

# New Leader, New Conservatives?

Chris Palmer

Undergraduate Dissertation

Since the election of David Cameron as Leader of the Conservative party, very little scrutiny by academics and the media has been afforded to the nature of its policies and the political agenda of the party leadership. This study argues that David Cameron has fundamentally re-aligned his political party, and attempts to rectify the notion that the Conservative party still pursues conservatism in any meaningful way. In doing so, this study shall highlight how the Conservative party in Britain has surrendered itself to the neo-liberal Leftist political consensus.

This dissertation is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the BSc in Politics with International Relations, 1 May 2009.

## Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Defining traditional conservatism	6
3. Marriage and The Family	8
4. Liberty and State	12
5. The European Union	14
6. Political Correctness	19
7. Conclusions	22
8. Bibliography	25

This document remains at all times Copyright © Chris Palmer 2009-2010.  
You may not reprint or republish any section of this document without the author's permission.

## Introduction

On the 6<sup>th</sup> December 2005, David Cameron, having been a Member of Parliament for only four years, was elected as leader of the Conservative party in a ballot of party members in which he defeated his leadership rival, David Davis, by 134,446 votes to 64,398. The result made him arguably the most inexperienced parliamentarian, by measure of his tenure as an MP, to take the leadership of the Conservative party since William Pitt the Younger in 1783.

David Cameron appeared to many, including the general public, as an unknown quantity before his election as Conservative party leader. Although his speech in Bournemouth at the Conservative party conference in 2005 had quickly established him amongst the media, and thus party members and the general public, as the favourite candidate, he continued to be rather vague about his opinions and which policies he might pursue. Instead he chose to portray himself as a modernising figure that embodied 'hope', 'optimism' and 'change' in a way that would be fundamentally different from the post-1997 leaders who had preceded him.

In his acceptance speech on the day of his election as party leader Cameron further stated such intents by telling the assembled audience that he would fight for the centre ground of British politics and that he wanted to 'give this country a modern compassionate Conservatism that is right for our times and right for our country'.<sup>1</sup> Soon after, in a speech to the left-leaning Think Tank Demos, David Cameron (2006), said:

'Embracing a new politics and accepting that in many areas New Labour was closer to the Conservative party was a difficult thing to do. But nevertheless it was the right thing to do. Not least because it's true. And make no mistake - I will stick to this path. The alternative to fighting for the centre-ground is irrelevance, defeat and failure'.<sup>2</sup>

It is with the broad yet hazy intention of fighting for the centre-ground of British politics that Mr Cameron has conducted his tenure as leader of the Conservative party since December 2005, and it appears that he has not thought it wise to re-examine this approach since.

Three and a half years have passed since the Conservative party leadership election, and the Conservatives are preparing themselves for another election, though of a different sort. At the next UK General Election, the Conservatives may have the opportunity to form their first Government since John Major's administration was historically defeated by a landslide in 1997. It is therefore an important time to evaluate the political direction that Mr Cameron and his party are pursuing, and establish whether or not it is notably conservative in nature.

Until this point very little scrutiny has been given, both academically and in the media, to the policies and the political agenda of the Conservative party under David Cameron from a traditionally conservative perspective. As the conservative newspaper columnist and author, Peter Hitchens (2007), observed, 'At this point in British political history, criticising David Cameron from a conservative point of view is just not done'.<sup>3</sup> Any scrutiny which Cameron

---

<sup>1</sup> CAMERON, D., 2005. Full text of David Cameron's victory speech [online]. 6 December, *The Guardian*.

<sup>2</sup> CAMERON, D., 2006. David Cameron's speech: Modern Conservatism [online]. 30 January, *The Guardian*.

<sup>3</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2007. Is this war? [online]. 27 March, *The Mail on Sunday*.

and his Conservative party have undergone since he became leader tends mainly to have been from the political Left, whether that be the Labour party, the Liberal Democrats, or organisations such as the BBC in the form of 'red corner questioning'.<sup>4</sup>

Most opinion polls tend to misrepresent true public support for political parties because they exclude percentage figures for those that have said they will not vote or have not decided. However, at the moment the Conservatives have opinion poll leads ranging from 8% to 10%, and on such a course they appear to be on the cusp of Government, whether it be by their own merits or because of Gordon Brown and the Labour Government's perceived failings. Writing in the Guardian, Martin Kettle (2009), observed:

Of the intentions of the Tories, who are by far our most likely rulers in this new age of austerity, we still know strikingly little ... The public is entitled to know which Tory approach it is buying and, the longer the answer is denied, the more suspicious they have a right to be ... So it is high time that the Tories were given a harder time. At the moment, however, they are being given a rather easy one.<sup>5</sup>

What is more, David Cameron has come under criticism, limited though it may be, from the political Right of his party and a number of traditional conservatives in the media who have expressed dissatisfaction with his leadership and the political direction and policies he is pursuing. Edward Leigh, Chairman of the traditionally conservative Cornerstone Group of Conservative MPs accused David Cameron of turning down the volume on the party's core beliefs to the point that they were inaudible<sup>6</sup>, while Norman Tebbit, often regarded as the Keeper of the Thatcherite flame<sup>7</sup> said Cameron was attempting to reposition the party on the 'Left of the middle ground'.<sup>8</sup> Likewise, the Sunday Telegraph commentator, Christopher Booker, said that the Conservatives under Cameron seem to have gambled 'on just one strategy: list everything the Party used to stand for – low taxes, the family, rolling back the power of the state, encouraging business, upholding our defences, curbing criminals, common sense – then go for the opposite ... [it] made him a laughing stock'.<sup>9</sup>

It is arguable that conservatism is not a political ideology in the same way as, for example, Marxism, for, as Roger Scruton (2001) highlighted, it is 'characteristically inarticulate, unwilling (and indeed usually unable) to translate itself into formulae or maxims, loathe to state its purpose or declare its view'.<sup>10</sup> Yet, it is important to state that, as well as conservatism being a disposition or a frame of mind, there is also a tradition of conservative thought, to which this study shall define and make continuous reference. This dissertation will therefore compare and contrast the Conservative party that David Cameron has sought to change and re-mould in his shape, in the wake of his election as leader, with the traditional conservative philosophy espoused by, in the beginning, the Whig Member of

---

<sup>4</sup> MONTGOMERIE, T., 2005. *Red Corner Questioning* [online].

<sup>5</sup> KETTLE, M., 2009. The Conservatives have had an easy ride – that has to stop [online]. 23 April, *The Guardian*.

<sup>6</sup> CHAPMAN, J., 2007. Cameron's own party draws blood from their leader [online]. 6 February, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>7</sup> MONTGOMERIE, T., 2008. *The Leaders of the Right: Lord Norman Tebbit* [online].

<sup>8</sup> HELM T. & RENNIE, D., 2006. Don't be fooled by Cameron, Tebbit to warn Right [online]. 31 January, *The Telegraph*.

<sup>9</sup> NORTH, R., 2006. *Booker column censored* [online].

<sup>10</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2001. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. p.9.

Parliament, Edmund Burke, up to and including the likes of modern conservative philosophers such as Roger Scruton.

Differentiation between separate political parties is vitally important for any healthy, representative democracy, because political and policy alternatives affect the choices with which voters are presented at elections. If all political parties with a realistic opportunity of forming a Government espouse very similarly policies then the electorate are left with little choice with which to voice their will or dissatisfaction. This study will therefore remain a subject of interest for anyone who has ever read a manifesto and felt aggrieved that there is little policy differentiation between the main British political parties. Further, it will add to the body of literature on the policies and politics of the British Conservative party under David Cameron from a traditionally conservative perspective, which seems so sorely lacking.

To this end I will attempt to contribute a broad analysis of elements of Conservative party policy under the leadership of David Cameron, documenting where necessary the political and philosophical changes the party has undergone and the way in which Cameron's beliefs have differed when compared to those of his predecessors. Before David Cameron even became leader of the party, the Conservatives had on many core issues including education and the free market, given away much of their conservatism to the liberal-Left. In light of this, the study shall confine itself to the examination of four topics over which the influence of David Cameron has had a major impact. What follows intends to demonstrate to the reader the evolution of Conservative party policy under David Cameron - for it is the central argument of this study that the Conservative party has largely pursued policies that cannot be considered to be traditionally conservative and instead have, with each period in opposition including now, accepted the orthodoxy of the age as defined by the political Left.

## Defining traditional conservatism

Edmund Burke is often seen as the father of conservative political thought. This is not to say that conservatism as a disposition in thought did not exist before him, but simply that no one person had distinctly articulated such a philosophy in such a coherent and directed manner before – especially one that caused many to sit up and take notice when his predictions about the French Revolution proved largely accurate.

