


Austin
Texas 78746-8032

1 May 1997

Dear Madam/Sir

I write following the broadcast on the evening of Sunday, 27 April of your programme on the British Parliamentary elections on C-SPAN, in place of the usual coverage of Question Time from the House of Commons. I am an English qualified lawyer who keeps in touch with developments back home through your channel and generally think your coverage of all political events is excellent. However, I was appalled by one commentator on the above programme. Frankly, I think the Adjunct Professor, Kendall Myers from the John Hopkins School of Law was poor, insulting and detracted from what could otherwise have been a fair impression of the election process in the UK.

What was he engaged to do? If he was supposed to deliver a learned "impartial" opinion on a fellow democratic system then he failed miserably. His explanations were woefully inadequate and, frankly, if I had been an American attempting to learn more about the British system I would have been left more confused than enlightened. He never explained how the two Houses of Parliament and the Queen interact in their respective constitutional functions nor on a practical day-to-day basis. He never gave an historic or overall picture of how the Houses operate or promoted a better understanding of what all the televised processions, debates from each House, Question Time itself, etc. meant. Instead we got pictures of apparent "decadent" rituals without proper explanation of their significance (if any) and gossip on what the Queen Mother is called in the UK and what family problems have faced the Queen!

Further, what explanations he did give were muddled, incomplete and so obviously tainted with his own biased opinions they were derisory. He was blatantly wrong on occasions e.g. Question Time does not take place every day; it occurs twice a week, on Tuesday and Thursday (and may change if Tony Blair gets in). It is a gross insult, too, to describe the House of Lords and the Monarchy as "anachronistic". Not only does it display his ignorance as to the significance of their respective roles (perhaps he would do well to read up on how their contemporary functions have evolved and track a piece of legislation, seeing the effects the Lords can have on its content), it reeks of a personal, narrow-minded conviction that democracy based on the American system is the only system. I beg to differ.

0-3215

In any event, this has no place on such a programme. Further, it becomes a little irritating to listen to such ill-thought out responses, tainted with bias and ignorance, displayed as learned opinion on an apparent teaching programme. As my husband says "he makes us look good" and, in this instance, certainly made the next speaker, Martin Walker, look outstanding. One tries not to judge everything according to what one is used to being understood back in the UK but I am afraid in this case, Mr Myers left me fuming.

Could I suggest that if you need an adviser in future you engage someone who knows something about the British democratic system, like an English Law Professor or even Lord St John-Stevas, the constitutional specialist in the House of Lords? I am sure both would willingly give their time and knowledge, leaving your viewers to make up their own minds about which system they prefer.

Yours faithfully

