coding reliability dropped to 70%, which in the view of this reviewer is dangerously low for anything more than preliminary results. The coding of the data that form the basis of the book's findings were done by the other two authors, again raising concerns for investigator bias.

The conclusions of this book are rather predictable: Switzerland, today the cradle of consociational theory, has the highest quality discourse, with Germany, home of corporatism and consensus politics, a close second. The US and the UK, with their confrontational styles, trail rather badly behind. The US scores somewhat higher than the UK, thanks mostly to the role of the president who can stand above and outside Congressional debate.

One valid reaction to this elaborate attempt to measure the quality of political discourse is "so what?" Do we learn anything by knowing that Switzerland's more consensual style of dialogue scores more highly than the confrontational styles preferred in the US and especially the UK? Is this anything we did not already know? One response to this book is that it is a desperate attempt to salvage consociational theory in the face of the breakdown of consociational politics in Lebanon, Sri Lanka, and the Netherlands. But at a deeper level, it is clear that there is merit to this research path. How we communicate is as important as what we say, and politicians at least would do well to remember that. *William Field, Rutgers University*

POTPOURRI XLVIII

England's Twelve Greatest, According to the

Tories – In consultation with academics, not identified in December, the Conservative Party released a list of what they deemed the dozen most important figures in British history, or at least those that 'shaped history.' The dozen, their dates, and accomplishments listed chronically are:

Saint Columbia (521-597) - Christianity in Britain

Alfred the Great (849-899) - The Kingdom of England

Henry II (1133-1189) - The Common Law

Simon de Montfort (1208-1265) - Parliament

James IV of Scotland (1473-1513) - The Kingdom of Scotland

Thomas Gresham (1519-1658) – The stock market

Oliver Cromwell (1599-1658) – The British army

Isaac Newton (1643-1717) – The Royal Society

Robert Clive ((1725-1774) – The British Empire

Sir Robert Peel (1778-1850) – The police

Millicent Fawcett (1847-1929) – Universal suffrage

Nye Bevan (1897-1960) – The National Health Service

The Shadow Education Secretary, David Willetts, said the list was "neither definitive nor exhaustive" but should "provoke thought and debate." As is apparent, the list focuses on institutions, rather than individual achievement. The party's policy adviser, Sean Lang of Anglia Ruskin University, compiled the list.

The most honoured status of all? In case, you missed the announcement, we report that a female will soon be joining the Beefeaters at the Tower of London. A Scotswoman, Moira Cameron, who is awaiting the fitting of her uniform, will join male colleagues in directing guided tours of the Town this summer. A career soldier who joined the service at age 16, Cameron was selected among six that applied for this posting. Some might deem this status to be more important than being the prime tenant at Number Ten.

Aren't you pleased you didn't say/write this!

(No doubt there are comparable, if not more inane utterances by Labour politicians, but the Petras pair did not cite them.)

a) "U.N. goodwill may be a bottomless pit, but it's by no means limitless." John Major when British prime minister, cited in Ross & Kathryn Petras, *The Stupidest Things Ever Said by Politicians* (New York: Pocket Books, 1999), p. 14

b) “The world has gone through tremendous change recently, both nationally and internationally.” John Major when prime minister, cited in *ibid.*, p. 93.

c) “With the retirement of Dickie Bird., something sad will have gone out of English cricket.” John Major when prime minister, cited in *ibid.*, p. 109.

d) “One important new area is proposed legislation to promote unfair discrimination against people with disabilities.” From the publication *Great Britain’s Forward Look of Government-funded Science, Engineering and Technology*, cited in *ibid.*, p. 152.

From the Canadian political arena –

a) “Don’t go around killing the goose that provides the golden opportunity.” Attributed to a Toronto municipal councilman during a council meeting, cited in Petras & Petras, *op. cit.*, p. 92.

b) “The honorable member disagrees. I can hear him shaking his head.” Prime minister Pierre Trudeau in the House of Commons, as cited in *ibid.*, p. 106.

c) “We’d like to pay her the same as men get, but times are tough.” Ontario prime minister William Davis explaining why his Education Secretary, a woman, had to take a 35% cut in salary, cited in *ibid.*, p. 158.

d) “Now, the only thing that remains unsolved is the resolution of the problem.” A different [from ‘c’] Education Secretary (male) in Ontario as cited in *ibid.*, p. 165.

e) “Remember, there’s only one taxpayer, you and me.” A Calgary councilman, as cited in *ibid.*, p. 168.

f) “Don’t quote me as saying that we will or we should increase our external aid. That would be my opinion if I had an opinion, but as a member of my government, I have no opinion.” Paul Martin when External Affairs Minister, as cited in *ibid.*, p. 179.

g) “I don’t want any information. I just want facts.” The same Calgary councilman quoted in ‘e’ above, as cite in *ibid.*, p. 218.