Burke, who had supported the American Revolution against British rule, saw the Revolution taking place in France as an attempt by the French to rewrite society from a blank canvas, uprooting traditions and customs and replacing society with a new set of idealistic, secular values. Further, in Burke's view the Revolution ignored the pessimistic Christian view of man which was the belief that humanity could not perfect itself and was burdened with original sin. By contrast, French radicalism, on which today's liberalism is founded, believed that institutions were, in the opinion of the French philosopher Rousseau, 'chains' on the ambitions of men and that if those institutions could be revolutionised or overthrown then man could create a more just and equal society for himself. It was this conflict of ideas that led Burke to conclude:

'Society is indeed a contract... to be looked on with other reverence ... It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are to be born'.<sup>11</sup>

Thus Burke argued that wisdom and experience accumulated over a period of time should be enshrined above the truth seeking of an individual or single generation, for otherwise this may lead to idealism and eventually tyranny. Further, Burke argued that society had evolved naturally and in such a way that it helped to accommodate flaws of human nature.

However, Burke did not think that society should never change, saying, 'A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation'.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, in a letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe, he wrote, 'We must all obey the great law of change. It is the most powerful law of nature, and the means perhaps of its conservation'.<sup>13</sup> Yet, Burke believed that change should be a gradual, natural process that built upon the wisdom of previous generations so as to maintain social stability, rather rapid upheaval of the old social order.

Furthermore, there are two variations of conservatism. The first is procedural and the other which can be classified as substantive conservatism or political thought. It is Burke that is associated with the latter of these two, which favours the preservation of a particular form of society and its institutions, to which this study shall make reference. On the other hand there is procedural conservatism which favours the maintenance of any traditions and institutions in a society regardless of how they were originally derived.

---

<sup>11</sup> BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. *Burke: Select Works*. p.114.

<sup>12</sup> BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. *Burke: Select Works*. p.xxvi.

<sup>13</sup> BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. *Burke: Select Works*. p.73.

Conservatism is a philosophy of imperfection. While arguably conservative thought may seem to be a relatively coherent collection of beliefs about the nature of tradition, society and the human condition, it might in fact be more precise to identify conservatism as 'not a creed or a doctrine, but a disposition'.<sup>14</sup> As a direct result of being a disposition, conservatism therefore becomes highly flexible rather than strict and dogmatic. Thus, a wide variety of citizens with differing, and sometimes contradictory views can all equally regard themselves as conservatives.

Furthermore, Ludlam and Smith (2005), describing conservatism in Britain, wrote that 'Conservative ideology is British public ideology... If there is no radical attack [on the status quo] then Conservative ideology becomes 'common sense' embodying relatively few general propositions'.<sup>15</sup> However, there is also a conflict of opinion between conservative thinkers on whether conservatism constitutes an ideology. Michael Oakeshott and his student Andrew Sullivan are against the notion that conservatism is ideological, while Roger Scruton argued it 'is part of conservatism to resist the loss of ideology'.<sup>16</sup>

Conservatism is founded upon the idea of an organic society made up of many elements all working together for the preservation of common order and harmony. These forces include restraints on the power of the state, respect for private property, the sacred covenant of marriage, the family, Christianity and the protection of national sovereignty. Many of these things have existed since time immemorial, particularly marriage and the family, while others have grown up slowly over time. However, they have all been tried and tested by the passing of time and reflect the wisdom of the past and of tradition.

---

<sup>14</sup> BRONNER, S., 2005. *Twentieth century political theory*. p.77.

<sup>15</sup> LUDLAM, S. & SMITH, M. J., 1996. *Contemporary British Conservatism*. p.6.

<sup>16</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2001. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. p.127.

## Marriage and The Family

Less than a year after David Cameron's election as party leader, on the BBC's *This Week* programme, Peter Hitchens (2006) told viewers that:

A putsch is underway in the only major British political faction that still speaks for the country's morally and culturally conservative subjects. David Cameron is trying to turn the Tories into a squidgy left-liberal party, just like New Labour and the Liberal Democrats. Maybe this will succeed in getting them back into office; maybe it won't. Who really cares? For, even if it does, we will end up with exactly the same government we have already.<sup>17</sup>

It must be made clear at this point, since it will be a continual theme that runs through this study, that in politics there is quite often a gap between rhetoric from politicians and the actual resulting policies that they implement. Similarly, there is often much in the rhetoric of David Cameron to appeal to the traditional conservative, and this can be most clearly seen with the Cameron and Conservative rhetoric on marriage and the family. However, like so many Conservative political positions, their stance is not quite what it may at first seem.

The Conservative party green paper, *A Plan for Social Reform*, states, 'A strong and stable family provides children with the security and affection they need. By supporting the family, we can increase opportunity and ensure everyone has the best possible start in life. Our ambition is to make Britain the most family-friendly country in the world'.<sup>18</sup> This would seem to be a traditional conservative stance. Roger Scruton (2006) notes that 'children born within a marriage are far more likely to be socialised, outgoing and able to form permanent relationships of their own, than children born out of wedlock'.<sup>19</sup> Roger Scruton is therefore suggesting that society, in line with traditional conservative thought, should maintain and support an institution that has evolved over generations and is known largely to work despite having its faults.

Furthermore, the married family is important to traditional conservatives because it is believed to be a bastion of liberty against the power and encroachment of the state, and an environment in which values and wisdom can be passed from one generation to the next. Indeed, D.H. Lawrence noted that, 'It is marriage, perhaps, which has given man the best of his freedom, given him his little kingdom of his own within the big kingdom of the State'.<sup>20</sup> Thus, this ties in with the traditional Burkeian notion that family, like society is a partnership between generations, vital in conserving society through reproduction and for maintaining long-term social stability while protecting participants from too much state control.

However, while David Cameron has often spoken about strengthening the married family, his definition of what a marriage may constitute seems to be at odds with that of traditional conservatism. In his speech at the end of the Conservative party conference in 2006, David

---

<sup>17</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2006. *This Week: Peter Hitchens* [online].

<sup>18</sup> CONSERVATIVES, 2009. *Our Plan for Social Reform* [online]. p.6.

<sup>19</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2006. *A Political Philosophy: Arguments for conservatism*. p.83.

<sup>20</sup> LAWRENCE, D.H., 1994. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. p.321.

Cameron said that, 'there's something special about marriage'<sup>21</sup>, with which traditionalists would no doubt agree. In fact it was Aristotle who observed as far back as the 4<sup>th</sup> Century BC that, 'Between man and wife friendship seems to exist by nature; for man is naturally inclined to form couples, even more than to form cities',<sup>22</sup> or Roger Scruton (2006) who said, 'In all observed societies some form of marriage exists'.<sup>23</sup> However, this was not Cameron's target and he went on to further say of marriage that, 'by the way, it means something whether you're a man and a woman, a woman and a woman or a man and another man. That's why we were right to support civil partnerships, and I'm proud of that'.<sup>24</sup>

Under Michael Howard, David Cameron's political Godfather, the Conservative party had tentatively moved towards supporting homosexual civil partnerships, whereas previous leaders had steered clear of agreeing with the issue.<sup>25</sup> It was, however, under the leadership of Mr Cameron that the party fully and significantly embraced the idea, thus breaking from any semblance of traditional conservative thought. The reasons behind this are twofold.

Firstly, there is the issue that traditional conservative wisdom suggests that marriage is a natural union between a man and a woman, and that the purpose of this marriage was for the benefit of society and a partnership in which to produce the next generation. Further, wisdom suggests that only with a mother and a father is a child brought up best. Yet, the MP charged by Mr Cameron with responsibility for reviewing family breakdown, former leader Iain Duncan-Smith, said of homosexual couples bringing up children that, 'if they are bringing them up well, well done and good luck to them'.<sup>26</sup> By supporting civil partnerships, Mr Cameron and the Conservatives have joined the liberal-Left in overthrowing this wisdom of the ages and seeking to radically redefine the entire concept of the married family.

Secondly, Peter Hitchens (2008) said that marriage 'can only be defended by reserving its privileges exclusively to marriage and to no other relationship. Any qualification of support for marriage (and the Tory position is crawling with qualifications) is a failure to confront this central issue'.<sup>27</sup> In addition, Roger Scruton (2006) commented that, 'Not surprisingly, when marriage is no more than an official rubber stamp affixed to a purely private contract, people cease to see the point of it. Why bother with the stamp? Whose business is it anyway?'<sup>28</sup> It can therefore be concluded that as soon as you allow another institution, such as civil partnerships, to exist alongside marriage then you undermine it. Only by bestowing upon marriage unique privileges can you protect its place in the social order.

Furthermore, David Cameron and the Conservatives' policy on taxation is another crucial link in the chain to their stance on marriage, which at first might not necessarily be clear. By refusing to significantly cut taxes, both on married couples, and in general, then Cameron is declaring himself uninterested in the battle between the individual and the increasingly mighty state. With every rise in tax, the independence and choice available to individuals is

---

<sup>21</sup> CAMERON, D., 2006. Full text of David Cameron's speech [online]. 4 October, *The Guardian*.

<sup>22</sup> ARISTOTLE, 2004. *Nicomachean Ethics*. p.131.

<sup>23</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2006. *A Political Philosophy: Arguments for conservatism*. p.82.

