

LA201: General Principles of Constitutional and Administrative Law

[View Online](#)

1.

Bradley AW, Ewing KD, Knight C. Constitutional and administrative law [Internet]. Sixteenth edition. Harlow, England: Pearson; 2014. Available from:
http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb2741966

2.

Elliott M, Thomas R. Public law. Third edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press; 2017.

3.

Jowell JL, Oliver D, O'Cinneide C. The changing constitution. Eighth edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press; 2015.

4.

Leyland P, Anthony G. Textbook on administrative law. 7th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013.

5.

Craig PP. Administrative law. 7th ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2012.

6.

Harlow C, Rawlings R. Law and administration [Internet]. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press; 2009. Available from:

<http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=238868&entityid=https://idp.warwick.ac.uk/idp/shibboleth>

7.

Bingham TH. The rule of law. London: Allen Lane; 2010.

8.

Leyland P. The constitution of the United Kingdom: a contextual analysis. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing; 2012.

9.

Loughlin M. The British constitution: a very short introduction. First edition. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press; 2013.

10.

Bogdanor V. The new British Constitution. Oxford: Hart Pub; 2009.

11.

King A. The British constitution [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2009. Available from:

<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199576982.001.0001>

12.

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

13.

Horne A, Drewry G, editors. Parliament and the law. Second edition. Oxford: Hart

Publishing; 2018.

14.

Bamforth N, Leyland P, editors. Accountability in the contemporary constitution [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014. Available from:
<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199670024.001.0001>

15.

Tomkins, Adam. Public law. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.

16.

Campbell T, Ewing KD, Tomkins A. Sceptical essays on human rights [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2001. Available from:
http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb2662633

17.

Oliver D. Constitutional reform in the UK. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.

18.

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

19.

Turpin C, Tomkins A. British government and the constitution: text and materials [Internet]. 7th ed. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press; 2012. Available from:
<http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=329861&entityid=https://idp.warwick.ac.uk/idp/shibboleth>

20.

Allan TRS. The sovereignty of law: freedom, constitution and common law [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013. Available from: <http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199685066.001.0001>

21.

Kavanagh A. Constitutional review under the UK Human Rights Act [Internet]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2009. Available from: <https://www.dawsonera.com/guard/protected/dawson.jsp?name=https://idp.warwick.ac.uk/idp/shibboleth&dest=http://www.dawsonera.com/abstract/9780511724374>

22.

Young AL. Parliamentary sovereignty and the Human Rights Act [Internet]. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2009. Available from: <http://0-portal.igpublish.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iglibrary/search/HARTB0000473.html>

23.

Hickman T, Craig PP. Public law after the Human Rights Act [Internet]. Oxford: Hart Pub; 2010. Available from: http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb2544638

24.

Brady ADP. Proportionality and deference under the UK Human Rights Act: an institutionally sensitive approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2012.

25.

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

26.

Thoburn v Sunderland City Council [2002] EWHC 195 (Admin) (18 February 2002) [Internet]. Available from: <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* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2002;(Aut):399–406. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I79F6E3A1E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

28.

Barber NW. The afterlife of Parliamentary sovereignty. *International Journal of Constitutional Law* [Internet]. 2011;9(1):144–154. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/icon/mor023>

29.

Young AL. Sovereignty: Demise, afterlife, or partial resurrection? *International Journal of Constitutional Law* [Internet]. 2011;9(1):163–171. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/icon/mor028>

30.

Allan TRS. Parliamentary sovereignty: law, politics, and revolution. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 1997;(113(Jul)):443–452. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I79F70AB0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

31.

Gordon M. The conceptual foundations of parliamentary sovereignty: reconsidering Jennings and Wade. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2009;(Jul):519–543. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I3E10D5B1727E11DE8047B748D67C18CA>

32.

Goldsworthy JD. *The sovereignty of Parliament: history and philosophy* [Internet]. Oxford: Clarendon; 2001. Available from:

<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199248087.001.0001>

33.

Laws J. Law and democracy. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 1995;(Spr):72–93. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID390A520E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

34.

Goldsworthy JD. Parliamentary sovereignty: contemporary debates [Internet]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2010. Available from:
<http://lib.myilibrary.com/browse/open.asp?id=277078&entityid=https://idp.warwick.ac.uk/idp/shibboleth>

35.

