

# LA201: General Principles of Constitutional and Administrative Law

[View Online](#)

---

1.

Bradley, A.W., Ewing, K.D., Knight, C.: Constitutional and administrative law. Pearson, Harlow, England (2014).

2.

Elliott, M., Thomas, R.: Public law. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2017).

3.

Jowell, J.L., Oliver, D., O'Cinneide, C.: The changing constitution. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2015).

4.

Leyland, P., Anthony, G.: Textbook on administrative law. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2013).

5.

Craig, P.P.: Administrative law. Sweet & Maxwell, London (2012).

6.

Harlow, C., Rawlings, R.: Law and administration. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2009).

7.

Bingham, T.H.: The rule of law. Allen Lane, London (2010).

8.

Leyland, P.: The constitution of the United Kingdom: a contextual analysis. Hart Publishing, Oxford, UK (2012).

9.

Loughlin, M.: The British constitution: a very short introduction. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom (2013).

10.

Bogdanor, V.: The new British Constitution. Hart Pub, Oxford (2009).

11.

King, A.: The British constitution. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2009).

12.

Bogdanor, V., British Academy: The British constitution in the twentieth century. Published for the British Academy by Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003).

13.

Horne, A., Drewry, G. eds: Parliament and the law. Hart Publishing, Oxford (2018).

14.

Bamforth, N., Leyland, P. eds: Accountability in the contemporary constitution. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2014).

15.

Tomkins, Adam: Public law. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003).

16.

Campbell, T., Ewing, K.D., Tomkins, A.: Sceptical essays on human rights. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2001).

17.

Oliver, D.: Constitutional reform in the UK. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2003).

18.

Johnson, Nevil: Reshaping the British constitution: essays in political interpretation. Palgrave Macmillan, Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire (2004).

19.

Turpin, C., Tomkins, A.: British government and the constitution: text and materials. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK (2012).

20.

Allan, T.R.S.: The sovereignty of law: freedom, constitution and common law. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2013).

21.

Kavanagh, A.: Constitutional review under the UK Human Rights Act. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2009).

22.

Young, A.L.: Parliamentary sovereignty and the Human Rights Act. Hart Publishing, Oxford (2009).

23.

Hickman, T., Craig, P.P.: Public law after the Human Rights Act. Hart Pub, Oxford (2010).

24.

Brady, A.D.P.: Proportionality and deference under the UK Human Rights Act: an institutionally sensitive approach. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2012).

25.

Jackson and others (Appellants) v. Her Majesty's Attorney General. [2005] UKHL 56, <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldjudgmt/jd051013/jack.pdf>.

26.

Thoburn v Sunderland City Council [2002] EWHC 195 (Admin) (18 February 2002), <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2002/195.html>.

27.

Campbell, D., Young, J.: The metric martyrs and the entrenchment jurisprudence of Lord Justice Laws. Public Law. 399–406 (2002).

28.

Barber, N.W.: The afterlife of Parliamentary sovereignty. International Journal of Constitutional Law. 9, 144–154 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mor023>.

29.

Young, A.L.: Sovereignty: Demise, afterlife, or partial resurrection? International Journal of Constitutional Law. 9, 163–171 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mor028>.

30.

Allan, T.R.S.: Parliamentary sovereignty: law, politics, and revolution. *Law Quarterly Review*. 443–452 (1997).

31.

Gordon, M.: The conceptual foundations of parliamentary sovereignty: reconsidering Jennings and Wade. *Public Law*. 519–543 (2009).

32.

Goldsworthy, J.D.: *The sovereignty of Parliament: history and philosophy*. Clarendon, Oxford (2001).

33.

Laws, J.: Law and democracy. *Public Law*. 72–93 (1995).

34.

Goldsworthy, J.D.: *Parliamentary sovereignty: contemporary debates*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2010).

35.

Wicks, E.: *The evolution of a constitution: eight key moments in British constitutional history*. Hart Pub, Oxford (2006).

36.

Rawlings, R., Leyland, P., Young, A.L. eds: *Sovereignty and the law: domestic, European and international perspectives*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2014).

37.

MacCormick, N.: Beyond the Sovereign State. *The Modern Law Review*. 56, 1–18 (1993).

38.

Craig, P.P.: Formal and substantive conceptions of the rule of law: an analytical framework. *Public Law*. 467–487 (1997).

39.

Entick v Carrington & Ors [1765] EWHC KB J98 (02 November 1765),  
<http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/KB/1765/J98.html>.

40.