<sup>24</sup> CAMERON, D., 2006. Full text of David Cameron's speech [online]. 4 October, *The Guardian*.

<sup>25</sup> WATT, N., 2004. Howard endorses gay partnerships [online]. 10 February, *The Guardian*.

<sup>26</sup> DUNCAN-SMITH, I., 2006. *Families 'key to poverty fight'* [online].

<sup>27</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2008. *Peter Hitchens replies* [online].

<sup>28</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2006. *A Political Philosophy: Arguments for conservatism*. p.87.

diminished and increasing pressure is placed upon private, family life due to financial constraints. This has the knock on effect of forcing both parents to find jobs and, more than likely, entrust their children's care to social workers or paid nannies, thus depriving their child of one of the key benefits of marriage – a strong parental upbringing.

When compared with his predecessors, David Cameron has moved yet further to the Left on other family and social issues. Richard Kay (2009) remarked, 'David Cameron is going back to his touchy-feely agenda by becoming the first Tory leader to appear on an openly gay platform'.<sup>29</sup> This is significant because Cameron is willingly towing the liberal-Left line in an attempt to normalise homosexuality and thus civil partnerships, whereas before the conservative stance had generally involved indifferent acceptance through inaction.

This is not to say that homosexuality in itself should not be tolerated. Edmund Burke said, 'I take toleration to be a part of religion. I do not know which I would sacrifice; I would keep them both: it is not necessary that I should sacrifice either'.<sup>30</sup> However, it is to say, a tolerant attitude, as the gay pride movement know, is still to disapprove of something – and they have sought to turn that tolerant but disapproving attitude of their sexual acts, made through choice, into one of acceptance of homosexuality as normality. David Cameron very clearly broke with the Burkeian line of conservative thought when he voted in favour of homosexual adoption and against an opt-out for Catholic adoption agencies.<sup>31</sup>

Adoption is undertaken for the benefit of a child. It is a sacrifice made by would-be parents to give an unfortunate child a loving family home and parental upbringing that they would not otherwise have received. Roger Scruton (2009) observed such when he said:

'For religious people that [adoption] means providing the child with a father and a mother. Anything else would be an injustice to the child and an abuse of his innocence. Hence there are no such things as 'adoption rights'. Adoption is the assumption of a duty, and the only rights involved are the rights of the child'.<sup>32</sup>

Furthermore, Cameron voted for, though did not whip Conservative MPs into supporting, the Labour Government's Human Embryonic bill which removed the natural link between father and child by allowing, by law, reference to a child's biological father to be omitted from the record of that's child's birth.<sup>33</sup> In so doing, Cameron aided the Left in hollowing out the institution of marriage yet further and replacing it with something fundamentally different, while also aiding the homosexual 'rights' agenda which clearly goes against traditional Burkeian conservative thought.

British society once treated marriage as the price to pay for sexual pleasure. Now, however, all activities of a sexual nature are treated as recreation. The Left's goal of liberating women

---

<sup>29</sup> KAY, R., 2009. David Cameron to be first Tory leader to join Gay Pride march [online]. 29 April, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>30</sup> BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. Burke: Select Works. p.51.

<sup>31</sup> DAILY MAIL, 2007. Cameron: I'll vote for gay adoption [online]. 29 January, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>32</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2009. This 'right' for gays is an injustice to children [online]. 1 March, *The Telegraph*.

<sup>33</sup> WINNETT, R., 2008. Embryo bill: David Cameron voted for human-animal hybrids over disabled son [online]. 21 May, *The Telegraph*.

was in a sense a false dawn because, in truth, there was a greater price to be paid. Children have become imprisoned in a world in which they come second to adult pleasures, whether sexual or by adoption. This problem, brought about by the liberalisation of social attitudes through the advances of the Left, will continue under Cameron's Conservatives since he and his party have no plans to rectify the situation. In fact, he and his Shadow Cabinet have not even conceded that it is a problem in the first place, and in certain areas they are actually providing their voice and support for the continuation of the sexual revolution.

Cameron has substantially modified how the Conservatives regard marriage. Roger Scruton (2009) says this means, 'instead of regarding the family as the present generation's way of sacrificing itself for the next, we are being asked to create families in which the next generation is sacrificed for the pleasure of the present one'.<sup>34</sup> The Conservative party is therefore fundamentally opposed to the idea, expressed by Burke, that 'Society is indeed a contract... to be looked on with other reverence ... It is a partnership in all science; a partnership in all art; a partnership in every virtue, and in all perfection. As the ends of such a partnership cannot be obtained in many generations, it becomes a partnership not only between those who are living, but between those who are to be born'.<sup>35</sup> In pandering to the idea that homosexuals have a 'right' to a partnership that is on par with marriage, or that they have a 'right' to adopt children above the rights of the child, then the Conservative party under Cameron are disagreeing, whether they understand or not, with a cornerstone belief of traditional conservative thought.

---

<sup>34</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2009. This 'right' for gays is an injustice to children [online]. 1 March, *The Telegraph*.

<sup>35</sup> BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. *Burke: Select Works*. p.114.

## Liberty and State

Does the Conservative party under David Cameron support conservative liberties or left-wing liberties? It is an important question because it must believe in (or at least have policies that reflect a preference of) either one or the other as they are quite different concepts and arguably cannot be reconciled for long.

Left-wing liberties are those that increase the power of the state, in that they give power to the state to decide the rights of its citizens. For example, if, at one moment in time the state decides to give a right of freedom of speech to its citizens then, at a later stage, if it so wishes, that right can be taken away. Power therefore ultimately resides with the state and not the citizen. Furthermore, such liberties, invented from scratch, are often highly ambiguous and as a result tend to be contradictory. Lord Hoffmann (2009) said, 'Right, the substantive right, is the child of law: from real laws come real rights; but from imaginary laws, from laws of nature, fancied and invented by poets, rhetoricians, and dealers in moral and intellectual poisons, come imaginary rights'.<sup>36</sup> Furthermore, 'human rights' stem from the idea that society is perfectible through universal endorsement of a perfect document. 'Human rights' are therefore grounded in the wisdom of an individual or small group who draw up these rights, rather than the wisdom of generations. Moreover, such rights hand an inordinate degree of power over to those who adjudicate on them, and thus can, in the wrong hands lead to revolutionary results.

Meanwhile, conservative liberties involve binding limitations on the power of the state over its citizens and the documentation of what government may do. As such, Peter Hitchens (2006) commented, 'Britain and the USA were not free because they had 'rights'. They were free because they had limited government. Their peoples have... freedoms to live in peace [and are] free to say and think what [they] like, because of good, hard restrictions on state power'.<sup>37</sup> This therefore reflects the traditional conservative view of the state and liberty, in which such a balance, in an imperfect society, has evolved naturally as a result of the opposing pressures of the state's desire to control on the one hand, and the people's desire to be free on the other.

On the issues of rights and human rights, David Cameron and the Conservatives seem to support what can be seen as left-wing liberties. At the moment Britain already has a perfectly adequate Bill of Rights dating back to 1689, which places good, hard restrictions on state power. Yet, despite the existence of this document, David Cameron has decided to champion a new so-called 'British Bill of Rights' in which the rights of British people will apparently be enshrined. In a speech to the Centre for Policy Studies, Cameron outlined this further by saying, 'a modern British bill of rights needs to define the core values which give us our identity as a free nation'.<sup>38</sup> Yet, the idea that a single document is necessary to 'define our core values' or 'give us our identity' does not seem compatible with traditional Burkeian conservatism. This is because Burke observed that our identity is a product of our history, our traditions, and the wisdom of previous generations, and therefore much too complex to encapsulate in a single document.

---

<sup>36</sup> HOFFMANN, L., 2009. *The Universality of Human Rights* [online].

<sup>37</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2006. Human wrongs [online]. 19 May, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>38</sup> WOODWARD, W., 2006. Cameron promises UK bill of rights to replace Human Rights Act. 26 June, *Guardian*.

In his speech Mr Cameron went on to add that his British Bill of Rights would 'spell out the fundamental duties and responsibilities of people living in this country' and he said it would protect the rights laid out in the European Convention on Human Rights in 'clearer and more precise terms'.<sup>39</sup> The primary purpose of Cameron's British Bill of Rights was to replace the Human Rights Act. However, Mr Cameron said the UK would remain a signatory to the European Convention on Human Rights, therefore still allowing British people to challenge British law in the European Court.<sup>40</sup> Thus this not only brings into question the relationship between citizen and state, but also the issue of sovereignty, of which control has clearly been passed onto courts that are at a level above that of the nation state.

One can only conclude that Mr Cameron and the Conservatives have been seduced by the human rights movement, finding it far easier to capitulate to a conception of liberty that is entirely alien to the conservative one, which they chose not to defend. Melanie Philips (2009) said, 'The justification is that human rights are universal principles to which no reasonable person could object. But the fact is that these are all abstract rights which have to be balanced against other rights. So these 'universal' principles are actually the product of the highly subjective prejudices and whims of the judges who conduct this trade-off process'.<sup>41</sup> The liberties that Britain enjoyed until very recently were arrived at as a result of century's worth of natural development of common law. Yet, the rapid transition from common law to a system of 'human rights' has seen the balance of power shift significantly from the citizen to the state and its judicial apparatus.

