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Introduction

In his pioneering book on government ministers Jean Blondel (1985: 8) almost thirty years ago could convincingly claim that the study of individual ministers and their political careers was still in its infancy. Since then, however, this field of research has come a long way. The first systematic studies examined ministers from a recruitment perspective (Dogan 1989, Blondel/Thiebault 1991, Almeida et al 2003): where do our political leaders come from and how do they get into their leadership position. In some publications the emerging picture was complemented by a look at ministerial duration (or elite turnover) (Blondel 1985) and the consequences of personal characteristics on policy output (Blondel/Müller Rommel 1993, Chabal 2003). More recently a new wave of scholars is working more vigorously on opening up the black box of personnel politics inside the cabinet by analyzing the mechanisms of “hiring and firing” government ministers (representative for many others cf. Dowding/Dumont 2009). Thus, by now, most stages in the careers of government ministers are under some form of academic scrutiny. There remains one segment in a minister’s trajectory, though, that has hardly ever been looked at systematically: the continuation of a minister’s career after leaving cabinet office.

To this date, the only comparative analysis of post-ministerial careers is still Blondel’s chapter in a collaborative research project on government ministers in Western Europe (Blondel 1991). Looking at thirteen parliamentary and one semi-presidential (France) system he came up with a number of differences between the countries, but also with a general conclusion: in the European “cabinet government system” a ministerial position is “the apex of a political career and indeed of a career tout court” (Blondel 1991: 153). In general, it does not provide rewarding career opportunities for the time after leaving office (Blondel 1991: 173). Almost at the same time Keith Nicholls studied the political careers of US cabinet ministers. According to him, in the presidential US system a cabinet position provides incumbents with even less political capital for career advancement in the political sphere. However, in contrast to Blondel’s findings in Europe, cabinet service in the US seems to improve career opportunities in the private/business sector as it “can facilitate one’s entry into the executive suites and corporate boardrooms of America” (Nicholls 1991: 170).

In this article we argue that it is about time to resume the systematic study of post-ministerial careers where Blondel and Nicholls left it some twenty years ago. Apart from updating and
challenging some of their specific findings we want to initiate a comparative study of post-ministerial trajectories that allows for the integration of parliamentary and presidential systems of government. As a first step into this direction we offer some theoretical and conceptual deliberations as to why and how we should do so, revealing some general challenges for any kind of comparative research into this field. In the main part we will illustrate these problems in an exploratory study of two very different political systems: Britain and the US. Comparing the post-cabinet careers of one ministerial cohort from each country we not only identify significant differences between the two cases, but also some important similarities. Moreover, adapting/deploying analytical tools for the study of these two very different cases this paper is also meant to contribute to the long-neglected development of a comprehensive conceptual framework for the comparative study post-ministerial careers.

**Post-Ministerial Careers: Why and how we should study them**

The study of political careers has long been seen as part of elite studies. Perceiving politicians primarily as part of the elite, though, almost automatically directs the academic interest to top level positions (mostly national legislators and national ministers) and to a recruitment perspective. We want to know, how they became part of the elite. What they do after they leave their elite position, is seen as largely irrelevant, as – almost per definition – this is a pathway that is directing them away from the elite position under investigation. Recruitment studies – i.e. studies interested in the career trajectories before entry into a pre-defined institution or position – are thus a predominant field of career studies.

However, from a more explicit career perspective that seeks to understand the mechanics of professional political careers and the causes and consequences of particular career movements, the question what comes after position x is at least as interesting as the question what has preceded this position. In order to identify collective career patterns or idealtypical career ladders we have to look at completed careers. Similarly, the true role/function of a particular position for a career can only be assessed in retrospect. Thus, in contrast to their hitherto neglect in academic studies, the offices taken up after leaving the cabinet are of particular importance, if we want to locate the ministerial office in such a career ladder.
Whether a position can be seen as a springboard to higher office, a dead-end or an aim in itself depends not only on the characteristics of the very position (competencies, status, salary, staff, duration etc.) but also to a very high degree on the future opportunities it offers, i.e. the positions that usually follow. If these positions are generally perceived as less attractive or inferior, then the cabinet office might well be seen as the apex of a political career, as Blondel suggests for European countries. Frequent movements to other high offices, though, might suggest that a cabinet position can also be used as a stepping stone towards the real career aim. In some political systems the only superior office might be that of prime-minister or president. In others, though, chief executive positions at the regional or local level, or even a mandate in the national parliament may already be considered a step up. Movements into non-political private occupations may also affect our understanding of the cabinet office and the political career in general. A return back to a previous non-political occupation may signal a general lack of political professionalization, while the frequent cross-over into a particular occupational field (e.g. business, lobbying) may indicate that a successful career in the subordinate occupational field of politics is used as a stepping stone into a more attractive and superior private occupation. Further, some are required to look for alternative jobs when election removes them from their cabinet post. Thus the post-cabinet career is a result of intended and unintended career moves.

