Prolegomenon

The origins and purpose of this book are stated succinctly in its Preface. The need for an introductory prologue might seem superfluous, except for the circumstance that delayed its publication.

Sir Bernard Crick died on 19 December 2008 in St Columba's Hospice, Edinburgh, aged seventy-nine, having lived and worked for over two decades with the knowledge of incurable prostate cancer. The publication of this collection of essays is no more and no less than the fulfilment of an undertaking that Bernard wished to have seen through. It was not the most important academic piece of work that outlived him. (He was working on a political history of the United Kingdom, parts of which may or may not be recoverable from his papers.) However, it has significance beyond the content of the essays in being Bernard Crick's last initiative in an enduring project to advocate for a real improvement in British civic and political life by wholly embracing active and inclusive citizenship into our institutions and culture.

The difficulties for me have been to exert editorial authority without Bernard's clout and to provide an introduction that he would have written, undoubtedly with more insight, style and persuasiveness. It is the harder by this project becoming evidently my inheritance during Bernard's last days: it was something to discuss when there was nothing more to be said about hospice food, ministerial gaffs, the state of Labour, Edinburgh traffic cones, and lesser matters of life and death.

This collection is not to be elevated as a series of essays in honour of Sir Bernard Crick – although most of the contributors were his choice and were influenced by him. There is already such a collection edited by Ian Hampsher-Monk *Defending Politics: Bernard Crick and Pluralism* (1993), which was presented to him at the Oxford Political Thought Conference on his retirement from Birkbeck. Bernard would not have welcomed another *festschrift* – though he graciously tolerated this one. He admitted

‘there was some surprisingly good stuff in it’: a judgement which his annotated copy confirms. (Adrian Oldfield’s essay on ‘Political Education’ gives the best account of Crick’s intellectual heritage – a mixture of classical republicanism and moderate socialism.) But as Ian Hampsher-Monk points out, even to do justice only to Bernard’s contribution to the study of Politics would require volumes. This leaves aside his contribution to other forms of literature; his role as a commentator on public affairs in all forms of media and his active involvement with agencies responsible for delivering policy on citizenship.

Neither is this a place for another Crick obituary. There are plenty of these – most are informative, some fairer than others. There is good reason to expect, and look forward to, enduring discussion of his work in many forums. Crick was acknowledged in 2000 to be one of the five leading contributors to the study of politics in the second half of the twentieth century by the Political Studies Association, the professional body of university politics teachers. If the reader wants a short assessment of Bernard Crick’s place as a public academic, read Richard Hoggart’s brief but acute Foreword to *Political Thoughts and Polemics*, a collection of Crick’s essays published by EUP in 1990 – ‘a cousin in spirit of Orwell’. But better to read the man himself.

The background to these essays does merit some amplification. As mentioned in the Preface they derive, directly or indirectly, from Bernard’s last part-time academic appointment as Stevenson Professor of Citizenship at Glasgow University from 2006–7. The main responsibility of this appointment was to take charge of the programme of public lectures on ‘Active Citizenship’; this he did by giving the first and last lectures, choosing and chairing the speakers in between.

Crick’s approach to this appointment reflected his wholehearted endorsement of the rationale of the Stevenson Citizenship Trust Fund. It was set up in 1921 by a bequest from Sir Daniel Macaulay Stevenson (1851–1944) a Glasgow-born engineer, liberal politician and philanthropist who was both Lord Provost and Chancellor of the University. He was first a municipal socialist, committed to improving the horizons of Glaswegians by various means of public education (including the Sunday opening of museums and art galleries); and second, after the Great War, a proponent of international understanding and co-operation, whence he became a benefactor of the university, funding Language chairs and the lectureship in Citizenship. His brief for the Citizenship Trust Fund was as follows:

to make provision in Glasgow for instruction in the rights, duties, and obligations of citizens in relation to the city, the state, and the commonwealth of nations; and promote study, inquiry and research in subjects bearing on local

government, national polity, and international community; and thereby to emphasize the compatibility of civic or local with national patriotism, and of both with full and free international co-operation.

The first appointee to the part-time post was W. H. Hadow (as Derek Heater notes in his essay in this collection). Hadow like Crick was a Sheffield Professor who promoted ‘citizenship’ in the school curriculum. Sheffield and Glasgow share similar civic socialist traditions. For a period prior to Bernard’s appointment there had been an implicit acceptance that the public lecture had become a lesser instrument of civic education, so the Stevenson Trust Fund had been put to diverse uses to promote citizenship education; most recently to help fund a post in the Education Faculty to develop a Global Citizenship Unit, providing school teachers with a resource – clearly in the spirit of Stevenson, but departing from the format of direct public lectures.

The Stevenson Trust Committee decided to return to Stevenson’s original idea of public lectures. In Sir Bernard Crick they found the leading proponent of citizenship education in the UK to be a ready advocate for Stevenson’s vision. Crick had an abiding belief that universities ought to do more to bring town and gown together. He took on the task to revive the public lectures with typical commitment (and willingness to tread on corporate toes) – ‘you need inspiring speakers and better publicity’. The Stevenson Trust Committee are still working on the paradigm to the standard he set – it should be said with considerable success. (The Lectures from 2007–8 onwards are available to download on the Stevenson Trust website: www.gla.ac.uk/departments/stevensontrustforcitizenship.)

The essays that follow are somewhat less uniform in approach than was anticipated. The diversity in style in part reflects the diverse background of the contributors: they are a mixture of academic political actors and politician academics. Most of the essays significantly departed from the original lectures, and in many cases are newly commissioned. Where this is not the case, as with Crick’s lectures I have not sought to edit them, or add references where they are lacking. Rather I have invited academic colleagues to modify their normal standards of scholarly notation in the interests of speaking directly to the public (following Bernard’s injunction to excise unnecessary textual notes).

My approach in the following Introduction is to give occasional contextual information and briefly summarise what the essays contribute to the subject in the title of the book. Bernard would have wanted to comment more on what others have said; I have not sought to do this. Some authors acknowledge and draw on their engagement with Crick’s work; sometimes

Prolegomenon

I have explained the connections. Generally, the Introduction is to provide readers with an indication of what to expect from each chapter, not provide an essay which links them.

Andrew Lockyer
November 2009