M v Home Office [1993] UKHL 5 (27 July 1993),  
<http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1993/5.html>.

41.

Allan, T.R.S.: Questions of legality and legitimacy: Form and substance in British constitutionalism. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. 9, 155–162 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mor017>.

42.

Young, A.L.: Rule of Law in the United Kingdom: Formal or Substantive, The. *Vienna Online Journal on International Constitutional Law* 6 (Law Journal Library). 6, (2012).

43.

Allan, T.R.S.: *Law, liberty, and justice: the legal foundations of British constitutionalism*. Clarendon Press, Oxford (1994).

44.

Allan, T.R.S.: *Constitutional justice: a liberal theory of the rule of law*. Oxford University

Press, Oxford (2005).

45.

Jowell, J.: Parliamentary sovereignty under the new constitutional hypothesis. Public Law. 562–580 (2006).

46.

Woolf, Lord: Droit public - English style. Public Law. 57–71 (1995).

47.

Sedley, S.: Human rights: a twenty-first century agenda. Public Law. 386–400 (1995).

48.

European Communities Act 1972, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1972/68/contents>.

49.

R v Secretary of State for Transport ex p Factortame Ltd (Interim Relief Order) [1990] UKHL 7 (26 July 1990), <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1990/7.html>.

50.

HS2 Alliance Case,  
[https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/UKSC\\_2013\\_0172\\_Judgment.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/UKSC_2013_0172_Judgment.pdf).

51.

Craig, P.: Constitutionalising constitutional law: HS2. Public Law. 373–392 (2014).

52.

Elliott, M.: Constitutional Legislation, European Union Law and the Nature of the United Kingdom's Contemporary Constitution. *European Constitutional Law Review*. 10, 379–392 (2014).

53.

Craig, Paul: The European Union Act 2011: Locks, limits and legality. *Common Market Law Review*. 48, 1915–1944.

54.

Peers, S.: European integration and the European Union Act 2011: an irresistible force meets an immovable object? *Public Law*. 119–134 (2013).

55.

Gordon, M., Dougan, M.: The United Kingdom's European Union Act 2011: 'who won the bloody war anyway?' *European Law Review*. 37, 3–30 (2012).

56.

Wade, H.W.R.: What has happened to the sovereignty of Parliament? *Law Quarterly Review*. 1–4 (1991).

57.

House of Commons - The EU Bill and Parliamentary Sovereignty - European Scrutiny Committee,  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmeuleg/633/63302.htm>.

58.

House of Commons - The EU Bill: Restrictions on Treaties and Decisions relating to the EU - European Scrutiny Committee,  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201011/cmselect/cmeuleg/682/68202.htm>.



59.

R (on the application of Nicklinson and another) (Appellants) v Ministry of Justice (Respondent), R (on the application of AM) (AP) (Respondent) v The Director of Public Prosecutions (Appellant) [2014] UKSC 38,  
[https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/uksc\\_2013\\_0235\\_judgment.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/uksc_2013_0235_judgment.pdf).

60.

Finnis, J.: A British 'Convention right' to assistance in suicide? *Law Quarterly Review*. 131, 1–8 (2015).

61.

Draghici, C.: The blanket ban on assisted suicide: between moral paternalism and utilitarian justice. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 286–297 (2015).

62.

Wicks, E.: The Supreme Court Judgment in Nicklinson: One Step Forward on Assisted Dying; Two Steps Back on Human Rights: A Commentary on The Supreme Court Judgment in R (Nicklinson) V Ministry Of Justice; R (AM) V Director Of Public Prosecutions [2014] UKSC 38. *Medical Law Review*. 23, 144–156 (2015).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/medlaw/fwu031>.

63.

Mullock, A.: The Supreme Court decision in Nicklinson: human rights, criminal wrongs and the dilemma of death. *Professional Negligence*. 31, 18–28 (2015).

64.

Beaton, R.: The Boundaries of Proportionality Review and the End of Life. *Judicial Review*. 19, 135–139 (2014). <https://doi.org/10.5235/10854681.19.3.135>.

65.

Kavanagh, A.: Defending deference in public law and constitutional theory. *Law Quarterly Review*. 222–250 (2010).

66.

Young, A.L.: In Defence of Due Deference. *Modern Law Review*. 72, 554–580 (2009).  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.2009.00757.x>.

67.

Allan, T.R.S.: Judicial deference and judicial review: legal doctrine and legal theory. *Law Quarterly Review*. 96–117 (2011).

68.