A particular relevance may be attributed to the study of post-ministerial careers when observed from the perspective of ambition theory. If we accept that “a politician’s behavior is a response to his office goals” (Schlesinger 1966: 9-10), than it makes sense to interpret/examine the pre-cabinet career of ministers as driven by their ministerial ambition. Moreover, assuming that incumbent ministers still hold further career ambitions, the same logic may well apply to their actual conduct in office.

The most notorious career interchange for cabinet ministers, is the so-called game of “revolving doors”. This notion entails the high frequency movement of individuals within the iron triangle of electoral politics, public administration and organised private interests. Representatives of business associations or professional groups are moving directly into the heart of government while in turn active politicians are lured with lucrative jobs in the private sector (Heclo 1978). Ambition theory would suggest that politicians and administrators who are switching to the other side of the triangle might have started to do so long before their public office ended, proactively grooming their potential new employers. Cabinet ministers
with their close and direct contact to the business sector may be seen to be much more prone to this game than ordinary legislators. In the conduct of their office they are gathering specialised expertise as well as invaluable political contacts and are thus likely to be wooed by interest groups and private companies. The special political relevance of post-ministerial career research thus stems from the expectation that the post-cabinet position government ministers aspire to may already exercise influence on them while they are still holding government office.

In this respect, the absolute number of movements is not necessarily the most important indicator. While only few minister will ever make it into the office of prime minister (largely because there is only one such office available), many more might gear their ministerial conduct in such a way as to maximize their chances to become the one. In general, striving for the premiership might not conflict with ministerial duties. However, ministers striving for office in an international organization or for a position in a regional/state or municipal government may well pay special heed to particular sectorial or territorial interests while serving the cabinet. This mechanism of “anticipatory obedience” might also play a role for less ambitious politicians. Senior office bearers (e.g. cabinet ministers) are often rewarded for their loyal services by their parties with well-endowed positions of varying degrees of political clout and public status (e.g. executive positions in party foundations, on the board of semi-public companies or even in the higher echelons of public administration). Again it seems not too far-fetched to assume that incumbents may be willing to “adapt” their behaviour in office in order to be considered for such a position.

Taken together we may conclude that an analysis of post-ministerial career pathways is an important contribution to a comprehensive understanding of the role and function of ministerial office in a professional political career as well as to a realistic depiction of the interface of political careers with the private sector. While the neglect of this field of study seems closely related to the limited research interest of elite studies (see above), it might also have something to do with the immense conceptual and methodological problems it entails.

For reversing the funnel perspective of traditional recruitment studies comes at a price. In terms of research pragmatics the most fundamental problem of post-ministerial research is to acquire the relevant career data. While recruitment studies with their clear institutional locus can retrieve information from official handbooks and websites or distribute surveys via
existing organizational channels, the study of career trajectories after an incumbent’s exit from a particular position or institution is much more difficult and tiresome as individuals are dispersed all over the place. Although modern information technology has come a long way and former cabinet ministers are among the most prominent persons in the newly available electronic media, multiple and often anonymous sources give rise to new problems. In general, follow-up studies are almost invariably tainted with high numbers of undocumented cases, some forms of selection bias and questions of reliability. In this small-scale exploratory study we collected information from a broad range of electronic sources double-checking them wherever possible. However, the cost of large scale follow-up studies proceeding in the same way would be immense\(^1\).

A related methodological problem of such a study is the lack of a pre-determined career endpoint. Ideally we would have to wait until the termination of political careers (and thus possibly until death) before we can include them in a sample. A fully blown sequence analysis would then entail each and every post held after exit from a pre-defined position, including questions of sequence, duration and multiple occupations. Again, this is an immense effort. The few existing follow-up studies of political careers have so far shied away from such endeavor, concentrating instead on only a few selected positions (Blondel 1991), the immediate follow-on position (Best/Edinger/Vogel 2008, Herrick/Nixon 1996) or the individual coding of post-ministerial career types on the basis of an evaluation of posts held until a particular point in time (Nicholls 1991). In our study we opt for a combination of these approaches in order to get a clearer look at a bigger stretch of the post-cabinet career.

