



EXECUTIVE POLITICS AND GOVERNANCE

The Problem of Governing

Essays for Richard Rose

Edited by Michael Keating · Ian McAllister
Edward C. Page · B. Guy Peters

palgrave
macmillan

Executive Politics and Governance

Series Editors

Martin Lodge

London School of Economics and Political Science

London, UK

Kai Wegrich

Hertie School of Governance

Berlin, Germany

The Executive Politics and Governance series focuses on central government, its organisation and its instruments. It is particularly concerned with how the changing conditions of contemporary governing affect perennial questions in political science and public administration. Executive Politics and Governance is therefore centrally interested in questions such as how politics interacts with bureaucracies, how issues rise and fall on political agendas, and how public organisations and services are designed and operated. This book series encourages a closer engagement with the role of politics in shaping executive structures, and how administration shapes politics and policy-making. In addition, this series also wishes to engage with the scholarship that focuses on the organisational aspects of politics, such as government formation and legislative institutions. The series welcomes high quality research-led monographs with comparative appeal. Edited volumes that provide in-depth analysis and critical insights into the field of Executive Politics and Governance are also encouraged.

Editorial Board

Philippe Bezes, CNRS-CERSA, Paris, France

Jennifer N. Brass, Indiana University Bloomington, USA

Sharon Gilad, Hebrew University Jerusalem, Israel

Will Jennings, University of Southampton, UK

David E. Lewis, Vanderbilt University, USA

Jan-Hinrik Meyer-Sahling, University of Nottingham, UK

Salvador Parrado, UNED, Madrid, Spain

Nick Sitter, Central European University, Hungary

Kutsal Yesilkagit, University of Utrecht, the Netherlands

Michael Keating • Ian McAllister
Edward C. Page • B. Guy Peters
Editors

The Problem of Governing

Essays for Richard Rose

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Michael Keating
School of Social Science
University of Aberdeen
Aberdeen, UK

Ian McAllister
School of Politics
Australian National University
Canberra, ACT, Australia

Edward C. Page
Department of Government
London School of Economics and
Political Science
London, UK

B. Guy Peters
Department of Political Science
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Executive Politics and Governance

ISBN 978-3-031-40816-8

ISBN 978-3-031-40817-5 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40817-5>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Paper in this product is recyclable.

PREFACE

Over a career spanning eight decades, Richard Rose has made a remarkable contribution to the academic study of politics. His first book—with David Butler on the 1959 British general election, part of the famous Nuffield election series—appeared in 1960. Since then, he has produced no fewer than 48 authored or co-authored books, 26 edited books or special issues of journals, and nearly 400 journal articles and book chapters. Even more impressive is the geographical range from Japan and Russia to the United Kingdom and the United States, and the range of topics, from problems of governance and public policy, comparative politics, elections and voting, and democracy and post-communism.

Rose's intellectual motivations are well described in his memoir *Learning About Politics in Time and Space* (Rose, 2014). This current book adds a different perspective to Rose's career by examining how his work has informed the study of governing. Each of his books, and the articles and chapters that have accompanied them, has followed a common theme by asking fundamental questions about the nature of politics and the problems of governing in modern societies. These questions have covered political legitimacy and authority, political representation and accountability, as well as how politicians, political elites and the mass public arrive at the decisions that affect how modern societies operate.

Each of the chapters that follow takes forward issues, debates and lines of research stimulated in Rose's work over nearly 70 years. While the chapters in the book take their cues from particular books or articles, the chapters are less appreciations of the works in question and even less a detailed

discussion of them as texts. Instead, the chapters reflect the authors' own original research and thinking in areas covered by Richard Rose's wide-ranging and pioneering work across the field. In each case, authors trace how Rose's approach has influenced later academic work and thinking in the field.

A distinctive feature of Rose's work has been the ability to identify political changes in their early stages and to highlight and develop their significance. This has included the 'input' side (parties and elections) and the 'outputs' (public policies) as well as the decision-making process that takes place in between. These are not merely mechanical systems but work in an environment where the complex and normatively charged concepts of legitimacy and consent are central. This makes this Festschrift for Richard Rose less a collection of papers on diverse aspects of his work than an extended examination of the key political issues of our times. Politics cannot be reduced to economics or to the sum of the actions of individuals, to predictive science or to functional determinism but has its own logic and modes of justification and is rooted in specific societies. We could argue that this is highly topical but, as Rose reminds us, they are universal and timeless. Few scholars, however, have been able to encompass this so comprehensively in so many different contexts.

The papers in the book are organized thematically under five headings that broadly cover the major areas of Rose's work, but the common concerns highlighted above recur throughout.