Adrian Mole’s political observations (some of them) –

a) **Age and romance** - “Pandora has got a crush on Tony Benn, just like the one she had on Adam Ant. She says older men are exciting.” (Sue Townsend, *The Adrian Mole Diaries*, Grove Press, 1986), p. 136.

b) **The working class, religion, and the ‘Argies’** – “The working classes are toiling around the clock to mend Britain’s old battleships. Britain is planning a surprise attack on Argentine in six weeks.” p. 156.

c) **On body size and political success** – “Saw Roy Hattersley on the television tonight. He is putting weight on. He ought to go on a diet in case there’s a general election. The viewers don’t like fat politicians. Look what happened to Churchill after the war. He was slung out because he got too fat. I know all of this because we had a film of the Second World War in History today. I might be a historian if my memory improves.” pp. 263-64.

d) **Debates and courage** - “Michael Heseltine has chickened out of a public debate on cruise missiles with CND. I expect he is scared of being showed up. A similar thing is happening in our house, my father is refusing to talk to Pandora’s mother, who is a marriage guidance counselor.” p. 273.

e) **On religion and gender** – “I asked him if there was any chance of him turning Catholic, he said ‘About as much chance as there is if Mrs. Thatcher turning into a woman!’” p. 298.

f) **On journalistic competence** – “The Hitler Diaries are being subjected to meticulous tests by scientists. Why can’t they take *The Sunday Times*’ word for it that the diaries are genuine? Even a sceptic like me knows that *The Sunday Times* wouldn’t risk its reputation if there was the faintest chance that the diaries were a forgery.” p. 298.

g) **Political affection** – “The SDP candidate (green suit, orange shirt, neutral tie, nervous smile) has just left our house on the verge of tears, after my mother refused to let her kiss Rose.” p. 304.

Royal connections – “My great-grandmother had an affair with your great-grandfather,” Camilla Parker-Bowles upon first meeting Prince Charles, as cited in Autumn Stephens, *Loose Cannons* (MFJ Books, 1998), p. 41.

On compromise – “If you are not very clever, you should be conciliatory,” Benjamin Disraeli (1880), ac cited in Suzy Platt, ed., *Respectfully Quoted: A Dictionary of Quotations* (New York: Barnes & Noble, 1993), p. 53.

A Methodist view of ‘princely’ politics – “My cool judgment, is, that if all the other doctrines of devils which have been committed to writing since letters were in the world were collected together in one volume, it would fall short of this; and that, should a Prince form himself by this book, so calmly recommending hypocrisy, treachery, lying, robbery, adultery, whoredom, and murder of all kinds, Domitian or Nero would be an angel of light compared to that man,” John Wesley’s comment after reading *The Works of Nicholas Machiavelli*, as cited in *ibid.*, p. 272.

On political parties – “Party divisions, whether on the whole operating for good or evil, are things inseparable from government,” Edmund Burke, *Observations of the Present State of the Nation* (1769), as cited in Daniel B. Baker, ed., *Political Quotations* (Detroit: Gail Research, 1990), p. 148.

Margaret Asquith on political personages –

- 1) On Lord Kitchner (1914) – “If Kitchner is not a great man, he is, at least, a great poster.”
 - 2) On David Lloyd George – “He can’t see a belt without hitting below it.”
 - 3) On an unnamed politician – “He always has his arm around your waist and his eye on the clock.”
- [All three quotations from Nigel Rees, *A Dictionary of Twentieth Century Quotations* (London: Fontana/Collins, 1987), p. 29.]
-

MEMBERSHIP NEWS

Kudos – **William S. Livingston, Jr.**, at a reception of the 2006 APSA Annual Meeting, received the Daniel Elazar Award for his contributions to the comparative study of federalism.

New Addresses –

Andrew Gamble, Department of Politics, 17 Mill Lane, Cambridge, CB2 1RX UK

Ralph Negrine, Department of Journalism Studies, University of Sheffield, 18-22 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 2NJ, UK

New or Changed email Addresses

Andrew Gamble – amg59@cam.ac.uk

Winter 2006, No 127

IN THIS ISSUE

Editor's Remarks	Page 2
Activities	Page 3
Awards	Page 4
Announcements	Page 5
From the BPG-L	Page 6
Movie Review: <i>The Queen</i>	Page 7
Abstracts	Page 10
Article: <i>The Curious Case of Victor Grayson</i> by Wyn Grant	Page 12
Book Reviews	Page 13
Pot Pourri	Page 17
Membership News	Page 19



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