A final problem regards the comparative study of post-ministerial careers across very different countries, especially across countries with a markedly different system of government. Here, it may be argued that it does not make sense to compare the post-office careers of politicians who had indeed been holding very different kinds of offices? In our study we reject such a view. While it is true that function, status and other aspects of the cabinet office differ considerably between parliamentary and presidential systems, this is not to say that they have nothing in common. Complementing comparative studies on legislative or cabinet recruitment (cf. Helms 2002) across systems of government, post-ministerial career studies thus will contribute to our understanding of these differences and variations. In order

\(^{1}\) We used several websites like electronic encyclopedias, online magazines, government websites to gather information for this exploratory study. Data are, however, not easy to come by and a more thorough and larger scale study would require much more time and financial resources to be spent on data gathering.
to record them in a meaningful way, however, we have to be careful in forming our analytical concepts, moving up the ladder of abstraction to the point of comparability between cases, while also providing a framework for a more detailed in-case analysis.

**Cabinet Ministers in Britain and the US**

In the following exploratory analysis we will compare post-ministerial careers of cabinet ministers in Britain and the US. We have selected these two cases because they are most different with regard to the institutional opportunity structures that condition career pathways both into and away from national cabinet. Empirical research on these two cases also suggests that actual career trajectories of cabinet minister in the US and the UK differ enormously. While we do not expect to contradict these findings in any substantial way, our aim is to spell out these differences (and potential similarities) more clearly and comprehensively by using a common analytical framework. Starting with two most-different cases compels us to widen our conceptual tools sufficiently to integrate the full breadth of cases that exist, while fine-tuning them in a way that allows us to depict even small yet meaningful distinctions. The institutional opportunity structure for professional politics in Britain and the US is fundamentally different in many of the most relevant aspects. Aside from the obvious difference in government structure (presidential vs. parliamentary systems), we feel that the differences in state structure (federal vs. unitary), the politicization of the higher administration (neutral or strongly political), the prominence of the political parties in the political process as well as the differences in the prestige of the cabinet post make the UK and the US and example of two most different cases. In this following section we outline how these might affect post-cabinet careers.

The most obvious case in point with regard to ministerial careers is the system of government. The British parliamentary system arguably provides the most comprehensive fusion of legislative and executive power. Cabinet ministers have to be recruited from parliament and they remain Member of Parliament (MP) throughout their ministerial service. The presidential system in the US with its strict separation of powers, on the other hand, exercises a stringent incompatibility rule. Cabinet minister must not be members of a legislative chamber. While recruitment from Congress is not prohibited, empirical studies also show very little direct movement from the legislative into the executive branch (Fenno 1966: 60, Bennett 1996: 128-30).
State structure (territorial order) is another fundamental difference between the two cases. The United States as a federal state offers a multitude of elected and unelected political positions on the state level, most notably state legislators, senators and governors. These positions are typically used as stepping stone towards federal office (Borchert & Copeland 2003, Stolz 2003), but may as well function as career focus in their own right (Squire 1988) or even as fall-back positions. By contrast, the United Kingdom is traditionally seen as a unitary state. While it has recently undergone significant territorial reform – the establishment of devolved authorities in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales in 1999 - this unitary character is still the formative framework for the majority of British politicians. In contrast to their (fewer) Scottish, Welsh or Northern Irish colleagues the vast majority of British politicians (those from England) have no means to pursue a professional political career on the regional level. Regional parliaments or regional cabinets thus cannot function as important recruitment pool or target arena for the UK cabinet and its members.

Another highly relevant difference is the politicization of the higher administration. While in the UK the principle of party political neutrality still governs the higher echelons of the civil service, the ministerial bureaucracy in the US remains highly politicized (Pollitt/Bouckaert 2000: 42) allowing for cross-over career movements to and from the political executive that are not possible in the UK. In addition, the high number and wider range of elected positions in the US (including positions in the legal system) adds an explicit political quality to many positions that are hardly perceived political in other countries. Again, this increases the potential for interchange with more clear-cut political positions, including the cabinet.

A fourth important discrepancy regards the role of political parties for the careers of politicians in general and more specifically for the careers of cabinet ministers. In Britain political recruitment is basically a function of political parties, while the introduction of primaries has largely stripped this task from their US American counterparts. Thus party interest is of vital importance for the prime minister when picking his cabinet team, while the US president remains more autonomous in his decision. Even more important for our purposes, though, is the capacity of British parties to reward loyal service (in cabinet and elsewhere) with a political position (e.g. in the House of Lords), that may not match that of Southern European partitocracies, yet certainly exceeds that of the two major US parties.
A final point is the vastly different function, power and prestige (attractiveness) that cabinet itself holds in the two political systems. While in the British cabinet government model a cabinet minister is part of a collective executive, US cabinet ministers are located at some distance from the unipersonal executive (i.e. the president) and function primarily as the administrative heads of their departments.