Peter Hitchens (2009) commented that "'Human Rights' don't actually exist. They are worthless paper money, invented by idealistic lawyers 56 years ago at a conference in Rome. The only 'rights' you have are the ones the liberal lawyers and judges are prepared to let you have'.<sup>42</sup> Yet, under David Cameron the Conservative party have sought to pursue a British Bill of Rights which will enshrine in codified law principles and 'rights' that go against traditional conservative values and thought.

---

<sup>39</sup> WOODWARD, W., 2006. Cameron promises UK bill of rights to replace Human Rights Act. 26 June, *Guardian*.

<sup>40</sup> WOODWARD, W., 2006. Cameron promises UK bill of rights to replace Human Rights Act. 26 June, *Guardian*.

<sup>41</sup> PHILLIPS, M., 2009. Two cheers for Lord Hoffmann [online]. 5 April, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>42</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2006. Human wrongs [online]. 19 May, *The Daily Mail*.

## The European Union

In 1946, after the end of the Second World War, Winston Churchill made a famous speech in which he said, 'we must build a kind of United States of Europe'.<sup>43</sup> However, the 'United States of Europe' which he envisaged was meant to include sovereign nations co-operating on an intergovernmental basis, rather than the supranational basis advocated by Jean Monnet and which became apparent during the 1950s. Critically, in this more conservative vision, Churchill saw Britain as a sponsor of the venture but not as a participatory member.<sup>44</sup>

By 1972, the Conservative party, now led by Edward Heath had switched their allegiances to favouring membership of the EEC's Common market. Wrongly, many Conservatives believed the EEC to be a free trade zone - in reality it was anything but. Dr Richard North (2004) said:

'Technically, the EU is – as was the EEC before it – a Customs Union... What is on offer, therefore, is a very far cry from free trade. It is a dirigiste, inflexible, regulation-bound system based on the very antithesis of free trade, designed not primarily to promote trade but to protect member states from it, and designed to assist in the process of building a United States of Europe'.<sup>45</sup>

The Conservative confusion between their perception of the EEC when compared with its reality boiled down to a fundamental lack of understanding concerning the entire nature of the European project. Yet, not all Conservatives were so unclear about its direction. Edward Heath said in a Prime Ministerial broadcast that, 'There are some in this country who fear that in going into Europe we shall in some way sacrifice independence and sovereignty. These fears, I need hardly say, are completely unjustified'.<sup>46</sup> Yet, it was he who had stood up in the House of Commons only two years earlier and told members of the House, 'that as members of the enlarged Community we would play our full part in the progress towards economic and monetary union'.<sup>47</sup>

Still, even after Britain had joined the EEC, the self deception continued. Margaret Thatcher had, like Heath, also initially been in favour of British membership of the Common Market, though for her the reasons were somewhat different. Influenced by the economist Milton Friedman and the author Friedrich Hayek, her attitude reflected the strains of liberalism in the economic sphere which had by then gradually crept into the Conservative party. Roger Scruton (2001) highlights that despite there being 'no logical identity between conservatism and capitalism',<sup>48</sup> Simon Gunn said that Thatcher adopted 'nearly all of significance that the neo-liberals had to say about economics: the need for a free market, competition, profit, choice, incentives, entrepreneurial spirit, inequality, private property, individualism and a negative conception of freedom'.<sup>49</sup> In many respects the market economy, coupled with EEC

---

<sup>43</sup> NICOLL, W. & SALMON, T., 1997. *Building European Union*. p.26.

<sup>44</sup> BOOKER, C. & NORTH, R., 2003. *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*. p.32.

<sup>45</sup> NORTH, R., 2004. *Myth of the Week: The EU is a free trade area?* [online].

<sup>46</sup> BOOKER, C., 2007. Christopher Booker's Notebook [online]. 5 November, *The Sunday Telegraph*.

<sup>47</sup> PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, 1971. *European Economic Community: 1970-71*. 5(818), p.1235.

<sup>48</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2001. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. p.27.

<sup>49</sup> GUNN, S., 1989. *The Revolution of the Right*. p.12.

membership, that Thatcher sought to impose on the UK threatened the then current social order, and was the very opposite of what conservatives who wished to protect it wanted.

By 1986, Thatcher had signed the Single European Act, but as the decade wore on she began to slowly come to realise the enormous national and democratic sacrifices membership of the European project entailed. This culminated in her famous 'No, No, No' speech in Bruges in which she railed against 'the erosion of democracy by centralisation and bureaucracy'<sup>50</sup> in the Community. It was at this point that her more liberal enemies within the Conservative party moved against her and toppled her from power, beginning with the resignation of Geoffrey Howe and ending with the leadership challenge from Michael Heseltine. What may have led to a potential re-establishment of certain conservative ideals was snubbed out.

Ever since the United Kingdom first joined the European Economic Community, the issue of British membership of the EEC and its successor organisations has vexed conservatives and as a result the Conservative party. During the leadership campaign of David Cameron, one of the very few concrete pledges that he chose to make was that if he became leader he would remove Conservative MEPs from the European People's Party (EPP-ED) grouping in the European Parliament.<sup>51</sup> He also promised that he would help Conservative MEPs form a new group of like-minded conservatives from across a number of other EU member states as specified by the rules of the European Parliament.<sup>52</sup>

This pledge was first made by Cameron with the intention of attracting the support of the Eurosceptic Right of the party, whose votes he needed in order to secure progression to the final stages of the leadership contest. However, upon his accession to the leadership of the party he reneged on his promise and Conservative MEPs did not leave the EPP-ED.<sup>53</sup> One could claim with a certain degree of validity that this issue was not entirely within David Cameron's control as leader of his party. The rules of the European Parliament state that MEPs are independent and are not under the jurisdiction of national parties:

'Article I: Members shall be free and independent... Article III: Members shall vote on an individual and personal basis. They shall not be bound by any instructions and shall not receive a binding mandate'.<sup>54</sup>

With these rules in mind, a number of pro-EU Conservative MEPs threatened to kick up a fuss or to resign from the party in protest should Cameron force the Conservative European delegation to leave the EPP-ED.<sup>55</sup> These actions by MEPs could have caused David Cameron and the Conservative party significant domestic problems in the national media.

---

<sup>50</sup> BOOKER, C. & NORTH, R., 2003. *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*. p.239.

<sup>51</sup> MULVEY, S., 2005. *Tory MEPs to fight Cameron plan* [online].

<sup>52</sup> WATT, N., 2006. *Cameron to postpone creation of new EU group* [online].

<sup>53</sup> In an interview with Edward Leigh MP on a Channel Four Dispatches programme, 'Toff at the Top', it was made clear that Leigh thought that David Cameron had pledged to withdraw Conservative MEPs from the EPP, but in fact in the long run probably had no intention of doing so.

<sup>54</sup> OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, 2005. *Decision of the European Parliament of 28 September 2005 adopting the Statute for Members of the European Parliament*. 2005/684/EC, Euratom. Brussels: EU Parliament. pp.3-4.

<sup>55</sup> THE PARLIAMENT.COM, 2009. *British Tory MEP condemns party leader over EPP-ED opt out* [online].

However, while MEPs are officially meant to be independent from national parties and instruction, in practice they often exhibit tendencies that are anything but. For example, when voting in Parliament, due to the speed of electronic voting, MEPs in party groups tend to go with what their leader is thumbing them to do,<sup>56</sup> which, as Craig and Elliott (2009) say, 'hardly looks like voting on an individual basis'.<sup>57</sup> Therefore, if Cameron had been strong and unequivocal about fulfilling his pledge then he would have simply gone ahead and left the EPP-ED without attempting to compromise with a small number of rebellious Conservative MEPs. However, he did not, and his promise of immediate withdrawal was changed to 'weeks not months',<sup>58</sup> then eventually it became years with him committing to the forming of a new grouping after the European Parliamentary elections in June 2009.

Had David Cameron acted swiftly and decisively he could have pulled Conservative MEPs out, but it is likely that his indecision was more a result of his reluctance to fulfil a pledge that he had been cynically made to win Eurosceptic MP votes, than because of problems one or two Conservative MEPs may have caused him. Furthermore, this issue is particularly important because it was a task that David Cameron could have achieved before he even got into Government. A willingness and ability to fulfil his pledge may have highlighted Cameron as more likely to be conservative on the European issue in future than he at first appeared.