The first section examines governing at multiple levels. If one book sums up Rose's early career, it is *Politics in England*, which was published in five editions between 1964 and 1989, each one substantially revised and updated from its predecessor. Keating, McAllister, Page and Peters argue that the book represented a fundamental break with previous interpretations of British politics by adopting new methods and analysis and by placing British institutions in a comparative context. The central theme in *Politics in England* is to understand why Britain has experienced long-term political stability, and how the institutions and culture have combined to resist radical change while at the same time ensuring an adequate degree of reform. As the century progressed, many of the themes that Rose highlighted in the 1964 edition of *Politics in England*—such as 'one crown, many nations'—have become central issues in British politics.

Rose's interest in the territorial dimension to UK politics, first given form in *Politics in England*, stemmed from his early experiences hitchhiking around Britain and Ireland. He observed that the component parts of

the United Kingdom—England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland—represented very different histories, institutions, identities and cultures. As Michael Keating points out in his chapter, Rose was the first political scientist to challenge the then dominant homogeneity thesis which viewed the modern state as undergoing a process of territorial integration which would see these differences gradually erode and eventually disappear. Understanding how these territorial differences could be managed became what Rose called ‘an intellectual puzzle’. As Keating argues, these insights produced a several decades-long project which examined territorial management across the United Kingdom as a whole, but encompassing particularly Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The second section takes up the theme of parties and elections in Rose’s work. His career started at a time of apparent stability in UK and US politics and party systems, but he was always sensitive to the *longue durée* and to the shifting sociological basis of party strength. Geoffrey Evans picks up this theme by examining the influence of Rose’s second book, *Must Labour Lose?*, co-authored with Mark Abrams. The research was conducted following the 1959 British general election when the Conservatives increased their vote and Labour lost many key working-class seats. It appeared that core voters were abandoning Labour as the party found it difficult to adjust to rising affluence. Evans argues that *Must Labour Lose?* was innovative, influential and agenda-setting and started a theme of research which continues to the present day about how social democracy can adapt to late industrialism.

Rose’s work on electoral behaviour has approached the subject from many dimensions. He pioneered the comparative empirical analysis of party competition, the historical analysis of democratic election results across two centuries and comparative studies of the influence on voting behaviour of religion and ethnicity as well as class. Mark Franklin’s chapter explores the mechanism tying party choice at the individual level to election-level turnout rates. His analysis employs CSES surveys from 31 countries to build on past findings that have used error correction models to confirm the role of negative feedback in maintaining equilibrium rates of party support. The analysis also elaborates on a parallel mechanism that helps to maintain an equilibrium level of turnout, through voter reactions to evolving levels of electoral competition.

The third section covers political institutions, including Rose’s pioneering work on presidents and prime ministers. In the early 1970s, he raised a characteristically Rosean issue, the ‘problem of party government’:

parties are necessary for representative government to exist, but they are necessarily imperfect institutions. One part of this problem is giving direction to government, and prime ministers are, more than ever, key players in domestic and international politics. The rise to increased prominence and power has, however, not marked the only element shaping recent developments at the level of political chief executives. In his chapter, Ludger Helms identifies several major features that separate the ‘new breed’ of contemporary presidents and prime ministers in Western Europe and the United States from their predecessors of the early post-war decades, and how this has come to shape the politics of executive leadership. As an exercise in transatlantic comparative politics, Helms uses Rose’s work as a starting point for a comparative assessment of the nature of political leaders and leadership at the close of the first quarter of the twenty-first century.

Rose was one of the first scholars to conduct a comparative examination of the problem of ‘big government’ and to analyse its causes and consequences for politics. In his 1984 book *Understanding Big Government*, Rose broadened the analysis beyond the United States and the United Kingdom to use a ‘program approach’ to examine western mixed-economy states. In the second chapter in this section, Donley Studlar examines the implications of this approach for later scholarly research, and how it has clarified the components of big government. Studlar points out that Rose was one of the first to highlight the requirement of public consent for big government to operate effectively, and to identify this as a particular problem for the European Union.

The fourth section covers Rose’s work on the political drivers of public policy: the role of parties, the political decisions that shaped government growth and the ways in which politicians interact with officials.

In his chapter examining Rose’s work on lesson-drawing, Mauricio Dussauge-Laguna argues that he made a major contribution to the field by shifting the emphasis in public policy research from policy ‘diffusion’ to policy ‘learning’. This ignited a much-needed discussion about the role that policymakers play in the travel of policy ideas across space. Dussauge-Laguna cites a rich vein of research which has benefitted from these ideas, in addition to practical examples of policy transfer, from economic policy in the 1980s to health policy during the COVID pandemic. Dussauge-Laguna concludes that Rose’s pioneering discussion on lesson-drawing remains as relevant and thought-provoking today as it originally was three

decades ago and provides an important analytical perspective for the study of cross-jurisdictional policy processes.