As a result of this vastly different institutional opportunity structure (that goes far beyond aspects mentioned) political career patterns in Britain and the US differ considerably (cf. Jun 2003, Borchert & Copeland 2003). In general, the realm of professional politics seems both wider and more permeable in the US. This contrast is particularly clear when studying the career pathways of ministers. British cabinet minister can generally look back at a long political career. These careers often follow a clearly defined career ladder a \textit{cursus honorum} that usually starts with party and/or local government office, proceeds with a parliamentary mandate at Westminster, before it ascents to a position of junior minister in the cabinet or shadow cabinet. It is from there that cabinet ministers are usually recruited (Jun 2003, Riddell 1993). By contrast, “In America there is simply no recognized reservoir of public men from which Cabinet leaders are drawn” (Fenno 1966: 85, see also Nicholls 1991). Instead cabinet ministers are recruited from different walks of life. Apart from elective politics and non-elective politics/administration the most important recruitment sectors are commerce and finance, academia, labor and the law (Bennett 1996: 121-131). Due to the different recruitment mechanisms the duration of cabinet ministers also differs considerably. In Britain cabinet tenure is generally longer (on average 4.8 years, Bakema 1991: 75) and may entail several portfolios, whereas in the US there is a higher cabinet turnover (Nicholls 1991).

Post-ministerial careers are less well documented. For Britain Blondel (1991) reveals the following features: almost all (98%) cabinet ministers return to Parliament, most of them (64%) for more than five years. However, a post-cabinet parliamentary mandate is usually either a form of retirement or a fall-back position from which to look for new career (Blondel 1991: 84). Hardly any of them (1%) moves into regional or local government. Given that only a quarter of ministers will return to the cabinet (Bakema 1991: 87), for the vast majority of ministers cabinet office is the apex of their political career. In contrast to many other European countries, though, former British ministers are provided with reasonable private sector opportunities. While only a small share (16%) return to their previous occupation (40%) enter a new job, most of them (30% of the full population) in the private sector.
For the US, the most detailed account comes from Nicholls (1991). In his study on the careers of initial cabinet appointments of newly elected presidents from 1789-1981, he distinguishes the immediate pre- and post-cabinet occupation of ministers from their general pre- and post-cabinet career. He also divides his population into two cohorts (pre-1896 and post-1896). In terms of developments over time, he depicts a clear historical trend increasing the importance of the business sector both as a recruitment pool (3x more likely than before 1896) and as a follow-up career (4x more likely) in comparison to the arena of government/politics (Nicholls 1991: 169). In the post-1896 period, immediate post-cabinet positions are to be found in government and politics (34 %), general business (26 %), law (private) (24 %) and other private sector (16 %) (Nicholls 1991: 168). While this result still has an occupation in the government/politics sector as the most likely succession to cabinet office, the actual share of ministers moving into political/administrative post-cabinet positions (roughly every third) is considerably lower than that of ministers coming from such a position (more than half of them, 51 %). Furthermore, if we shift our focus from the immediate post-cabinet position to the general post-cabinet career, a career in the general business sector is by far the most frequent career choice (46 %), while politics/government trails far behind (19 %) (authors’ calculations from Nicholls 1991: 168).

Taken together, these figures clearly point to the expected opposition between the Blondel’s and Nicholls studies. However, due to the manifold differences the authors made with regard to the definition of population, categories and concepts etc. the numbers are hardly comparable. Our study tries to remedy that.

**Post-cabinet careers in diverse institutional settings: a tale of two ministerial cohorts**

In the following we attempt to capture these differences but also potential similarities in an exploratory study of two ministerial cohorts: the cabinet ministers of John Major (1990-1997) in Britain and those of Bill Clinton (1993-2001) in the US. Both these cohorts fulfill a number of criteria that make them suitable for such a comparison. Ministers of these cohorts have served roughly at the same point in time (the 1990ies), the time span of the cabinet is about the same (7 years for Major and 8 years for Clinton) and the number of cabinet ministers is fairly similar (28 vs 37). Furthermore, these past cabinets have ceased to exist for more than ten years now, allowing us to scan a substantial post-ministerial career rather than just a short
post-exit phase. As both political parties, the British Conservatives and the US Democrats, have regained government office since their electoral defeat under Major and Clinton the cohort is also the most recent that allows to record potential ministerial comebacks.

In line with Blondel (1991), but in contrast to Nicholls (1991: 157) our cohorts include all members of the core cabinet. Interested in cabinet ministers in general we did not want to limit our population to any particular subgroup. This does not mean that we would not expect to see rather different career trajectories for various subgroups, defined by their time of entry, time of exit or perhaps even more meaningful their particular type of exit (Stolz & Fischer). Such a more differentiated analysis could and should be part of a future, more comprehensive study.