However, the EPP-ED issue is but one facet of the Conservatives' policy on and towards the European Union. Since the Thatcher period the Conservative party has increasingly become what is often referred to as 'eurosceptic'. However, as Peter Hitchens (2008) clearly laid out:

'The word 'Eurosceptic' means 'a person who adopts anti-EU rhetoric in opposition, and then surrenders to the EU in government'. This is inevitable. You cannot be in the EU and not run by it, any more than you can be a little bit pregnant. If you don't like being run by it, you must leave, as all serious students of the subject long ago realised. I don't think there's any serious dispute about which side of this fence Mr Cameron is on'.<sup>59</sup>

Thus, the Conservative party slogan of 'In Europe, not run by Europe'<sup>60</sup> which was dreamt up by William Hague and is still adhered to by David Cameron essentially means that the Conservatives still favour Britain's membership of the European Union because they have explicitly said they want to remain in the EU rather than leave.

Furthermore, David Cameron recently invited the passionately pro-EU MP, Kenneth Clarke, into his Shadow Cabinet. Mr Clarke (2009), who had in the past criticised his Conservative party colleagues for their 'euroscepticism' acknowledged upon his appointment to the Cameron Shadow Cabinet that his party is 'still firmly Eurosceptic but it's now moderate, harmless Euroscepticism. It's a bit silly sometimes, like which group do you join in the European parliament, but full-blooded stuff like renegotiating the treaty of accession is as

---

<sup>56</sup> CRAIG, D. & ELLIOTT, M., 2009. *The Great European Rip-Off: How the Corrupt, Wasteful EU is Taking Control of our lives*. p.129.

<sup>57</sup> CRAIG, D. & ELLIOTT, M., 2009. *The Great European Rip-Off: How the Corrupt, Wasteful EU is Taking Control of our lives*. p.130.

<sup>58</sup> POLITICS.CO.UK, 2006. *MEP slams humiliating EPP delay* [online]. 1 August, *Politics.co.uk*.

<sup>59</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2008. *Peter Hitchens replies* [online].

<sup>60</sup> HAGUE, W., 1999. *Conservative party European Election Manifesto: In Europe, not run by Europe* [online].

dead as a dodo'.<sup>61</sup> Conversely, while allowing a well known Europhile MP into his Shadow Cabinet, David Cameron has forbidden Conservative MPs who have signed up to the Freedom Association's Better Off Out campaign, which takes the stance that it would benefit Britain to leave the European Union, from serving in either his Shadow Cabinet or any Government he may in future form.<sup>62</sup>

Having established David Cameron and the Conservative party's current political stance on the European Union, it can be acknowledged that their position is in no way in keeping with a traditionally conservative point of view. According to the conservative author, Roger Scruton (2004), traditional conservatism is wedded to the idea of national sovereignty and fundamentally tied to the idea of the nation state, in so far as it:

'...is not that the nation state is the only answer to the problems of modern government, but that it is the only answer that has proved itself. We may feel tempted to experiment with other forms of political order. But experiments on this scale are dangerous, since nobody knows how to predict or to reverse the results of them'.<sup>63</sup>

The European project's active hostility to nationalism is particularly important. This is mainly because it is an obvious attempt to destroy the ancient link between people and nation that has developed naturally over time. Jeremy Black (2006) remarked that, 'A political system cannot work unless the bulk of the population feels some sense of identity. Related to, and, in part due to the EU, this sense is now weakening, at the same time that patterns of deference encouraging consent are also eroding'.<sup>64</sup> This link is one revered by conservative thinkers including Burke and Scruton as essential for the establishment of a civilised and stable political order. The intention of the European Union's institutions to recreate the identity link at a supranational European level marks the EU out as an organisation opposed to conservative beliefs.

Moreover, Christopher Booker and Richard North (2003) observed the intentions of the EU project when they wrote that, 'Monnet would inspire the setting up of the European Economic Community, deliberately intended as an embryonic 'United States of Europe' [as] he envisaged [it] as another way to erode nationalism'.<sup>65</sup> Thus, support for the entire European Union, whose aim is to sweep away the old order of nation states, democratic traditions, and accumulated knowledge, and replace it with a new, untested supranational construct in which sovereignty is passed to a higher level than the nation, is fundamentally alien to conservatism.

Roger Scruton stated that the conservative approach would be 'to accept the arrangements, however imperfect, that have evolved through custom and inheritance, to improve them by small adjustments, but not to jeopardise them by large-scale alterations the consequences

---

<sup>61</sup> STRATTON, A., 2009. Ken Clarke warned Tories Barack Obama would snub a 'Eurosceptic' UK [online]. 21 January, *The Guardian*.

<sup>62</sup> HANNAN, D., 2009. *If Ken Clarke can be on the front bench, so can MPs who want to leave the EU* [online].

<sup>63</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2004. *England and the Need for Nations*. p.2.

<sup>64</sup> BLACK, J., 2006. *The European Question and the National Interest*. p.143.

<sup>65</sup> BOOKER, C. & NORTH, R., 2003. *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*. p.17.

of which nobody can really envisage'.<sup>66</sup> In policy terms this would involve a Conservative party commitment of taking Britain out of the European Union. Thus it is arguable that, far from establishing a new, more conservative EU doctrine for the Conservative party, David Cameron is merely continuing the Conservative tradition of supporting the EU project, albeit with one or two slight, but irrelevant, presentational differences.

---

<sup>66</sup> SCRUTON, R., 2004. *England and the Need for Nations*. p.3.

## Political Correctness

During his leadership election campaign David Cameron had, with increasing frequency, said that if he became leader, then the party would have to change the way it looked and what it said. By this he meant the immediate discrimination in favour of minority groups including homosexuals and non-white ethnics, and the kowtowing to political correctness.

On the day of his election as party leader, Cameron clarified this message in an acceptance speech in which he confirmed that, 'I said when I launched my campaign that we needed to change in order to win. We will change the way we look. Nine out of 10 Conservative MPs, like me, are white men. We need to change the scandalous under representation of women in the Conservative party and we'll do that'.<sup>67</sup> Soon after, Cameron established the A-List of Conservative candidates to help him increase the number of ethnic minorities, women and homosexuals amongst the ranks of potential Conservative MPs at the General Election.

It must be made very clear that the A-List was not created with the intention of reflecting the abilities of a candidate to carry out the job of being an MP, or for their political views or previous experience. Instead it was simply a means by which to discriminate in favour of candidates based on race, sexuality or gender. This is to say that men are in the process discriminated against. In addition, Cameron changed candidate selection rules forcing local Conservative Associations to give preferential treatment to women by including at least 50% of women in any selection final. It is worth noting that if a fresh faced David Cameron were applying to be the Conservative candidate in his current constituency of Whitney, it seems unlikely that he would pass his own set of rules and be selected by the local association.

Peter Hitchens (2006) remarked, 'As it happens, there are very good conservative reasons for being against this leftist dogma. And it is a sign of how the Tories have been captured by the forces of Cultural Marxism that the ridiculous 'A' list is in being at all'.<sup>68</sup> Indeed the pursuit of the equality agenda and political correctness are very notable for not being conservative. According to Edna Andrews (1996), the use of inclusive, neutral phraseology and words in everyday speech is based on the conception that 'the usage of PC terms is overtly connected to the position that language represents thought and may even control thought'.<sup>69</sup> Thus, it is possible to say that through the use of words and phrases political correctness seeks to radically shape users' ideas and also as a direct result their actions. Edna Andrews (1996) sums up by saying, 'thus initiating cultural change via linguistic change is a reasonable deduction'.<sup>70</sup> Political correctness as a tool of the Left can therefore be seen as a challenge to the old conservative order that has grown out of wisdom and experience. As Edmund Burke noted, 'But what is liberty without wisdom, and without virtue? It is the greatest of all possible evils; for it is folly, vice, and madness, without tuition or restraint'.<sup>71</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> CAMERON, D., 2005. Full text of David Cameron's victory speech [online]. 6 December, *The Guardian*.

<sup>68</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2006. What does it matter what sex your MP is? [online]. 23 August, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>69</sup> ANDREWS, E., 1996. Cultural Sensitivity and Political Correctness: The Linguistic Problem of Naming, *American Speech*, 71(4), pp.392.

<sup>70</sup> ANDREWS, E., 1996. Cultural Sensitivity and Political Correctness: The Linguistic Problem of Naming, *American Speech*, 71(4), pp.393.

<sup>71</sup> BURKE, E. & CLARK, J., 2001. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. p.412.

Furthermore, prejudice, which David Cameron's A-List and political correctness supposedly seek to negate, is in fact a traditional Burkeian conservative notion in which wisdom and experience accumulated over a period of time are enshrined above the truth seeking of an individual or single generation. Edmund Burke said in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* that, 'I am bold enough to confess that in this enlightened age we are generally men of untaught feelings; that instead of casting away all our old prejudices we cherish them to a very considerable degree'.<sup>72</sup> Burke went on to say that the more generally prejudices have prevailed, the more people have cherished them, and essentially what he and traditional conservatives argue is that it is foolish for individuals or a single generation in society to declare themselves so enlightened that they can replace the previous system of values and beliefs with something entirely new and different, which is essentially what the A-List seeks.