One underlying theme across Rose's work in the area of public policy is the notion of 'inheritance before choice'. The range of existing policies constrains political choices in ways that go beyond 'path dependence', thus constraining governments in their policy choices. When governments enter office, they inherit laws, institutions and policies from their predecessors, many put in place years or decades earlier. In his chapter on the topic, Edward C. Page discusses what constitutes a policy and what a change in policy is likely to look like. By examining several case studies, he finds that policies do live on, in line with Rose's argument, but that the structural features of the legislative process also survive long after their originators have left office.

Much work in public policy focuses on the consequences and processes of policy, and on those who design, implement and evaluate it. One of Rose's insights was to examine how ordinary people are impacted by and engage with policy processes. This approach was developed in a trilogy of books, starting with a conceptual framework applied to Japan as well as Western countries, and then to the transformation of formerly communist societies and the experience of ordinary people with grass-roots corruption in developing countries. In evaluating this work, Caryn Peiffer sees the distinctive contribution as developing an understanding of how people use a range of resources and tactics to maintain their well-being. She argues that this draws on state and public policy outputs as well as on their social networks to achieve this goal. Peiffer argues that Rose's work on corruption, especially, provides a fertile ground for testing some of these propositions.

A major concern of Richard Rose's work on public policy has been the question of good governance. As governments take on ever more responsibilities, how can public expectations of what governments can deliver be satisfied? The risk that citizens lose confidence in their governments' ability to manage the policy agenda is a loss of legitimacy. In some interpretations, the populist upsurge in the early 2000s reflects a popular reaction against ineffective governance. In his chapter, B. Guy Peters examines these issues, outlining his joint work with Rose and Rose's own work on 'overloaded government' and ungovernability. So far, challenges such as climate change and the ageing of the population have defeated governments around the world. Peters uses Rose's work to point to solutions

such as re-engaging citizens in the processes of government or, at the opposite end of the spectrum, depoliticizing decision-making on difficult policy issues.

The fifth section takes up the themes of legitimacy, consent and efficacy. This covers challenges to democracy, especially in eastern and central Europe and governing without consent, a notion introduced by Rose in his early studies of Northern Ireland. Few subjects have generated as much interest as the conditions under which democracy can thrive or wither. Thomas Remington evaluates Rose's contribution to this debate by examining his work on the post-communist states of Central and Eastern Europe. Rose sees the best conditions for democratization as a modern state operating under impersonal rules and an advanced economy. From these assumptions, Rose sees the 'third wave' democracies of the 1990s as going about democratization backwards, that is creating electoral institutions in the absence of the other key elements of the modern states—an independent judiciary, a professional state bureaucracy and a vibrant civil society. Remington argues that Rose's insights ran counter to most other academic and policy thinking at the time, which saw political elites as the key to a stable, successful democracy. This was the central flaw in the west's approach to Russia under Putin. In his chapter, Remington traces how Rose's work has highlighted the dynamic nature of the interaction between political elites and the populace, each side shaping the other's behaviour and expectations through a process of continuous mutual adaptation.

The problem of governing in Northern Ireland first came to Rose's attention following a 1954 hitchhiking tour around Ireland. Why would one part of the United Kingdom—Northern Ireland—be partially legitimate, while the rest of the United Kingdom enjoyed high legitimacy? Rose tackled this problem in his 1971 book *Governing Without Consensus: An Irish Perspective*, which was based on a 1968 opinion survey conducted on the very eve of the Troubles. Hayes and McAllister examine how *Governing Without Consensus* represented a fundamental break with prior scholarship and trace its subsequent influence on academic thinking about the Northern Ireland problem. Rose advocated the un-British solution of power-sharing between the Catholic and Protestant communities and involving the Irish government in Northern Ireland affairs. These ideas eventually formed the basis for the 1998 Northern Ireland Agreement. The authors outline why it took three decades for Rose's idea to be encapsulated in policies which effectively ended the violence.

A single book could never do justice to the breadth and depth of Richard Rose's contribution to the study of politics. The chapters we present here cannot be definitive, but we hope that, in the spirit of Rose's own work, they will provoke more questions, discussions and research.