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

36.

Rawlings R, Leyland P, Young AL, editors. Sovereignty and the law: domestic, European and international perspectives [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2014. Available from:
<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199684069.001.0001>

37.

MacCormick N. Beyond the Sovereign State. The Modern Law Review [Internet]. 1993;56(1):1–18. Available from:
<http://0-www.jstor.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/stable/1096572>

38.

Craig PP. Formal and substantive conceptions of the rule of law: an analytical framework.

Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 1997;467–487. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID15274F0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

39.

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

40.

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

41.

Allan TRS. Questions of legality and legitimacy: Form and substance in British constitutionalism. International Journal of Constitutional Law [Internet]. 2011;9(1):155–162. Available from:
<http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/icon/mor017>

42.

Young AL. Rule of Law in the United Kingdom: Formal or Substantive, The. Vienna Online Journal on International Constitutional Law 6 (Law Journal Library) [Internet]. Wien, Austria: Universität Wien; 2012;6(1995–5855). Available from:
http://0-heinonline.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/vioincl6&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=259

43.

Allan TRS. Law, liberty, and justice: the legal foundations of British constitutionalism. Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1994.

44.

Allan TRS. Constitutional justice: a liberal theory of the rule of law [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005. Available from:

<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199267880.001.0001>

45.

Jowell J. Parliamentary sovereignty under the new constitutional hypothesis. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2006;(Aut):562–580. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IF0D05E100D4A11DB9253D431BB978268>

46.

Woolf, Lord. Droit public - English style. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 1995;(Spr):57–71. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID38EF770E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

47.

Sedley S. Human rights: a twenty-first century agenda. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 1995;(Aut):386–400. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID38FBAC0E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

48.

European Communities Act 1972 [Internet]. Statute Law Database; Available from: <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) [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1990/7.html>

50.

HS2 Alliance Case [Internet]. Available from: https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/UKSC_2013_0172_Judgment.pdf

51.

Craig P. Constitutionalising constitutional law: HS2. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2014;(Jul):373–392. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID5A13AB0F30B11E385A2E4EF39C65A9A>

52.

Elliott M. Constitutional Legislation, European Union Law and the Nature of the United Kingdom's Contemporary Constitution. European Constitutional Law Review [Internet]. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; 2014;10(3):379–392. Available from:
<http://0-search.proquest.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/docview/1648045830?accountid=14888>

53.

Craig, Paul. The European Union Act 2011: Locks, limits and legality. Common Market Law Review [Internet]. Kluwer Law International; 48(6):1915–1944. Available from:
<http://0-www.kluwerlawonline.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/abstract.php?area=Journals&id=COLA2011074>

54.

Peers S. European integration and the European Union Act 2011: an irresistible force meets an immovable object? Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2013;(Jan):119–134. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IBA050BB03F0711E2990CBEA3BDA0BE6D>

55.

Gordon M, Dougan M. The United Kingdom's European Union Act 2011: 'who won the bloody war anyway?' European Law Review [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2012;37(1):3–30. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID13B043050A411E18A8AA01CC7CE21D9>

56.

Wade HWR. What has happened to the sovereignty of Parliament? Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 1991;(107(Jan)):1-4. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ICD256D10E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

57.

House of Commons - The EU Bill and Parliamentary Sovereignty - European Scrutiny Committee [Internet]. Available from: <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 [Internet]. Available from: <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 [Internet]. Available from: 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 [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2015;131:1-8. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I34BAA2907BAE11E49BBC911AA7DF78F5>

61.

Draghici C. The blanket ban on assisted suicide: between moral paternalism and utilitarian justice. European Human Rights Law Review [Internet]. 2015;(3):286-297. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I293F05E026F411E58A24809D3D7EB82F>

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 [Internet]. 2015;23(1):144–156. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/medlaw/fwu031>

63.

Mullock A. The Supreme Court decision in Nicklinson: human rights, criminal wrongs and the dilemma of death. Professional Negligence [Internet]. 2015;31(1):18–28. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I9DF4F830B51711E49F8488D430410EF0>

64.

Beaton R. The Boundaries of Proportionality Review and the End of Life. Judicial Review [Internet]. 2014;19(3):135–139. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.5235/10854681.19.3.135>

65.

