LA201: General Principles of Constitutional and Administrative Law



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).

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

1	5	
	J	

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).

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.

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).

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.	
HS2 Alliance Case, https://www.supremecourt.uk/decided-cases/docs/UKSC_2013_0172_Judgment.pdf.	
51. Craig, P.: Constitutionalising constitutional law: HS2. Public Law. 373–392 (2014).	
$^{\circ}$ $^{\circ}$	

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.

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.

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).

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.

Obergefell v. Hodges No. 14–556, 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).

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.

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).

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).

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/ggg013.

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).

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).

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, (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).
Dow joines Reactive Dasiness interactive Ele The spectator. (1997).
129.
Public law. (1956).
Fublic law. (1930).
130.
Public law.
1.2.1
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/.

142.

Bradley, A.W.: The Courts and the Machinery of Justice. In: Constitutional and administrative law. pp. 362–394. Pearson Longman, New York (2010).

143.

Craig, P.: Britain in the European Union. In: The Changing Constitution. pp. 84–107 (2007).

144.

Dyke, T.: Judicial review in an age of austerity. Judicial Review. 3, 202–215 (2011).

145.

McEldowney, J.: Parliament. In: Public law. pp. 59-94. Sweet & Maxwell, London (2002).

146.

Partington, M.: Law and Society: The purposes and functions of Law. In: An Introduction to the English Legal System. pp. 13–30 (2006).

147.

Turpin, C., Tomkins, A.: The Ideas of the Constitution. In: British government and the constitution: text and materials. pp. 33–137. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2007).