Aberdeen, UK
Canberra, ACT, Australia
London, UK
Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Michael Keating
Ian McAllister
Edward C. Page
B. Guy Peters

CONTENTS

1	Richard Rose: Connections Over 60 Years	1
	Dennis Kavanagh	
Part I	Governing at Multiple Levels	19
2	Politics in England	21
	Michael Keating, Ian McAllister, Edward C. Page, and B. Guy Peters	
3	The United Kingdom as an Intellectual Puzzle	39
	Michael Keating	
Part II	Parties and Elections	57
4	Must Labour Lose? A Reconsideration	59
	Geoffrey Evans	
5	Studying the Interplay of Party Support and Turnout	75
	Mark Franklin	

Part III	Institutions and Governing	95
6	Presidents and Prime Ministers: Then and Now Ludger Helms	97
7	Understanding Big Government Donley Studlar	117
Part IV	Public Policy	139
8	Learning Across Time and Space: Richard Rose's Work on Lesson-Drawing Mauricio I. Dussauge-Laguna	141
9	Inheritance, Choice and Change Edward C. Page	163
10	The Ordinary People Perspective: Coping at the Grass-Roots Caryn Peiffer	183
11	Governments and Citizens Under Stress B. Guy Peters	203
Part V	Trust and Legitimacy	219
12	Democracy and Its Alternatives Thomas F. Remington	221
13	Northern Ireland: Searching for Consensus Bernadette C. Hayes and Ian McAllister	237
14	Reflections of a Comparative Social Scientist Richard Rose	255
	Index	275

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Mauricio I. Dussauge-Laguna is a professor-researcher at the Public Administration Division, Center for Teaching and Research in Economics (CIDE), in Mexico City, and a visiting research fellow, Center for Asian and Pacific Studies (CAPS), Seikei University. A graduate of El Colegio de México, the Maxwell School of Syracuse University, and the London School of Economics and Political Science, he has written extensively on policy transfer and administrative reforms. His research topics include the study of regulatory developments in Mexico, the effects of populism on public policy and administration, and the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on state capacities.

Geoffrey Evans is Official Fellow in Politics, Nuffield College, and Professor of the Sociology of Politics, Oxford University. Since 2013, he has been a co-director of the British Election Study (BES). His areas of interest include social and political cleavages, perceptions, values and political choices. In addition to the BES, he has directed several large-scale survey projects in Eastern Europe and Northern Ireland. His most recent books are *The New Politics of Class: The Political Exclusion of the British Working Class* (with James Tilley, 2017), *Brexit and British Politics* (with Anand Menon, 2017) and *Electoral Shocks: The Volatile Voter in a Turbulent World* (with the BES team, 2020).

Mark Franklin is the Reitemeyer Professor Emeritus of International Politics at Trinity College Connecticut, USA. He has also held chairs at

the European University Institute and University of Houston, and a readership at the University of Strathclyde. He is a founding member of the Steering Committee (now Board of Directors) of the Monitoring Electoral Democracy (MEDem) Infrastructure project.

Bernadette C. Hayes is Emeritus Professor of Sociology at the University of Aberdeen. She has published extensively in the areas of gender, social stratification, religious and ethnonational identity, politics and victims' issues. She has also held academic appointments at the Australian National University, the University of Surrey and Queen's University of Belfast. She is the author of *Conflict to Peace: Politics and Society in Northern Ireland over Half a Century* (with Ian McAllister, 2013).

Ludger Helms is Professor of Political Science and Chair of Comparative Politics at the University of Innsbruck. His research interests focus on issues of executive politics, political elites and leadership, party and parliamentary government, as well as democratization and autocratization. He has published widely in those fields.

Dennis Kavanagh is Emeritus Professor at University of Liverpool. Before then, he held posts at Nottingham and Manchester universities and visiting professorships at Stanford and the European University Institute. He has co-authored every one of the Nuffield studies of British general elections between February 1974 and 2017. He took his degrees at Manchester University where he was a student of Richard Rose, who supervised his master's thesis and taught him as an undergraduate.

Michael Keating is Emeritus Professor of Politics at the University of Aberdeen. He graduated from the University of Oxford in PPE and in 1975 was the first PhD graduate from what is now Glasgow Caledonian University. He taught at the University of Strathclyde, University of Western Ontario and European University Institute and at universities in France and Spain and is a fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, the British Academy, the Academy of Social Sciences and the European Academy. His main interests are territorial politics and public policy. Recent books include *Rescaling the European State* (2013), *State and Nation in the United Kingdom* (2021) and (edited) *The Oxford Handbook of Scottish Politics* (2020).

Ian McAllister is Distinguished Professor of Political Science at the Australian National University. His most recent books are *Voting and*

Elections (2022), *Public Opinion and Australian Defence and Foreign Policy* (with Danielle Chubb) (Palgrave, 2021) and *Conflict to Peace: Society and Politics in Northern Ireland over Half a Century* (with Bernadette Hayes; 2013). He has been director of the Australian Election Study since 1987. His research covers Australian politics, comparative political behaviour and post-communist politics. He is a fellow of the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia and a corresponding fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh. His PhD, from Strathclyde University, was supervised by Richard Rose.