Kavanagh A. Defending deference in public law and constitutional theory. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2010;(126(Apr)):222–250. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IF3B510D22E5211DFBE2FA967ED04D069>

66.

Young AL. In Defence of Due Deference. Modern Law Review [Internet]. 2009;72(4):554–580. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1111/j.1468-2230.2009.00757.x>

67.

Allan TRS. Judicial deference and judicial review: legal doctrine and legal theory. Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2011;(127(Jan)):96–117. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app>

/document?docguid=I20DA9E6008C611E0A451F66F817AC0EE

68.

Allan TRS. Human Rights and Judicial Review: A Critique of "Due Deference". The Cambridge Law Journal [Internet]. 2006;65(3):671–695. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1017/S0008197306007264>

69.

Clayton R. Judicial deference and 'democratic dialogue': the legitimacy of judicial intervention under the Human Rights Act 1998. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2004;(Spr):33–47. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I84927EF0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

70.

Jowell J. Judicial deference: servility, civility or institutional capacity? Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2003;592–601. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I8487F7A0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

71.

Klug F. Judicial deference under the Human Rights Act 1998. European Human Rights Law Review [Internet]. London: Sweet and Maxwell; 2003;(2):125–133. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I84A25D70E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

72.

Edwards RA. Judicial Deference under the Human Rights Act. Modern Law Review [Internet]. 2002;65(6):859–882. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1111/1468-2230.00413>

73.

Obergefell v. Hodges No. 14–556 [Internet]. Supreme Court of the United States; 2014.

Available from: http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/14pdf/14-556_3204.pdf

74.

Wells CE. *Obergefell v Hodges*. *European Human Rights Law Review* [Internet]. London: Sweet and Maxwell; 2015;(4):406–412. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I88B2E3B0411211E59CB8B97FD04D5F6C>

75.

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

76.

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

77.

Young AL. *Ghaidan v Godin-Mendoza: avoiding the deference trap*. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2005;(Spr):23–34. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I8499AAE0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

78.

Kavanagh A. *The Role of Parliamentary Intention in Adjudication under the Human Rights Act 1998*. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [Internet]. 2006;26(1):179–206. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/ojls/gqi049>

79.

Young AL. *Is dialogue working under the Human Rights Act 1998?* *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2011;773–800. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID7EAF690E23C11E080A9C399189E1576>

80.

Sales P, Ekins R. Rights-consistent interpretation and the Human Rights Act 1998. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2011;(127(Apr)):217-238.

Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I7DFA62304E5611E0B91FA9F94CE59879>

81.

Moj. Commission on a Bill of Rights: The Choice Before Us [Internet]. IMB; Available from: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130206065653/https://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/about/cbr/uk-bill-rights-vol-1.pdf>

82.

Conservatives on Bill of Rights [Internet]. Available from:

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* [Internet]. London: Sweet and Maxwell; 2015;(1):1-8. Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IAD6D8CD0ADF811E4A8D6F1E3CD2AEA2E>

84.

Human Rights Act Reform | UK Constitutional Law Association [Internet]. Available from:

<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* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2013;(Jul):459-468.

Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I00EDF7D0D7C911E29A79B66BE8E69D4B>

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* [Internet]. London: Sweet and Maxwell; 2013;2:137–151. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I4BCCF680A3E811E2A94CA75C16A20EA4>

87.

Heydon JD. Are bills of rights necessary in common law systems? *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2014;(130(Jul)):392–412. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I7CAEEF40F31C11E3847EA720781C7CD8>

88.

Foster S. Repealing the Human Rights Act 1998. *Criminal Law & Justice Weekly* [Internet]. London: Lexis Nexis; 2015;179(46). Available from: <http://0-www.lexisnexis.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?lni=5HK8-1J01-DYJF-G17K&csi=280390&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

89.

Ewing KD. The futility of the Human Rights Act. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2004;(Win):829–852. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I84A8ED21E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

90.

Ewing KD, Tham JC. The continuing futility of the Human Rights Act. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2008;(Win):668–693. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I00EAB8B099A111DD9611E019A6BFBE26>

91.

Kavanagh A. Judging the judges under the Human Rights Act: deference, disillusionment and the 'war on terror'. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2009;(Apr):287–304. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IFC2512E1231F11DEBA18CA797BE6038F>

92.