Our analysis is meant to capture both the main similarities and differences between our two cases as well as to give a more detailed account of how post-ministerial careers look like in each individual case. We therefore start our analysis with quite broad categories, narrowing them down in the course of the investigation. As stated above, our central question is whether ministers stay within the realm of professional politics or leave this arena for other occupational sectors. For those who do stay on, we want to know more about the type of political positions they took on after their cabinet exit (in order to evaluate the function of the cabinet position in the political career). For those who move elsewhere, we want to know to which sector they have moved and whether this is related to either their previous non-political job or their cabinet office (portfolio). Following Nicholls our basic definition for a political job is rather inclusive. It comprises of full-time elective mandates, executive positions and employees of political parties. As the political and administrative structure of Britain and the US differ considerably, so do the positions that are covered by this definition. In Britain we would include for example a seat in the House of Lords (HoL), if this seat is not accompanied by another occupation, while in the US elected legal positions (judges, attorneys etc.) can be considered a political occupation. Throughout our analysis we had to take a number of difficult coding decisions which are discussed in footnotes.

**Immediate post-cabinet positions**

---

2 As core cabinet members we defined in the UK all senior ministers of the cabinet and in the US we considered all the Secretaries heading their departments as core cabinet members. Excluded are the president and prime minister himself and the vice president. Further high ranking members of the US’ Executive Office of the President, like the White House Chief of Staff are excluded.
In a first step – again following Nicholls – we identified and coded the jobs/positions taken up immediately after cabinet exit. With regard to the most general distinction of immediate post-cabinet positions the evolving picture could hardly be more contrastive: While almost all of the ministers in the British case (34/37 and thus 91%) retained a position within the political sphere, not one of the US cabinet ministers did so. The British figure is hardly surprising and roughly in line with Blondel’s findings (though he did not distinguish between immediate and later positions). To a large extent it can be seen as a mere reflection of a structural characteristic: the parliamentary system of government (and its specific British interpretation). As all UK ministers have to be members of the Parliament, the vast majority simply retained this mandate beyond their cabinet tenure. This applies to the 13 MPs in the House of Commons (HoC) who lost their cabinet position during the Major’s administration, but also to 11 cabinet members who served the Major administration to its end in 1997, only to find their party to be in opposition when they returned to the HoC after the general election. Of course, the two cabinet members from the HoL also retained their life peerage, despite losing their cabinet position. However, apart from this automatic continuation in a political position, there were also 7 cases of former cabinet ministers stepping immediately into a new political/government office. This includes those who got themselves elevated directly to the HoL after losing HoC seat and cabinet office at the same time, as well as two cabinet members who got transferred directly to the positions of governor in a former colony (Chris Patten and Waddington). Applying individual coding decisions to life peers in the HoL with regard to their actual engagement in politics vis-à-vis any additional non-political position they hold simultaneously (see above) suggests that no more than four out of 37 cabinet ministers left professional politics the day they left cabinet.

In contrast to this almost automatic access to immediate fall-back positions within British professional politics, institutional structures in the US do not provide cabinet ministers with such an opportunity. Apart from the obvious effect of the presidential system of government (i.e. incompatibility rules) the rarity of direct movements into another political position may also be due to the limited role of political parties in the selection of candidates for public offices³. However, our result is not entirely consistent with Nicholls’ findings. In Nicholls’

---

³ As literature on the German case has revealed political parties are often very helpful in providing former high-ranking members with further positions either within the party organization or access to lists and seats for other elected positions (see Edinger and Schwarz). Also the example of the Malcolm Rifkind in the UK provides further illustration for the party helping a high-ranking member in his/ her continuation of the political career.
study of cabinet ministers between 1896 and 1981, more than half of them (51%) had come from a political/administrative position yet only 34% left into such a position. In the Clinton cohort a slightly lower share was recruited from the politics/administration sector (36.4%), yet none (!) of them retained a political/administrative position after leaving cabinet. This discrepancy might be explained as a peculiarity of our specific cohort, as the result of our deviant cohort definition, as an effect of divergent coding decisions or perhaps as rapid acceleration of a trend already identified by Nicholls (see above). Most likely it is a combination of all these factors.

New political positions

Opportunities for an immediate follow-up position (or their lack of), however, do not necessarily translate into longer term career trajectories. Nor do political fall-back positions necessarily reflect career ambitions. In a second step of our analysis we thus concentrate on the documented ambition of former cabinet members to continue in the political profession. Again we start with the most inclusive definition, counting all those, who have run for or were newly appointed to a political/government position since they lost their cabinet office. This measure discounts all those who simply completed the mandate they held concurrently to their ministerial office (whether as MP or member of the HoL) and did not re-enter the electoral competition since, yet it integrates those that re-entered or attempted to re-enter politics/administration at a later time. As to be expected this measure discloses a less stark contrast between our two cases, yet it hardly changes the overall picture: In the UK this group encompasses 22 former ministers (59.5%) (17 candidatures successful, 5 unsuccessful). In the US we counted at least 5/28 and thus 17.9% cabinet ministers with a sustained ambition in professional politics, 2 of them successful (7.1%), 3 of them unsuccessful (10.7%).