Edward C. Page has been Sidney and Beatrice Webb Professor of Public Policy in the Department of Government at the London School of Economics since 2001, before that he was a lecturer, senior lecturer, reader and professor at the University of Hull. He has written articles on British and comparative public policy issues as well as several books including *Political Authority and Bureaucratic Power* (1985), *Localism and Centralism in Europe* (1991), *Governing by Numbers* (2001), *Policy Bureaucracy* (2005, with W. I. Jenkins), *Policy Without Politicians* (2012) and *Weber's Scorecard* (2024). His PhD, from Strathclyde University, was supervised by Richard Rose.

Caryn Peiffer is Senior Lecturer in International Public Policy and Governance at the University of Bristol and formerly a research fellow at the Centre for the Study of Public Policy at the University of Strathclyde. She researches patterns and consequences of corruption as well as the (unintended) impacts of anti-corruption policies. She has conducted research in Papua New Guinea, Zambia, Botswana, Uganda, Nigeria, Indonesia, India, South Africa and Albania and regularly advises on anti-corruption policies.

B. Guy Peters is Maurice Falk Professor of Government at the University of Pittsburgh. He was also the founding president of the International Public Policy Association and founding editor of *Governance*, the *European Political Science Review* and the *International Review of Public Policy*. Prior to joining the University of Pittsburgh in 1984, he taught at Emory University, the University of Delaware and Tulane University, where he was Director of the Center for Public Policy. He has also been a visiting professor at a number of universities, including Oxford, Sciences Po (Paris), KU Leuven, El Colegio de Mexico, FLACSO (Quito), Australian

National University and the University of Hong Kong. Guy Peters has written or edited over 70 books and 400 articles and book chapters. These include studies in public administration, public policy, comparative politics, American politics and methodology.

Thomas F. Remington is Visiting Professor of Government at Harvard University and Goodrich C. White Professor (Emeritus) of Political Science at Emory University. He is the author of many books and articles, including *The Returns to Power: A Political Theory of Economic Inequality* (2023), *Presidential Decrees in Russia: A Comparative Perspective* (2014) and *The Politics of Inequality in Russia* (2011). His research concerns the political sources of economic inequality in the United States, Russia, China and Germany, as well as issues related to education, skill formation and workforce development.

Donley Studlar is Emeritus Professor of Political Science at West Virginia University and Adjunct Faculty of Health Services Management and Policy at East Tennessee State University. He has published widely on comparative politics and public policy. He first met Richard Rose when he was a graduate student at Indiana University in the spring of 1972. Subsequently, he benefited from Rose's counsel, especially in residences at the University of Strathclyde in 1972–1973 and 2013–2016, respectively.

ABBREVIATIONS

CDU	Christian Democratic Union
CSPP	Centre for the Study of Public Policy
CSES	Comparative Study of Electoral Systems
ECM	Error Correction Models
ECP	Error Correction Parameter
EU	European Union
GATT	General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs
IMF	International Monetary Fund
IRA	Irish Republican Army
MMT	Modern Monetary Theory
NRB	New Democracies Barometer
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization

LIST OF FIGURES

- Fig. 4.1 Share of the vote by party in UK general elections, 1918–2019. Source: Lukas Audickas, Richard Cracknell, and Philip Loft. 2020. *UK Election Statistics: 1918–2019: A Century of Elections*. London: House of Commons Library. Briefing paper, Number CBP7529, p. 6. Note: Liberal vote share includes votes for Liberal/SDP alliance (1983–1987) and Liberal Democrats from 1992. Figures for 1918 include all Ireland 65
- Fig. 5.1 Schema for a feedback loop ‘correcting’ voter–party congruence and turnout 77

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1	Party and birthyear level (fixed effects) error correction models of party support and turnout	83
Table 5.2	Change in left-right proximity due to change in respondent versus party left-right location (party and birthyear cohort analyses)	87



Richard Rose: Connections Over 60 Years

Dennis Kavanagh

From E. M. Forster's *Howard's End*, Richard Rose borrowed the epigram 'Only Connect' for at least two of his books, including his first major one, *Politics in England*. His use of the epigram suggests the primacy of research which joins the worlds of political ideas and of political practice. It might also apply to his concern to connect with his readers and with those he engages in conversations and interviews. It is difficult to think of any political scientist in Britain who has achieved as much as he has in both endeavours.

Rose is not only a prolific scholar—one could still be regarded as such with only a fraction of his output. Equally impressive is the range and quality of the work, much of it ground breaking and continuing over more than 60 years. As of 2019, his writings, including books written or co-authored, and articles, spanned 34 pages on his website. Such a list invites

I am grateful for comments from Sir Ivor Crewe on an earlier draft of this chapter.