Lester A. The utility of the Human rights Act: a reply to Keith Ewing. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2005;(Sum):249–258. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I84A43231E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

93.

Tomkins A. National security and the role of the court: a changed landscape? Law Quarterly Review [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2010;(126(Oct)):543–567. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I0756BA21C2CE11DFA880E34515B10C27>

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 [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2010;(Jan):110–139. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I67F11560E15B11DE88C6C8FBE711743E>

95.

Gearty CA. Liberty and security. Cambridge, UK: Polity; 2013.

96.

Murkens JEK. The Quest for Constitutionalism in UK Public Law Discourse. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. 2009;29(3):427–455. Available from:
<https://academic.oup.com/ojls/article-abstract/29/3/427/1533571?redirectedFrom=fulltext>

97.

Gee G, Webber GCN. What Is a Political Constitution? Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. 2010;30(2):273–299. Available from:
<https://0-academic-oup-com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ojs/article/30/2/273/1505202>

98.

Gyorfi T. Between Common Law Constitutionalism and Procedural Democracy. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. 2013;33(2):317–338. Available from:
<https://0-academic-oup-com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ojs/article/33/2/317/1547137>

99.

Poole T. Back to the Future? Unearthing the Theory of Common Law Constitutionalism. Oxford Journal of Legal Studies [Internet]. 2003;23(3):435–454. Available from:
<https://0-academic-oup-com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ojs/article/23/3/435/1585696>

100.

Himsworth CMG. Devolution and its Jurisdictional Asymmetries. Modern Law Review [Internet]. 2007;70(1):31–58. Available from:
<http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/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 [Internet]. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2005. Available from:
<http://0-dx.doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/0199258201.001.0001>

102.

Jones TH, Williams JM. Wales as a jurisdiction. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2004;(Spr):78–101. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I847E33A0E45411DA92358E85EE602D8A>

103.

Jones TH. Wales, Devolution and Sovereignty. Statute Law Review [Internet]. 2012;33(2):151–162. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1093/slr/hms023>

104.

McLean I, Peterson S. Transitional constitutionalism in the United Kingdom. Cambridge Journal of International and Comparative Law [Internet]. 2014;3(4):1113–1135. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I6587228063DF11E58BD8DD30ADE7CC2B>

105.

Aroney N. Reserved matters, legislative purpose and the referendum on Scottish independence. Public Law [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2014;(Jul):422–445. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID5A24C20F30B11E385A2E4EF39C65A9A>

106.

Elliott M. The Proposed Scotland Bill: The Constitutional Implications of Draft Clauses 1 and 2. SSRN Electronic Journal [Internet]. 2015; Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2557451

107.

Taylor RB. Foundational and regulatory conventions: exploring the constitutional significance of Britain's dependency upon conventions. Public Law [Internet]. Sweet & Maxwell: London; 2015;614–632. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I3A36A2305C5611E58916B963212E7CCD>

108.

Parliamentary Research Paper 04/31 [Internet]. Available from: <http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/RP04-31>

109.

Research Briefings - Individual ministerial accountability (2012) [Internet]. Available from: <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* [Internet]. 2000;6(3):73-92. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1080/13572330008420632>

111.

Barendt E. Separation of powers and constitutional government. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 1995;(Win):599-619. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=ID3936440E72111DA9D198AF4F85CA028>

112.

Barber NW. Prelude to the Separation of Powers. *The Cambridge Law Journal* [Internet]. 2001;60(1):59-88. Available from: <http://0-doi.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/10.1017/S0008197301000629>

113.

White R. Separation of powers and legislative supremacy. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2011;(127(Jul)):456-474. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I3C19CA009A2711E09D29F4D8A5F97F11>

114.

Stephenson S. The Supreme Court's renewed interest in Autochthonous Constitutionalism. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2015; Available from: <https://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/document?&srguid=i0ad6ada60000016436a303cb1194d14a&docguid=I4508F36010F311E5B853A6F356F47180&hitguid=I4508F36010F311E5B853A6F356F47180&rank=1&spos=1&epos=1&t=1&crumb-action=append&context=2&resolvein=true>

115.

Bjorge E. Fundamental rights at English (and European?) common law. *Law Quarterly Review* [Internet]. London: Stevens and Sons; 2015;(131(Apr)):192–196. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I9010B212C81111E4A0E9E7C45C1190E1>

116.