However, in an increasingly rationalistic age the political Left have seen prejudice as a cruel obstacle to equality and the progress that they so desire. The former Editor of the BBC Radio programme, *The Archers*, Vanessa Whitburn said, 'To be PC is really to be moral. It is having a correct moral stance. PC is, in fact, my moral plank. I don't think that wishy-washy liberal ideology works any more'.<sup>73</sup> According to Rousseau, evil and suffering are not inseparable from the human condition but are imposed from institutions created by men. Such thinking leads to the natural conclusion that if those institutions could be revolutionised or overthrown then man could create a more just and equal society. Yet, as O'Sullivan noted, for conservatives 'the world imposes limitations upon what either the individual or the state can hope to achieve without destroying the stability of society',<sup>74</sup> a view vindicated by, in part, by Burke's pessimistic prediction of the events of the French Revolution.

The A-List is a representative example of David Cameron going much further than previous Conservative policies. The very notion that there are not enough, for example, female MPs in the Conservative ranks, and that this is somehow, according to Melanie Philips (2005) 'an acute embarrassment and glaringly out of kilter with modern Britain',<sup>75</sup> is, in itself, an anti-conservative stance in believing that a position is wrong simply by being out of date. The A-List is therefore an artificial rather than natural extension of institutional change, not in keeping with traditional conservative thought.

Furthermore, it should be noted that in the past the Tory party had never made much attempt to stop or reverse the creeping political correctness that had begun under Labour Governments. This has included such things as the gradual removal of the mention of a 'Christian name' on Government forms being replaced with 'Forename', or the replacement of 'spouse' with the very recent term 'partner', which erodes the traditional connection with marriage – neither of which the Conservatives have attempted to rectify when they have previously been in Government. Incidentally, this was reflected in an interview on *Newsnight*, when Mr Cameron was asked by the BBC journalist, Stephanie Flanders, whether having had a child, she should be married. He declined to answer 'yes'.<sup>76</sup> Peter Hitchens (2000) also said that 'the Thatcher Government unwittingly helped destroy many

---

<sup>72</sup> BURKE, E., 2005. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. p.49.

<sup>73</sup> THOMPSON, D., 2001. We must resist the Blairing of Britain [online]. 23 August, *The Telegraph*.

<sup>74</sup> O'SULLIVAN, N., 1976. *Modern Ideologies: Conservatism*. p.12.

<sup>75</sup> PHILLIPS, M., 2005. Having it all [online]. 30 December, *The Daily Mail*.

<sup>76</sup> LITTLEJOHN, R., 2007. If BBC reporter Stephanie Flanders speaks for Britain, I'm a gnu. 30 August, *Daily Mail*.

things conservatism once stood for. In eighteen years... [the Tory] government was unable to reverse a single part of the cultural revolution, not least because it barely tried'.<sup>77</sup> Yet, under Cameron there has been a fundamental change of direction. He has moved his party from passive acceptance of political correctness and such leftist doctrine to its very public, active, and willing pursuit.

Cameron has not stopped with the A-List either. Without wishing to discuss the scientific validity of Anthropogenic Global Warming, which this study does not have enough room to consider, it can be said that Manmade Global Warming has become a dogma of the political Left.<sup>78</sup> Consequently, the solutions to the perceived problems of Global Warming have taken on a uniquely leftist aura, including the pursuit of massive state intervention into public and family life to curb the effects of warming, along with higher taxation and government expenditure, thus removing freedom of choice and personal expression. The Conservatives under David Cameron have largely accepted these arguments which go far beyond the conservative idea of conservation of the environment. This can be seen in David Cameron's policies to increase taxation on 'polluting' CO<sup>2</sup> vehicles and flights by creating a 'carbon levy',<sup>79</sup> while he said, 'we can change how we get around; we can change how we build our homes; we can change our lifestyles, change our industrial processes. It's called progress'.<sup>80</sup>

Finally, Cameron's capitulation to the pursuit of political correctness is reflected in the observation made by Mr Blair's biographer, John Rentoul (2006), who wrote that 'Thatcher's great achievement was to reconcile Labour to the market. Blair's great achievement has been to reconcile the Tory party to public services and equality'.<sup>81</sup> On these two issues, among many others, Cameron has gone further than the Tories ever had been willing before in surrendering, often without so much as a whimper, to the Left on matters of equality and political correctness which are not in keeping with traditional conservatism.

---

<sup>77</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2008. *The Abolition of Britain*. p.300.

<sup>78</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2009. Condoms, pills... but how about restraint? [online]. 28 March, *The Mail on Sunday*.

<sup>79</sup> OSBORNE, G., 2008. *George Osborne: Speech to the Green Alliance* [online].

<sup>80</sup> WINTOUR, P., 2006. Cameron pledges to firm up green credentials with carbon levy [online]. 21 April, *The Guardian*.

<sup>81</sup> RENTOUL, J., 2006. Cameron's first year: not bad, Dave [online]. 3 December, *The Independent*.

## Conclusions

The Conservative party, acknowledged as one of the world's oldest political parties and once seen as the natural party of government during the twentieth century, has always sought to adapt its policies to the political situation in which it has found itself. One might say that this is the mark of any good, successful political party, in that those most adaptable to changing their policies and image to suit the needs of the electorate survive, while others fall by the wayside. In the words of Matthew d'Ancona (2006), the Editor of the *Spectator* magazine, 'this is a season of high hopes but also of rude awakenings. To win power in a political system such as ours, when you have lost the habits of victory, is incredibly hard'.<sup>82</sup>

Yet, adaptability comes at a price, and that price for the Conservatives has so often been principle and their conservative inclinations. Time and again the party has shown that when faced with a period in opposition, rather than stand up for its views, its values and its voters, it has chosen the seemingly quicker and easier option of accepting the liberal-Left orthodoxy of the time. Accordingly, Peter Hitchens (2009) was able to remark that the Conservative Party has been responsible for 'every stupid decision of the past half-century [which] was either made by them or later supported by them'.<sup>83</sup> This essentially sums up the real political philosophy of the Conservative Party since the end of the Second World War, in that it has not attempted to be conservative in any traditional sense but has instead contented itself with surrendering to liberalism and the Left in order to gain office, though not power since the ideas it implements are not conservative or its own.

The Conservatives therefore, like rats, have continually danced to the Pied Piper's Leftist tune. In so doing they have helped bring about their own electoral downfall by destroying their support base – both as a result of their policies' impact on society and by causing their voters to desert them – only for them a few years down the line to lurch back into office, after once again conceding to the policies of their rivals, to begin the whole process over again.

Beginning with the liberalisation of social attitudes in the late 1950s and 60s and continuing into the Thatcher period with economic liberalism and the rule of the market, the traditional conservatism once espoused by Edmund Burke has slowly receded to the point at which it barely registers at all. When it does make an appearance in the modern Conservative party it is mainly rhetorical, used more as a ploy to stir party members and tribal voters into action and into supporting the party machine at elections, than to convey any real sense of political direction.

The latest link in that chain is David Cameron, who, after seeing his Conservative party out of office for more than a decade, has sought to redefine himself as 'the heir to Blair'<sup>84</sup> and all that goes with it. This has not therefore simply meant an actual physical continuation from one Prime Minister to the next, but the virtual carbon copying by the Conservatives of Blair's entire political outlook, content and style of politics. Whether it be the Shadow

---

<sup>82</sup> D'ANCONA, M., 2006. Yes, the Tories could lose. It's why they need Cameron [online]. 8 April, *The Telegraph*.

<sup>83</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2009. Yeah, sweet... With two sneering words, a killer provides the epitaph for a society that tries to 'understand' criminals rather than make them quake in fear [online]. 7 March, *The Mail on Sunday*.

<sup>84</sup> PIERCE, A., 2005. Horror as Cameron brandishes the B word [online]. 5 October, *The Times*.

Education Secretary, Michael Gove (2009), saying that the Conservatives will be ‘carrying forward the Blair agenda in education’<sup>85</sup>, or Andrew Rawnsley (2005), declaring that ‘I left the Labour conference in Brighton unsure how much of Blairism will outlast Blair. Perhaps that was the wrong place to be looking. It may be the Tory conference in Blackpool that will provide the answer’,<sup>86</sup> it seems undeniable that the party has actively sought to abandon the last vestiges of conservatism that it still held, in pursuit of office.

Yet, the evidence of this final abandonment of traditionalism and conservative values by the Conservative party under the leadership of David Cameron cannot just be observed in the policies or mannerisms of its leader. It can also be seen in the way in which the party is now treated by its former political enemies and opponents in the media. Peter Hitchens (2009) observed that the British liberal elite ‘is more than content for the Tories to win the next election because they have abandoned the last traces of conservatism. Why else has the liberal leftish BBC now fallen in love with David Cameron?’<sup>87</sup> Indeed, when William Hague was leader of his party he regularly made speeches at Prime Minister’s Questions which arguably ran rings around Mr Blair. Yet, very rarely were these speeches mentioned by the BBC, when, by comparison, David Cameron’s rather mediocre speeches across the dispatch box have been greeted with prime time news coverage from the corporation.