D. Kavanagh (✉)
University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK
e-mail: dennis.kavanagh@talktalk.net

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2023

M. Keating et al. (eds.), *The Problem of Governing*, Executive
Politics and Governance,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-40817-5_1

various reactions, ranging from admiration and inspiration to depression and jealousy. The output has called not only for talent at writing, ability to generate ideas for research and mastery of relevant literature but also discipline to complete a project.

Perhaps inevitably, Richard could not have had such a positive impact on political science without at times rubbing some people up the wrong way. In some respects, his strengths are seen by some as shortcomings. Some find the speed of his thought and speech intimidating; the same might be said of his dynamism and enthusiasm. And some may think he too readily assumes others have a level of energy and commitment to match his own. Yet, these reservations do not count for much when considered in the larger picture.

In this introduction, I will outline what I regard as key features of Rose's life and career over more than 60 years. I will also discuss some of his remarkable research output; his work is so vast that I must emphasise the word 'some'. Much of his published work contains relevant comments on his life and experiences, but he has written at some length about both in his memoir *Learning About Politics in Time and Space* (2014). I also draw on my memories about him which start when I was an undergraduate at Manchester in the early 1960s.

EARLY YEARS

Richard was born in St Louis Missouri in 1933. At school, he was what today would be called 'advanced'; the chief challenge at primary school was to remember to take a book to read because the assignments were done in no time. As a child, he was an omnivorous reader. At the age of eight, he taught himself to type in order to write up baseball history. In the 1960s, when he was a junior lecturer at Manchester University, I recall that the only offices that contained typewriters were those occupied by the secretaries and by Richard Rose. The political theorist Brian Barry once told me that he felt uneasy if a day passed and he had not written something reasonably substantial. I cannot imagine Rose had similar cause to feel uneasy. Under 'Recreations' in his *Who's Who* entry, he lists 'writing'. After more than half a century of publishing books, he concluded an essay about writing with the word 'I still write books to suit myself'.

Rose attended Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, because it was so oriented towards the PhD that students could take their BA whenever they could pass the requisite examinations. His wide reading enabled him

to secure a degree in comparative literature and drama in two years. With time in hand, he sailed for England believing, as he later said, that he was going to Europe and could speak English. To complement his undergraduate degree in the humanities, he enrolled as a postgraduate student in international relations at the London School of Economics. He found the lunchtime meetings with politicians and activists more interesting than the lectures and travelled in war-ravaged Italy, Germany, France and Ireland in long vacations. At the LSE, he met a fellow student, Rosemary Kenny of Whitstable, Kent, who later became his wife of 65 years. After a year of learning to speak English and what Europe was like, he returned to St Louis without a degree.

In 1955, Rose finally achieved his youthful ambition to be a reporter on the *St Louis Post-Dispatch*. The paper was founded by Joseph Pulitzer, and senior reporters were ex-FBI men who won national prizes to dig out facts that could result in politicians going to jail. His first story made the front page and was about the uproar caused when a pig being taken to market escaped and roamed the city streets. As a reporter, he learned the essentials of research that were later to stand him in good stead: to figure out where relevant information was about a story, to go straight to sources and to write news with verifiable and precise facts.

After two years as a reporter, Rose decided that he had had too much education to be satisfied with writing stories about runaway pigs and not enough education to become a scholar, like the professors he admired at Johns Hopkins. He decided to go for a PhD and looked at the syllabuses for Harvard and Oxford. The former required several years of course work in topics that did not interest him before starting to write a thesis, whereas Oxford simply required a student to write a doctoral thesis. He wrote a letter of enquiry to heads of several colleges and promptly received back letters of acceptance with a request to complete an application form.

BECOMING AN ACADEMIC

In autumn 1957, Richard entered Oxford, thinking he was leaving journalism and entering a university like Johns Hopkins. Having been accustomed to working a 40-hour week on a daily newspaper, he devoted the British equivalent, then a 44-hour working week, to researching his thesis, and carefully noted the hours work in his daily account book.

Over three years, he experienced much that advanced his academic career but was very different from the training in political science that he

would have received in an American graduate school. In his first year, he was attached to an undergraduate college, Lincoln, more like a small American liberal arts college, than a university institution. He won a studentship to Nuffield College where graduate students could either pursue a second degree by writing essays and examination or register to write a thesis that some completed.

Rose's doctoral thesis was on the conflict between socialist principles of foreign policy and the practice of the post-war Labour government. In response to the Soviet Union's imposition of communist regimes on half of Europe, the government worked with the United States to create the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. His supervisor, Dr Saul Rose at St Antony's College, had been international secretary of the Labour Party and gave him introductions to former Cabinet ministers. Richard may have left the *Post-Despatch*, but he had not left his newspaper training behind.