Allan, T.R.S.: Human Rights and Judicial Review: A Critique of "Due Deference". *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 65, 671–695 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197306007264>.

69.

Clayton, R.: Judicial deference and 'democratic dialogue': the legitimacy of judicial intervention under the Human Rights Act 1998. *Public Law*. 33–47 (2004).

70.

Jowell, J.: Judicial deference: servility, civility or institutional capacity? *Public Law*. 592–601 (2003).

71.

Klug, F.: Judicial deference under the Human Rights Act 1998. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 125–133 (2003).

72.

Edwards, R.A.: Judicial Deference under the Human Rights Act. *Modern Law Review*. 65, 859–882 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.00413>.

73.

Obergefell v. Hodges No. 14-556,  
[http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556\\_3204.pdf](http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf), (2014).

74.

Wells, C.E.: Obergefell v Hodges. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 406–412 (2015).

75.

Bellinger (FC) (Appellant) v. Bellinger [2003] UKHL 21,  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200203/ldjudgmt/jd030410/bellin-1.htm>.

76.

Ghaidan (Appellant) v. Godin-Mendoza (FC) (Respondent) [2004] UKHL 30,  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200304/ldjudgmt/jd040621/gha-1.htm>.

77.

Young, A.L.: Ghaidan v Godin-Mendoza: avoiding the deference trap. *Public Law*. 23–34 (2005).

78.

Kavanagh, A.: The Role of Parliamentary Intention in Adjudication under the Human Rights Act 1998. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*. 26, 179–206 (2006).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqi049>.

79.

Young, A.L.: Is dialogue working under the Human Rights Act 1998? *Public Law*. 773–800 (2011).

80.

Sales, P., Ekins, R.: Rights-consistent interpretation and the Human Rights Act 1998. *Law Quarterly Review*. 217–238 (2011).

81.

MoJ: Commission on a Bill of Rights: The Choice Before Us,  
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130206065653/https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/cbr/uk-bill-rights-vol-1.pdf>.

82.

Coservatives on Bill of Rights,  
[https://www.conservatives.com/~media/files/downloadable%20Files/human\\_rights.pdf](https://www.conservatives.com/~media/files/downloadable%20Files/human_rights.pdf).

83.

Gearty, C.: On fantasy island: British politics, English judges and the European Convention on Human Rights. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 1–8 (2015).

84.

Human Rights Act Reform | UK Constitutional Law Association,  
<http://ukconstitutionallaw.org/tag/human-rights-act-reform/>.

85.

Klug, F., Williams, A.: The choice before us? The report of the Commission on a Bill of Rights. *Public Law*. 459–468 (2013).

86.

Elliott, M.: A damp squib in the long grass: the report of the Commission on a Bill of Rights. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 2, 137–151 (2013).

87.

Heydon, J.D.: Are bills of rights necessary in common law systems? *Law Quarterly Review*. 392–412 (2014).

88.

Foster, S.: Repealing the Human Rights Act 1998. *Criminal Law & Justice Weekly*. 179, (2015).

89.

Ewing, K.D.: The futility of the Human Rights Act. *Public Law*. 829–852 (2004).

90.

Ewing, K.D., Tham, J.-C.: The continuing futility of the Human Rights Act. *Public Law*. 668–693 (2008).

91.

Kavanagh, A.: Judging the judges under the Human Rights Act: deference, disillusionment and the 'war on terror'. *Public Law*. 287–304 (2009).

92.

Lester, A.: The utility of the Human rights Act: a reply to Keith Ewing. *Public Law*. 249–258 (2005).

93.

Tomkins, A.: National security and the role of the court: a changed landscape? *Law Quarterly Review*. 543–567 (2010).

94.

McKeever, D.: The Human Rights Act and anti-terrorism in the UK: one great leap forward by Parliament, but are the courts able to slow the steady retreat that has followed? *Public Law*. 110–139 (2010).

95.

Gearty, C.A.: Liberty and security. Polity, Cambridge, UK (2013).

96.

Murkens, J.E.K.: The Quest for Constitutionalism in UK Public Law Discourse. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 29, 427–455 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqp020>.

97.

Gee, G., Webber, G.C.N.: What Is a Political Constitution? Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 30, 273–299 (2010). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqq013>.

98.

Gyorfi, T.: Between Common Law Constitutionalism and Procedural Democracy. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 33, 317–338 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqt004>.

99.

Poole, T.: Back to the Future? Unearthing the Theory of Common Law Constitutionalism. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies. 23, 435–454 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/23.3.435>.