But what do the political ambitions and options of former cabinet ministers look like? We will first describe the two country patterns inductively summarizing the evidence from our two

---

4 There were no party-employees
5 Among the five unsuccessful is Malcolm Rifkind who unsuccessfully attempted to re-enter the House of Commons in 2001, but got ran successfully in a different constituency in 2005
6 Robert Reich (MA), Janet Reno (FL) and William Daley (IL) attempted to run for governor but withdrew or failed their candidacies before or at the primary stage.
cohorts. In a next step we will than compare the two cases using a common analytical framework.

**Britain**

The subsequent political career of John Major’s cabinet ministers – just like their prior political career – is basically a career in the Westminster Parliament. Of the 32 ministers who were recruited from the HoC, 22 even stood for another legislative period (17 of them successfully). While holding on to an existing mandate might be seen as a transitional career stage, the re-entry into an electoral campaign is clearly a deliberate decision to continue the political career. A similar explicit decision has been made by two of the ministers who had lost their parliamentary seat simultaneously with their cabinet office (Rifkind and Portillo in 1997). Taking up a non-political occupation at first, they prepared for a comeback and finally re-entered the Commons at a later stage.

The role former ministers take up in the House of Commons of course varies. However, in general former ministers are highly likely to hold important positions as shadow secretaries or committee chairs. As such former ministers form the inner core of the pool from which future ministers and party leaders are recruited. And indeed, two of Major’s former ministers (Hague and Howard) have got elevated to become Conservative party leader, leader of the opposition and thus prime minister in waiting. When the Conservatives finally regained the British government after 13 years in opposition at the general election of 2010 a younger candidate had taken over. At the level of cabinet minister, however, the new Conservative prime minister David Cameron provided three ministers of the Major cabinet with a ministerial comeback (Hague, Clarke, Young).

The ultimate destination for a majority of cabinet ministers however is the House of Lords. To this date 25 of John Major’s cabinet ministers – and thus more than two thirds of them – have actually ended up in Britain’s non-elected second chamber. This figure of course comprises life peers with very different career pathways. Some of them had been elevated to the HoL even before their cabinet appointment (2), some right after their cabinet exit (6) and others

---

7 i.e. Gillian Shephard who was Shadow Secretary of State for Transport, the Environment and the regions as well as Shadowleader of the HoC from 1997 to 1998; John Redwood Shadow Secretary of State for Transport, the Environment and the regions 1999 to 2000; Brian Mawhinney, Shadow Home Secretary 1997-1998; Tom King who served as the chair of the Intelligence and Security Select Committee from 1994–2001, selection, not complete data
some time during their post-ministerial career (17). Also their dedication to their legislative task in the HoL varies considerably. While some see it as a full-time occupation, others basically use it as retirement ornament or as a sideline to a more important non-political private occupation.

Apart from seats in the Westminster Parliament (and government) post-ministerial political positions of Major’s cabinet include that of governor in former colonies (2), Chris Patten was governor of Hong Kong from 1992 to 1997 and went on to become European Commissioner of External Relation; David Waddington served as Governor of Bermuda from 1992 to 1997.

US

In the US, by contrast, the continuation of a ministerial career in the realm of professional politics/administration is rather less clearly defined. Those of Clinton’s ministers that did pursue such an ambition seem to have aimed either for a state governorship or a post in the federal administration. None has run for Congress!

Of the five former ministers who have run for governor (Cuomo, Reich, Reno, Richardson, Daley) two have won their race. Both of them (Cuomo and Richardson) followed a fairly similar career track: they spend a transition period in the business sector, they pursued executive offices at the state level and then became state governor. This is a position, though, that might also function as a springboard for even the highest office. And indeed they have already been either tipped to enter the presidential race (Cuomo) or have actually done so (Richardson, 2008).

In order to compare the British and the US case with each other, but also in order to make them comparable to a more comprehensive comparative analysis, we represent these results applying some useful analytical categories/classifications.

The first classification reflects the territorial level of government on which post-ministerial political/administrative positions have been held or sought.