To determine party principles, he systematically read Labour Party and Trade Union conference reports and documents on foreign policy from 1900 onwards and became the first Oxford politics student to interview MPs and cabinet ministers from retired prime minister Clement Attlee to expelled fellow-traveller MP Konni Zilliacus. When Attlee asked him how he got his address, Rose pointed out that it was in the telephone book. He took shorthand notes and compared what they told him with what they had done in office. That gave a familiarity with the tea rooms and the bars of the House of Commons and contacts with Labour MPs who subsequently became cabinet ministers and prime ministers. The only publication from the thesis was a topical Op-ed piece in *The Guardian*; the potential London publisher could not get a buyer for the American rights.

After finishing his doctorate in 21 months, Rose had a year left on his studentship and, when the 1959 general election was called, David Butler, the Oxford don, welcomed his company in undertaking constituency interviews for Butler's third book on a general election. The introduction of American-style political advertising by the Conservatives and lively telecasts by Labour gave Rose an opportunity to write an appendix for the election book. When it became apparent that the new techniques were a major theme, Butler generously invited him to be co-author. Rose not only dealt with the practices of political television and advertising, he also found out how much the Conservative Party spent on its then new election tools of opinion polls and public relations. The results were debated in the House of Commons and received headline attention in the press. 60

years later, Butler looked back on the 1959 book that Rose co-authored as marking not only the arrival of the Nuffield brand but also the one that had the most impact of the 15 general election studies that Butler authored or co-authored.

Another offshoot of the election book was collaboration with Mark Abrams to write an influential Penguin Special book, *Must Labour Lose?* (Abrams and Rose 1960), prompted by Labour's third successive general election defeat in 1959. It drew on survey research by Abrams, with Rose providing a political science perspective on how elections are won and lost drawing on American voting studies. The short book fed into the debate about whether the arrival of the affluent society and fall in working class support for Labour heralded the party's inevitable decline. Rose's view was that Labour would need to change its approach if it was to avoid another election defeat, a strategy that Harold Wilson, coached by Abrams, followed to become Labour prime minister in 1964. The public interest in Rose's two co-authored books made him at the age of 27 a well-known figure in Westminster and Fleet Street. The terms 'Butler and Rose' and 'Abrams and Rose' quickly became familiar in the political world.

Talking to senior politicians, party officials, journalists and pollsters gave the young Rose a grasp of real-world British politics, something that could not be gained from, but be added to, what he learnt in a library. He introduced the regular interviewing of politicians to the Nuffield series, and work with Abrams taught him about designing surveys. Having talked with key people in the industry, he later wrote about the newer techniques of electioneering in *Influencing Voters* (1967).

With a DPhil, two books published and a wife pregnant with their second child, Rose found himself unemployed when his Nuffield studentship ended in September 1960. David Butler cautioned him against hoping to gain a university post in England and urged a return to the United States. With Butler's support, Rose wrote to almost two dozen American universities applying for a job as well as watching British newspapers for very occasional advertisements of research fellowships. He was shortlisted but turned down for posts at Oxford, the LSE and the University of Michigan. However, in autumn 1960, he received an unsolicited job offer from Professor W. J. M. Mackenzie, head of the government department at Manchester University. Appointment of an American citizen to a job in Britain required Home Office approval. Mackenzie, a Scot, had no difficulty in declaring that there was no English person competent to take the job of teaching British government.

MANCHESTER MADE HIM A POLITICAL SCIENTIST

In 1961, Rose became a junior member of a small government department with colleagues very different in their backgrounds, intellectual inquisitiveness and orientation towards research than the dons he had known at Oxford. Mackenzie put Rose in charge of the departmental seminar. Instead of inviting politicians as guest speakers, as was done at Nuffield, Rose gave priority to inviting papers from American political scientists spending a year on research leave in the south of England, such as Richard Neustadt and Angus Campbell.

The great majority of high calibre US academics have preferred to remain in their own elite institutions rather than settle overseas. Rose has been one of the outstanding exceptions. Rose has spent a good part of his career analysing and explaining British politics to people in his host country and abroad. The young Rose soon realised that for many people in the United Kingdom, the first interesting feature about him is that he was an American. Not resenting being perceived by some as an outsider, he has pointed to what he regards as the benefits of his Anglo-American perspective in a sentence, ‘The grass is greener in England but the mechanical devices to care for grass are superior in America’.