100.

Himsworth, C.M.G.: Devolution and its Jurisdictional Asymmetries. Modern Law Review. 70, 31–58 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2230.2006.00625.x>.

101.

McLean, I., McMillan, A.: State of the union: Unionism and the alternatives in the United Kingdom since 1707. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2005).

102.

Jones, T.H., Williams, J.M.: Wales as a jurisdiction. *Public Law*. 78–101 (2004).

103.

Jones, T.H.: Wales, Devolution and Sovereignty. *Statute Law Review*. 33, 151–162 (2012).  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/slr/hms023>.

104.

McLean, I., Peterson, S.: Transitional constitutionalism in the United Kingdom. *Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law*. 3, 1113–1135 (2014).

105.

Aroney, N.: Reserved matters, legislative purpose and the referendum on Scottish independence. *Public Law*. 422–445 (2014).

106.

Elliott, M.: The Proposed Scotland Bill: The Constitutional Implications of Draft Clauses 1 and 2. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. (2015). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2557451>.

107.

Taylor, R.B.: Foundational and regulatory conventions: exploring the constitutional significance of Britain's dependency upon conventions. *Public Law*. 614–632 (2015).

108.

Parliamentary Research Paper 04/31,  
<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/RP04-31>.

109.

Research Briefings - Individual ministerial accountability (2012),

<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/SN06467>.

110.

Flinders, M.: The enduring centrality of individual ministerial responsibility within the British constitution. *The Journal of Legislative Studies*. 6, 73–92 (2000).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13572330008420632>.

111.

Barendt, E.: Separation of powers and constitutional government. *Public Law*. 599–619 (1995).

112.

Barber, N.W.: Prelude to the Separation of Powers. *The Cambridge Law Journal*. 60, 59–88 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197301000629>.

113.

White, R.: Separation of powers and legislative supremacy. *Law Quarterly Review*. 456–474 (2011).

114.

Stephenson, S.: The Supreme Court's renewed interest in Autochthonous Constitutionalism. *Public Law*. (2015).

115.

Bjorge, E.: Fundamental rights at English (and European?) common law. *Law Quarterly Review*. 192–196 (2015).

116.

Masterman, R., Wheatle, S.: A Common law Resurgence in Rights Protection. *European Human Rights Law Review*. 1, 57–65 (2015).



117.

Clayton, R.: The empire strikes back: common law rights and the Human Rights Act. Public Law. 3-12 (2015).

118.

Russell, M.: The contemporary House of Lords: Westminster bicameralism revived. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2013).

119.

Ballinger, C.: The House of Lords, 1911-2011: a century of non-reform. Hart, Oxford (2012).

120.

Melton, J., Stuart, C., Helen, D.: To Codify or not to Codify?,  
<https://www.ucl.ac.uk/constitution-unit/publications/tabs/unit-publications/162.pdf>.

121.

Blick, A.: Codifying – or not codifying – the UK constitution: A Literature Review,  
[http://www.parliament.uk/pagefiles/56954/CPCS%20Literature%20Review%20\(4\).pdf](http://www.parliament.uk/pagefiles/56954/CPCS%20Literature%20Review%20(4).pdf),  
(2011).

122.

A New Magna Carta,  
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmpolcon/463/463.pdf>,  
(2014).

123.

Walter, J., Finey, W., Walter, W., Walter, J., Robinson, H.C., Stoddart, J., Barnes, T., Delane, J.T., Chenery, T., Buckle, G.E., Dawson, G., Casey, W.F., Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC.: The times. (1788).

124.

The guardian. (1980).

125.

The economist.

126.

New statesman. (1996).

127.

Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC.: Prospect: politics, essay, review.

128.

Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC.: The spectator. (1994).

129.

Public law. (1956).

130.

Public law.

131.

William S. Hein & Company: The law quarterly review. (1885).

132.

The Law quarterly review.

133.

JSTOR (Organization), William S. Hein & Company: The modern law review. (1937).

134.

The Modern law review.

135.

Cambridge University Law Society, University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, William S. Hein & Company: The Cambridge law journal. (1921).

136.

The Cambridge law journal.

137.

Oxford journal of legal studies.

138.

Society of Public Teachers of Law (London, England): Legal studies: The Journal of the Society of Legal Scholars.

139.

Lee, R.G.: Blackstone's statutes on public law and human rights 2010-2011. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2010).

140.

Legislation.gov.uk, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga>.

141.

British and Irish Legal Information Institute, <http://www.bailii.org/>.