Masterman R, Wheatle S shauna. A Common law Resurgence in Rights Protection. *European Human Rights Law Review* [Internet]. London: Sweet and Maxwell; 2015;1:57–65. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=IAD718470ADF811E4A8D6F1E3CD2AEA2E>

117.

Clayton R. The empire strikes back: common law rights and the Human Rights Act. *Public Law* [Internet]. London: Sweet & Maxwell Stevens Journals; 2015;(Jan):3–12. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/app/authentication/sso/athens?redirect=/maf/wluk/app/document?docguid=I28D78E607B4611E4A15DE99780331015>

118.

Russell M. *The contemporary House of Lords: Westminster bicameralism revived*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2013.

119.

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

120.

Melton J, Stuart C, Helen D. To Codify or not to Codify? [Internet]. The Constitution Unit; Available from: <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 [Internet]. Centre for Political and Constitutional Studies King's College London; 2011. Available from: [http://www.parliament.uk/pagefiles/56954/CPCS%20Literature%20Review%20\(4\).pdf](http://www.parliament.uk/pagefiles/56954/CPCS%20Literature%20Review%20(4).pdf)

122.

A New Magna Carta [Internet]. 2014. Available from: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201415/cmselect/cmpolcon/463/463.pdf>

123.

Walter J, Finey W, Walter W, Walter J, Robinson HC, Stoddart J, Barnes T, Delane JT, Chenery T, Buckle GE, Dawson G, Casey WF, Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC. The times. London [England]: R. Nutkins; 1788; Available from: <http://0-infotrac.galegroup.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/itweb/warwick?db=TTDA>

124.

The guardian. [Charlottetown]: Public Archives of P.E.I.; 1980; Available from: http://0-www.bpe.europresse.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ip/intro.asp?user=WARWICK_T_1

125.

The economist. London: [Economist Newspaper Ltd.]; Available from: <http://0-search.proquest.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/publication/41716>

126.

New statesman. London: New Statesman Ltd; 1996; Available from: http://0-www.bpe.europresse.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ip/intro.asp?user=WARWICK_T_1

127.

128.

129.

130.

131.

132.

133.

22/25

England: Stevens & Sons; 1937; Available from:
[http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/journal/10.1111/\(ISSN\)1468-2230](http://0-onlinelibrary.wiley.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/journal/10.1111/(ISSN)1468-2230)

134.

The Modern law review. Oxford, UK: Published for the Modern Law Review Ltd. by Blackwell Publishers [etc.];

135.

Cambridge University Law Society, University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, William S. Hein & Company. The Cambridge law journal. London: Published by Stevens & Sons, for the Cambridge University Law Society; 1921; Available from:
http://0-journals.cambridge.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/jid_Clj

136.

The Cambridge law journal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; Available from:
http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1737980

137.

Oxford journal of legal studies. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press; Available from:
http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1743939

138.

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

139.

Lee RG. Blackstone's statutes on public law and human rights 2010-2011. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.

140.

Legislation.gov.uk [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga>

141.

British and Irish Legal Information Institute [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bailii.org/>

142.

Bradley AW. The Courts and the Machinery of Justice. Constitutional and administrative law [Internet]. 15th ed. New York: Pearson Longman; 2010. p. 362–394. Available from: <https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=238b8e66-8543-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

143.

Craig P. Britain in the European Union. The Changing Constitution [Internet]. 2007. p. 84–107. Available from: <https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=fe132c05-8b43-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

144.

Dyke T. Judicial review in an age of austerity. Judicial Review [Internet]. 2011;3(16):202–215. Available from: <https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=cf77d1d2-8e43-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

145.

McEldowney J. Parliament. Public law [Internet]. 3rd ed. London: Sweet & Maxwell; 2002. p. 59–94. Available from: <https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=dc70e3c1-b143-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

146.

Partington M. Law and Society: The purposes and functions of Law. An Introduction to the English Legal System [Internet]. 2006. p. 13–30. Available from:
<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=d59df230-bd43-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

147.

Turpin C, Tomkins A. The Ideas of the Constitution. British government and the constitution: text and materials [Internet]. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2007. p. 33–137. Available from:
<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=cd674a39-dc43-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>