Shortly after his arrival at Manchester, Gabriel Almond invited him to write a textbook on politics in England using the new framework that Almond had developed for comparing political systems in developing as well as developed countries (Almond and Coleman 1960). After *Politics in England* was published in the United States in 1964 and the following year, with minor amendments to cater to the English obsession with class politics, it sold upwards of 200,000 copies over 40 years. It was different from other textbooks on British politics, containing chapters on such topics as political culture and political socialisation. Significantly, it was about England not Britain, noting that to get ahead in British politics one had to adapt to the ways of London SW1. Anglo-centric texts of the time saw England and Britain as the same thing. With devolution, the title was eventually changed to *Politics in Britain*. The sub-title of the book changed over editions between ‘Persistence and Change’ and ‘Change and Persistence’.

Rose has always happily acknowledged his intellectual debt to the Manchester University department and to W. J. M. Mackenzie as his real *doktorvater* (doctor father), because his response to many issues often cut to the heart of the matter in an unexpected way. In reading a rough first

draft of *Politics in England*, Mackenzie responded: ‘I never thought I would know anyone who could write English, American and German-American (i.e. the language of political sociology). For God’s sake, choose one and stick to it’.

Writing *Politics in England* made him aware that Northern Ireland raised questions about political legitimacy (taken for granted among writers on British politics) and that Westminster rule was only partly legitimate; generalisations about British rule had to be qualified ‘except for Ireland’. Catholic versus Protestant divisions and conflicting loyalties to Westminster or Dublin made politics in the province so different from that on the mainland. It was identity politics with a vengeance. To be ‘green’ in the province had little to do with concerns about the environment in that time and place. Northern Ireland was so different from the rest of the United Kingdom that it was virtually ignored as a subject of study by academics.

As a research student, I recall a conversation in 1965 with Richard being cut short as he said he had to take a taxi to Manchester airport to catch a flight to Belfast. I only learnt later that he had embarked on an ambitious project. He launched his surveys and interviews with key figures on both sides of the divide before the bombs went off and civil rights protesters were marching. His classic *Governing Without Consensus* (1971) was the result of his research. Later he wrote *Northern Ireland: A Time of Choice* (1976). The province fired his interest in conditions affecting political legitimacy and political stability. The research project was inspired by what was happening on the ground, a regular feature of his career.

Entering academe did not mean that he abandoned journalism; he was too much the writer to do that. Journalism could be a side activity, and it gave him both name recognition among politicians and an incentive for them to influence what he wrote by giving him what they considered the ‘true facts’. He wrote regularly for *New Society* from its foundation as a weekly in 1962, and his profile was raised when he became the election expert writing for *The Times*. He became an on-camera election commentator for ITN, and subsequently Scottish Television. I accompanied him on some his work during the 1966 general election campaign and was impressed at his ready access to key figures and their interest in his views.

I was in the student body of some 400 first-year students in early 1961 when Rose gave his first lectures on British government. With his dark curly hair, ready smile, youthfulness, American accent and obvious enjoyment in talking about politics, he charmed many of the students. I recall

his first lecture on American politics when he introduced himself as ‘a border state Democrat’. No doubt some students wrote down ‘democrat’, and he left it up to us to find out what the phrase meant. The Rose lecturing style was apparent from the start—a rich mix of information, ideas, anecdotes, interesting asides and an air of spontaneity. His succinct typed notes were hardly looked at. Did we know how lucky we students were to have our lectures on Tuesday and Thursday mornings from Mackenzie and Rose?

Rose created the first class on political behaviour at a British university. It covered topics as wide-ranging as Walter Bagehot and Almond and Verba on political culture, Harold Lasswell on the motivations of political elites, the sociological analysis of party identification of Lipset and Rokkan and the social psychological approach of the University of Michigan. When Rose realised that Manchester undergraduates, unlike Oxford students, lacked the opportunities to hear politicians speak and question them, he created a Friday evening series of talks that not only offered food for political thinking but also a buffet supper for hungry undergraduates.

Third year political behaviour students were expected to learn how to analyse surveys of public opinion using a counter-sorter, the forerunner of a computer. Students learnt about what ordinary people thought by designing a questionnaire, drawing a sample and conducting interviews in a marginal constituency. The results of the survey were subsequently incorporated in a jointly authored article with a Manchester student and reprinted multiple times (Rose and Mossawir 1967).

Already familiar with London and Oxford, Rose found life in the north of England more like America in its emphasis on money and achievement. He would regularly address student and Manchester societies on political topics, taking careful account of their reactions. He was a distinctive presence, radiating physical and intellectual energy. Walking, usually at speed, along Dover Street where the social science faculty was based, he would sometimes accost a passing student to ask about their background and interests. It was questioning with a purpose, as he wanted to learn about what made different people tick and anything else they might say. A good listener, he would establish rapport quickly but sometimes take people aback with his direct questions.

I was among a group of first-year students he surprised by asking for their reactions to the prosecutor’s question to the jury in the trial over the proposed banning of *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in 1961, ‘Is this a book that that you would even wish your wife or your servants to read?’ Some