---

Table 1: Territorial level of post-cabinet political positions held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Nat. Level only</th>
<th>Nat. + reg./local level</th>
<th>Reg./local level only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of all</td>
<td>% of all</td>
<td># of PM in P/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>34¹</td>
<td>34/37</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>2²</td>
<td>2/28</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ in the UK, another 3 cabinet members ran (unsuccessfully) for a Westminster seat again
² in the US, Bill Richardson ran (unsuccessfully) for another post on the national level (president), while Bill Daley, Janet Reno and Robert Reich ran unsuccessfully for posts of governor

Table 1 clearly reflects the different territorial order of the two states. The relative lack of full-time political/administrative positions on the local and regional level in unitary Britain restricts post-ministerial movements into this direction considerably. However, the extreme result – no single minister of the Major cabinet has moved to a political/administrative position on the regional or local level – is most probably a cohort or party effect. The former Conservative ministers who opposed devolution in many parliamentary debates before 1997 were never the most likely candidates to move to the newly established devolved institutions.⁹

When drawn from the full cohort the share of former US cabinet ministers moving to the regional (state) or local political/administrative level is also rather low (3.5%). However, it is when represented as a proportion of those who continued their career in the political/administrative realm at all, that movements to the regional/local level become significant (50.0 %). This high share of “downward” movement is particularly surprising when viewed in the context of a mainly unidirectional – leading from local, to state, to federal level - pattern for US political careers in general (cf. Copeland/Opheim 2011).

Table 2: Former Cabinet members actively pursuing political office after their time in cabinet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Legislative only</th>
<th>Legislative + Executive</th>
<th>Executive only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

⁹ And indeed, a number of Labour ministers from the Blair cabinet (Donald Dewar, Alun Michael, Frank Dobson) did take such a path.
A second meaningful classification of post-ministerial political positions is one that distinguishes legislative mandates from executive positions. In the US where we have a strict division between the two, the cross-over of cabinet ministers into the legislative arena seems a rather limited phenomenon. As table 2 shows, not one member of the Clinton cabinet has won a Congress, a state legislature or a state senate seat, as indeed, nobody had run for a legislative mandate.\(^1\) In Britain, where the cabinet office itself is invariably held concurrently to a legislative mandate, there is no institutional boundary to be crossed. As a result most former cabinet ministers have moved back into the legislative arena, perhaps simply reflecting the relative lack of executive positions with a political edge (i.e. positions that are not civil service positions) in the British system.

An analytical distinction that is often used in US career studies (including studies on the cabinet, cf. Bennet) is that of elected vs. non-elected politics. In the US this classification is basically a distinction between front-line public offices and mandates (who are almost all elected) and positions that are somehow removed from the front-line or from the public (party offices, administrative offices etc.). In parliamentary systems, though, the election criterion would almost directly reproduce the legislative-executive distinction (as members of the political executive – in contrast to their colleagues in the legislatures - are usually not directly elected). In Britain this situation is further complicated by the fact that almost all members of a political executive are concurrently holding an elected mandate, while a considerable number of members in the legislative branch are in fact unelected (i.e. peers in the HoL). As

\(^1\) in the UK additionally 5 cabinet members ran for a legislative mandate again
\(^2\) in the US, 2 more members ran unsuccessfully for executive office on the state level, further 2 members that held executive level offices tried for other executive level positions (Richardson, successful for governor, unsuccessful for president; Daley held position as White House chief of staff, unsuccessful attempt running for governor of IL)

10 Again, this rather extreme result might be partly interpreted as a particular characteristic of this cohort as ministers of other cabinets did make such a move: Elizabeth Dole (Reagan cabinet and Bush sr. cabinet) ran successfully for the Senate; Tommy Thompson (Bush jr. cabinet) ran 2012 for the Senate, but lost.
the election criterion means different things in different systems, it seems not a helpful category for a comparative analysis.

In order to capture the original meaning of the election criterion we would have to distinguish front-line political positions from administrative, private or backroom jobs by specifying them explicitly. For this purpose we would suggest a simple model that may be adapted on a country by country base. We will define front-line political positions as legislative mandates and major government offices (chief executive + cabinet) on the national (federal) and regional (state) level as well as leadership positions in large local government authorities. We have excluded those British members who were only part of the House of Lords after their time in Cabinet, as their role in the HoL cannot be clearly defined as frontline political positions, unless they are recruited into cabinet again.

Table 3: Active political careers after cabinet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>front line political positions</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of all</th>
<th>% of PM in P/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P+C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P+C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19/37</td>
<td>19/34 64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24/37</td>
<td>19/34 64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>55.8 70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4/28</td>
<td>4/6 66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/28</td>
<td>6/6 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 P signifies those who held positions
2 P+C combines those who held positions, as well as those who ran for front-line positions