Furthermore, the Blairite faction of the Labour party is desperate to see a Cameron (as opposed to a Brown) victory at the next General Election, with Telegraph columnist Janet Daley (2008) pertinently asking, ‘Who are these adoring acolytes who offer such unreserved support to Mr Cameron? Why, the Blairites, of course’.<sup>88</sup> For it is Blair and his acolytes who have reason to believe that they have transformed the British political landscape in an irreversible way – and perhaps they are correct. During the 2001 General Election campaign, Tony Blair stopped in Wellingborough and made a speech in which he said that never again should any political party stand for cuts in spending in hospitals and schools, or that public spending should be controlled. He wasn’t saying that is what Labour should think but telling the opposition what they should do. The change was not immediate but, under Cameron, and on these issues, along with many others, the Conservatives have now obeyed.<sup>89</sup>

The Conservative party is both a product of its past and its current leadership. Any leader, however conservative they might be, would find the party’s increasingly liberalised legacy inescapable. While David Cameron may be the most recent leader of the Conservative party, in certain respects the course of his leadership towards the Left merely reflects much older established trends by his party in that direction. Even in light of recent events such as the banking crisis and decline of the UK economy into recession, it does not appear that Mr Cameron’s slight modification of his economic policies constitutes a fundamental or conservative rethinking of his stance. The party and its leadership still obstinately refuse to

---

<sup>85</sup> WATT, N. & WINTOUR, P., 2009. We are carrying forward the Blair agenda [online]. 25 April, *The Guardian*.

<sup>86</sup> RAWNSLEY, A., 2005. Blairism lives - in the Conservatives [online]. 2 October, *The Guardian*.

<sup>87</sup> HITCHENS, P., 2009. What does it matter if we are governed by Blue Labour or New Labour? [online]. 23 March, *The Mail on Sunday*.

<sup>88</sup> DALEY, J., 2008. David Cameron is the true heir of the New Labour project [online]. 15 December, *Telegraph*.

<sup>89</sup> START THE WEEK WITH ANDREW MARR, 2007. [RADIO programme] BBC, BBC Radio 4, 23 March 2007 09.00.

publicly reconsider their previously unconservative commitments to match Labour's plans on taxation and spending in what is likely to be a period of coming austerity.<sup>90</sup>

Moreover, the fundamental conflict between unrestrained liberalism and conservatism in the Conservative party is still as yet unresolved. Even now, despite such an enormous level of compromise with the Left, in which the party has adopted not only its methods but often its worldview, certain elements of traditional conservative thought have managed to linger on, mainly amongst its backbench MPs and party members. Yet, it seems that even these last remnants of a distant conservative heritage will too be expunged from existence in the fullness of time and as the A-List of Conservative candidates takes effect.

Considering the evidence before us, it therefore seems clear that the Conservative Party of David Cameron is not conservative in the traditional manner that this study has defined. What is more, since one cannot be all things to all men, the Conservative Party under Cameron and his predecessors has had to choose whether it believes in conservative values or office for its own sake. In its continual attempts to return to the gilded corridors of Whitehall, but not power, the party has disenfranchised hundreds of thousands of voters who do hold traditionally conservative opinions and now have nowhere else to turn.

The result of the next UK General Election will undoubtedly prove interesting and its final outcome will provide fertile ground for academic research. If the Conservative Party forms a Government, the question of whether David Cameron will really continue the Blair legacy, or whether he will go beyond the opportunistic rhetoric he currently adopts, will eventually be resolved – although it seems increasingly unlikely that the latter will be the case.

While Mr Cameron may be a new leader of a seemingly new style of Conservative party, in actual fact he is simply using tried and tested methods of stealing the clothing of rivals – and there is nothing new or favourable for our democratic society in that.

---

<sup>90</sup> In an interview with Channel 4 News on Sunday the 26<sup>th</sup> April 2009, William Hague was pressed on whether 'the public sector wage bill will be lower under the Tories?' A simple 'yes' would have sufficed. However, Mr Hague continually refused to give a specific commitment on whether the level of public spending would be reduced after the next election.

## Bibliography

### Literature & Books

1. ANDREWS, E., 1996. Cultural Sensitivity and Political Correctness: The Linguistic Problem of Naming, *American Speech*, 71(4), pp.389-404.
2. ARISTOTLE, 2004. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.
3. BLACK, J., 2006. *The European Question and the National Interest*. Belgium: The Social Affairs Unit.
4. BOOKER, C. & NORTH, R., 2003. *The Great Deception: The Secret History of the European Union*. Trowbridge: Continuum Books.
5. BRONNER, S., 2005. *Twentieth century political theory*. London: Routledge.
6. BURKE, E. & CLARK, J., 2001. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. California: Stanford University Press.
7. BURKE, E. & PAYNE, J., 2005. *Burke: Select Works*. London: The Lawbook Exchange Ltd.
8. BURKE, E., 2005. *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. London: Digireads Publishing.
9. CRAIG, D. & ELLIOTT, M., 2009. *The Great European Rip-Off: How the Corrupt, Wasteful EU is Taking Control of our lives*. Croydon: Random House Books.
10. GUNN, S., 1989. *Revolution of the Right*. London: Pluto Press.
11. HITCHENS, P., 2003. *The Abolition of Liberty*. London: Quartet Books.
12. HITCHENS, P., 2008. *The Abolition of Britain*. 3rd ed. London: Continuum Books.
13. LAWRENCE, D.H., 1994. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. London: Penguin Classics.
14. LUDLAM, S. & SMITH, M. J., eds., 1996. *Contemporary British Conservatism*. London: Macmillan.
15. NICOLL, W. & SALMON, T., 1997. *Building European Union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
16. O'SULLIVAN, N., 1976. *Modern Ideologies: Conservatism*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons.
17. OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, 2005. *Decision of the European Parliament of 28 September 2005 adopting the Statute for Members of the European Parliament*. 2005/684/EC, Euratom. Brussels: EU Parliament.
18. PHILLIPS, M., 1998. *All Must Have Prizes*. 2nd ed. London: Time Warner.
19. SCRUTON, R., 2001. *The Meaning of Conservatism*. 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
20. SCRUTON, R., 2004. *England and the Need for Nations*. London: Civitas.
21. SCRUTON, R., 2006. *A Political Philosophy: Arguments for conservatism*. London: Continuum International Publishing.

### Internet Sources

1. BOOKER, C., 2007. Christopher Booker's Notebook [online]. 5 November, *The Sunday Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1568259/Christopher-Bookers-Notebook.html> [Accessed 12/02/09]
2. CAMERON, D., 2005. Conservative party leadership contest 2005: Full text of David Cameron's victory speech [online]. 6 December, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/dec/06/toryleadership2005.conservatives3> [Accessed 14/04/09]

3. CAMERON, D., 2006. David Cameron's speech: Modern Conservatism. Full text of the Conservative party leader's speech to Demos [online]. 30 January, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/jan/30/conservatives.davidcameron> [Accessed 26/04/09]
4. CAMERON, D., 2006. Full text of David Cameron's speech [online]. 4 October, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/oct/04/conservatives2006.conservatives> [Accessed 26/04/09]
5. CHAPMAN, J., 2007. Cameron's own party draws blood from their leader [online]. 6 February, *The Daily Mail*. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-434085/Camerons-party-draws-blood-leader.html> [Accessed 18/04/09]
6. CONSERVATIVES, 2009. *Our Plan for Social Reform* [online]. Available from: [http://www.conservatives.com/~media/Files/Downloadable%20Files/Social\\_reform.aspx?dl=true](http://www.conservatives.com/~media/Files/Downloadable%20Files/Social_reform.aspx?dl=true) [Accessed 29/01/09]
7. D'ANCONA, M., 2006. Yes, the Tories could lose. It's why they need Cameron [online]. 8 April, *The Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3624227/Yes-the-Tories-could-lose.-Its-why-they-need-Cameron.html> [Accessed 17/04/09]
8. DAILY MAIL, 2007. Cameron: I'll vote for gay adoption [online]. 29 January, *The Daily Mail*. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-432141/Cameron-ill-vote-gay-adoption.html> [Accessed 29/01/09]
9. DALEY, J., 2008. David Cameron is the true heir of the New Labour project [online]. 15 December, *The Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3634903/David-Cameron-is-the-true-heir-of-the-New-Labour-project.html> [Accessed 08/03/09]
10. DUNCAN-SMITH, I., 2006. *Families 'key to poverty fight'* [online]. Available from: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk\\_politics/6165833.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/6165833.stm) [Accessed 26/04/09]
11. HAGUE, W., 1999. Conservative party European Election Manifesto: In Europe, not run by Europe [online]. Available from: [http://www.conservatives.gi/ep\\_manifesto.pdf](http://www.conservatives.gi/ep_manifesto.pdf) [Accessed 17/03/09]
12. HANNAN, D., 2009. *If Ken Clarke can be on the front bench, so can MPs who want to leave the EU* [online]. Available from: [http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/daniel\\_hannan/blog/2009/01/19/if\\_ken\\_clarke\\_can\\_be\\_on\\_the\\_front\\_bench\\_so\\_can\\_mps\\_who\\_want\\_to\\_leave\\_the\\_eu](http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/daniel_hannan/blog/2009/01/19/if_ken_clarke_can_be_on_the_front_bench_so_can_mps_who_want_to_leave_the_eu) [Accessed 19/01/09]
13. HELM T. & RENNIE, D., 2006. Don't be fooled by Cameron, Tebbit to warn Right [online]. 31 January, *The Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1509210/Dont-be-fooled-by-Cameron-Tebbit-to-warn-Right.html> [Accessed 26/04/09]
14. HITCHENS, P., 2006. Human wrongs [online]. 19 May, *The Daily Mail*. Available from: [http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2006/05/human\\_wrongs.html](http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2006/05/human_wrongs.html) [Accessed 02/04/09]
15. HITCHENS, P., 2006. *This Week: Peter Hitchens* [online]. Available from: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/this\\_week/5412812.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/this_week/5412812.stm) [Accessed 26/04/09]
16. HITCHENS, P., 2006. What does it matter what sex your MP is? [online]. 23 August, *The Daily Mail*. Available from:

- [http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2006/08/what does it ma.html](http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2006/08/what_does_it_ma.html) [Accessed 28/01/09]
17. HITCHENS, P., 2007. Is this war? [online]. 27 March, *The Mail on Sunday*. Available from: [http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2007/03/is this war.html](http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2007/03/is_this_war.html) [Accessed 01/03/09]
  18. HITCHENS, P., 2008. *Peter Hitchens replies* [online]. Available from: <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/centre-right/2008/10/peter-hitchens.html> [Accessed 08/10/08]
  19. HITCHENS, P., 2009. Condoms, pills... but how about restraint? [online]. 28 March, *The Mail on Sunday*. Available from: <http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2009/03/condoms-pills-but-how-about-restraint.html> [Accessed 28/03/09]
  20. HITCHENS, P., 2009. What does it matter if we are governed by Blue Labour or New Labour? [online]. 23 March, *The Mail on Sunday*. Available from: <http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2009/03/what-does-it-matter-if-we-are-governed-by-blue-labour-or-new-labour.html> [Accessed 23/03/09]
  21. HITCHENS, P., 2009. Yeah, sweet... With two sneering words, a killer provides the epitaph for a society that tries to 'understand' criminals rather than make them quake in fear [online]. 7 March, *The Mail on Sunday*. Available from: <http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2009/03/yeah-sweet-with-two-sneering-words-a-killer-provides-the-epitaph-for-a-society-that-tries-to-underst.html> [Accessed 07/03/09]
  22. KAY, R., 2009. David Cameron to be first Tory leader to join Gay Pride march. 29 April, *The Daily Mail*. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1174540/David-Cameron-Tory-leader-join-Gay-Pride-march.html> [Accessed 29/04/09]
  23. KETTLE, M., 2009. The Conservatives have had an easy ride – that has to stop [online]. 23 April, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2009/apr/23/budget-2009-labour-conservatives> [Accessed 23/04/09]
  24. LITTLEJOHN, R., 2007. If BBC reporter Stephanie Flanders speaks for Britain, I'm a gnu. 30 August, *Daily Mail*. Available from: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/columnists/article-478859/LITTLEJOHN-If-BBC-reporter-Stephanie-Flanders-speaks-Britain-Im-gnu.html> [Accessed 26/04/09]
  25. MONTGOMERIE, T., 2005. *Red Corner Questioning* [online]. Available from: [http://conservativehome.blogs.com/dictionary/2005/08/red\\_corner\\_ques.html](http://conservativehome.blogs.com/dictionary/2005/08/red_corner_ques.html) [Accessed 26/04/09]
  26. MONTGOMERIE, T., 2008. *The leaders of the Right: Lord Norman Tebbit* [online]. Available from: <http://conservativehome.blogs.com/torydiary/2008/05/the-leaders-of.html> [Accessed 26/04/09]
  27. MULVEY, S., 2005. *Tory MEPs to fight Cameron plan* [online]. Available from: [http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk\\_politics/4507516.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/4507516.stm) [Accessed 26/04/09]
  28. NORTH, R., 2004. *Myth of the Week: The EU is a free trade area?* [online]. <http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2004/05/myth-of-week.html> [Accessed 25/01/09]
  29. NORTH, R., 2006. *Booker column censored* [online]. Available from: <http://eureferendum.blogspot.com/2006/12/booker-column-censored.html> [Accessed 25/01/09]

30. OSBORNE, G., 2008. *George Osborne: Speech to the Green Alliance* [online]. Available from: [http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2008/07/George Osborne Speech to the Green Alliance.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2008/07/George%20Osborne%20Speech%20to%20the%20Green%20Alliance.aspx) [Accessed 26/04/09]
31. PHILLIPS, M., 2005. Having it all [online]. 30 December, *The Daily Mail*. Available from: <http://www.melaniephillips.com/articles-new/?p=380> [Accessed 14/02/09]
32. PIERCE, A., 2005. Horror as Cameron brandishes the B word [online]. 5 October, *The Times*. Available from: <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/politics/article574814.ece> [Accessed 26/04/09]
33. POLITICS.CO.UK, 2006. *MEP slams humiliating EPP delay* [online]. 1 August, Politics.co.uk. Available from: [http://www.politics.co.uk/news/foreign-policy/mep-slams-humiliating-epp-delay-\\$446458.htm](http://www.politics.co.uk/news/foreign-policy/mep-slams-humiliating-epp-delay-$446458.htm) [Accessed 26/04/09]
34. RAWNSLEY, A., 2005. Blairism lives - in the Conservatives: Contenders for the Tory leadership show that their party is finally beginning to grasp why they lost the last three elections [online]. 2 October, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/oct/02/toryleadership2005.labourconference> [Accessed 08/02/09]
35. RENTOUL, J., 2006. Cameron's first year: not bad, Dave [online]. 3 December, *The Independent*. Available from: <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/john-rentoul/john-rentoul-camersons-first-year-not-bad-dave-426756.html> [Accessed 26/03/09]
36. SCRUTON, R., 2009. This 'right' for gays is an injustice to children [online]. 1 March, *The Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/personal-view/3636798/This-right-for-gays-is-an-injustice-to-children.html> [Accessed 02/03/09]
37. STRATTON, A., 2009. Ken Clarke warned Tories Barack Obama would snub a 'Euro-sceptic' UK [online]. 21 January, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/jan/21/ken-clarke-europe-barack-obama> [Accessed 21/01/09]
38. THE PARLIAMENT.COM, 2009. *British Tory MEP condemns party leader over EPP-ED opt out* [online]. Available from: <http://www.theparliament.com/latestnews/news-article/newsarticle/british-tory-mep-condemns-party-leader-over-epp-ed-opt-out/> [Accessed 26/04/09]
39. THOMPSON, D., 2001. We must resist the Blairing of Britain [online]. 23 August, *The Telegraph*. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/4254170/We-must-resist-the-Blairing-of-Britain.html> [Accessed 26/04/09]
40. WATT, N. & WINTOUR, P., 2009. Michael Gove Interview: We are carrying forward the Blair agenda [online]. 25 April, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/apr/25/michael-gove-interview> [Accessed 25/04/09]
41. WATT, N., 2004. Howard endorses gay partnerships [online]. 10 February, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/feb/10/uk.gayrights> [Accessed 26/04/09]
42. WATT, N., 2006. *Cameron to postpone creation of new EU group* [online]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/jul/13/uk.eu> [Accessed 26/04/09]
43. WINNETT, R., 2008. Embryo bill: David Cameron voted for human-animal hybrids over disabled son [online]. 21 May, *The Telegraph*. Available from:

- <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newsttopics/politics/1994552/Embryo-bill-David-Cameron-voted-for-human-animal-hybrids-over-disabled-son.html> [Accessed 26/04/09]
44. WINTOUR, P., 2006. Cameron pledges to firm up green credentials with carbon levy [online]. 21 April, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/apr/21/uk.conservatives> [Accessed 26/04/09]
  45. HOFFMANN, L., 2009. *The Universality of Human Rights* [online]. Available from: [http://www.jsboard.co.uk/downloads/Hoffmann\\_2009\\_JSB\\_Annual\\_Lecture\\_Universality\\_of\\_Human\\_Rights.doc](http://www.jsboard.co.uk/downloads/Hoffmann_2009_JSB_Annual_Lecture_Universality_of_Human_Rights.doc) [Accessed 28/04/09]
  46. WOODWARD, W., 2006. Cameron promises UK bill of rights to replace Human Rights Act. 26 June, *The Guardian*. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/jun/26/uk.humanrights> [Accessed 03/04/09]

#### Broadcast

1. START THE WEEK WITH ANDREW MARR, 2007. [RADIO programme] BBC, BBC Radio 4, 23 March 2007 09.00.
2. TOFF AT THE TOP, 2007. [TV programme] CHANNEL FOUR, Channel 4, 26 March 2007 20.00.