

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. Vol. Law in context.

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. Vol. Constitutional systems of the world. Oxford, UK: Hart Publishing; 2012.

9.

Loughlin M. The British constitution: a very short introduction. First edition. Vol. Very Short Introductions. 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. Vol. volume 8. 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. Vol. Clarendon law series. 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. Vol. Law in context series. 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]. 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):144–54. 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):163–71. 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]. 1997;(113(Jul)):443–52. 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]. 2009;(Jul):519–43. 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]. 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]. Vol. Cambridge studies in constitutional law. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2010.

Available from:

<http://lib.mylibrary.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]. 1997;467-87. 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):155-62. 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]. 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/9780199267880.001.00>

01

45.

Jowell J. Parliamentary sovereignty under the new constitutional hypothesis. Public Law [Internet]. 2006;(Aut):562–80. 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]. 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]. 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]. 2014;(Jul):373–92. 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]. 2014;10(3):379–92. 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]. 48(6):1915–44. 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]. 2013;(Jan):119–34. 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]. 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]. 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]. 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):286-97. 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):144–56. 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):135–9. 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]. 2010;(126(Apr)):222–50. 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):554–80. 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]. 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):671-95. 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]. 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]. 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]. 2003;(2):125-33. 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):859-82. 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]. 2015;(4):406–12. 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]. 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]. 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]. 2011;(127(Apr)):217–38. 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.

Coservatives 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]. 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]. 2013;(Jul):459–68. 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]. 2013;2:137-51. 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]. 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]. 2015;179(46). Available from: <http://0-www.lexisnexis.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=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]. 2004;(Win):829-52. 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]. 2008;(Win):668-93. 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]. 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]. 2005;(Sum):249–58. 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]. 2010;(126(Oct)):543–67. 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]. 2010;(Jan):110–39. 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):427–55. 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):273–99. Available from:
<https://0-academic-oup-com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/ojls/article/30/2/273/1505202>

98.

Gyorfi T. Between Common Law Constitutionalism and Procedural Democracy. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* [Internet]. 2013;33(2):317–38. 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):435–54. 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]. 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):151–62. 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):1113–35. 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]. 2014;(Jul):422–45. 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]. 2015;614–32. 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]. 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]. 2011;(127(Jul)):456–74. 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]. 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]. 2015;(131(Apr)):192–6. 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]. 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]. 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. Vol. Hart studies in constitutional law. 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.

123.

124.

125.

126.

127.

128.

Dow Jones Reuters Business Interactive LLC. The spectator. 1994; Available from:
<http://0-global.factiva.com.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/en/sess/login.asp?XSID=S003sFo3sb90pFyMT7yMTEnNDUoOTUvMtm5DFHY96oYqZINFFBOUFBQUFBQUFBQUFBQUFBQUFBQUFBQU>

FBQUFBQUFBQUFBQUFB

129.

Public law. 1956; Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/wluk/app/external/path?ao=o.l66580770A29A11DB9A2D866D614A63ED&ddd=2&athens=true>

130.

Public law.

131.

William S. Hein & Company. The law quarterly review. 1885; Available from:

<http://0-heinonline.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/HOL/Index?index=journals/lqr&collection=journals>

132.

The Law quarterly review. Available from:

http://encore.lib.warwick.ac.uk/iii/encore/record/C__Rb1742833

133.

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

135.

Cambridge University Law Society, University of Cambridge, Cambridge University Press,

William S. Hein & Company. The Cambridge law journal. 1921; Available from:
http://0-journals.cambridge.org.pugwash.lib.warwick.ac.uk/jid_Clj

136.

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

137.

Oxford journal of legal studies. 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.

139.

Lee RG. Blackstone's statutes on public law and human rights 2010-2011. Vol. Blackstone's statutes series. 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. In: Constitutional and administrative law [Internet]. 15th ed. New York: Pearson Longman; 2010. p. 362-94. Available from: <https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=238b8e66-8543-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

143.

Craig P. Britain in the European Union. In: 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):202–15. Available from:
<https://contentstore.cla.co.uk/secure/link?id=cf77d1d2-8e43-e611-80bd-0cc47a6bddeb>

145.

McEldowney J. Parliament. In: 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. In: 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. In: 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>