Applying this definition to our two cohorts closely replicates the results of the first two investigations as former Clinton ministers sought their front-line position as governors (state level, executive) state level, while Major’s cabinet pursued their front-line political career almost exclusively in the national parliament (national level, legislative). In general, British cabinet ministers very often continue their career in front line politics (51.3 %), while only few US cabinet ministers do so (14.3 %) or attempt to do so (7.1 %). While this category, thus, does not add much to our comparative analysis of the two cohorts, it remains an important category in a comprehensive comparative framework as it captures a highly meaningful distinction.
In order to decide whether the cabinet office is the apex of a political career, we would have to define the offices that rank higher on a political career ladder. This is of course a difficult and highly contentious venture. The status or attractiveness of a particular political position may not only vary considerably across countries, but also across different groups of politicians within a country. If we limit our analysis to the only non-disputed higher-rank positions - the vice-presidency and presidency in the US and the premiership in the UK – the result seems quite clear: none of Clinton’s cabinet has made it into the vice/presidency, neither has any of Major’s ministers become Prime Minister. This measure tells us something about the likelihood of such a career move. In both cases the likelihood of cabinet ministers to become chief executive of the national government is very low indeed. Thus, following the above definition, their cabinet office will remain the political career apex for almost all cabinet ministers.

However, this is to a very large degree a direct reflection of the availability ratio. In other words, as there is only one (or two, if we include the vice-president) position to be filled every four years, the share of cabinet ministers who can actually make such a step is highly restricted. If we reverse the perspective, though, and look at recruitment into the chief executive position over time, a big difference becomes obvious: since WWII not one US president has held a cabinet position before moving into the White House (and only one – Hoover - since 1900).\(^{11}\) By contrast, in Britain 10 of the 13 post-war prime ministers (and thus 77\%) had held a cabinet office before entering 10 Downing Street (5 of them, and thus 39\%, had held the Chancellor office).\(^{12}\) Thus, although for most ministers the cabinet office remains the apex of their political career, in Britain (unlike in the US) it can nevertheless be seen as “the” stepping stone to the ultimate top of the career ladder. Compared to the US, British cabinet ministers are thus much more likely to foster progressive ambitions.

But is for all those who do not make this ultimate step “to cease being a minister” really always “a form of decline” (Blondel (1991: 153)? Apart from a comeback in cabinet, a few positions might be evaluated to be on the same level as the ministerial office. Again this might vary from country to country, but we would put the chief executive position on the regional level (state governor or first minister of a devolved government) as well as the mayorship in a large city into this category. In the US, arguably, a senate seat (perhaps even a

\(^{11}\) Indeed, there is only one since 1990 (Hoover).
\(^{12}\) Those who did not are Heath, Blair and Cameron.
seat in the House) as well as a few leading positions in the Executive Office of the President (EOP) might also be included. In Britain, some international positions such as EU commissioner or post-colonial governor might fit the bill. Table 4 shows the result for our cohorts according to the different definitions we just developed.

Table 4: Cabinet comebacks and return into similar positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cabinet comeback</th>
<th>+gov (US)/first minister (UK)/mayor both</th>
<th>+ Other¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>% of all cab. Min.</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain (n=37)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US (n=28)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ This category includes the governors of former colonies for the UK and positions in the extended Cabinet or the Executive branch (EOP) for the US.

On the whole, British ministers leaving cabinet seem to have better chances for a ministerial comeback than their US counterparts.¹³ Three ministers of John Major’s cabinet (and thus 8.1%) have been re-appointed to a government ministry by David Cameron, while none of the Clinton cohort has re-entered cabinet. However, once we broaden our perspective to other jobs on a similar level, the image changes. In the US there are arguably more positions of a similar value to the cabinet office (governor positions etc.). And indeed, with 2 governors (Richardson and Cuomo, 1 White House Chief of Staff (Daley) and 1 member being part of the Executive Office of the President (Summers)¹⁴ four former ministers of the Clinton cabinet (and thus 14.2%) have reached such a position. Taken together, the likelihood of former UK and US ministers to re-enter the political career ladder on a similar position seems almost the same. Again, the rather low overall figures support the argument that the cabinet office is generally to be seen as the (terminal) apex of political careers in both countries. At the same time though, we should keep in mind that this does not mean that only a minority of ministers is striving to continue their career in a comparable or even higher position.

So far we have recorded whether former cabinet ministers have held political/administrative positions in their post-ministerial careers and which types of positions they have pursued. Just

---

¹³ Though if we were to look at the extended Cabinet we’d see that current Secretary of Treasury Jack Lew had been in an extended Cabinet position in the Clinton administration

¹⁴ Summers serving at the National Economic Council
like Blondel we have looked at individual offices rather than at the full post-ministerial career. Before we move on to positions in the non-political sector, we will shift our level of analysis briefly to the full post-ministerial career since cabinet exit. Do cabinet ministers pursue a political/administrative career or one in a non-political occupation? The answer to this question obviously depends to a large extent on coding decisions. Nicholls in his 1991 study on US cabinet ministers recorded around 20% post-ministerial careers in the government/politics sector. However, his coding scheme is not really transparent. Taking a close look at post-ministerial careers of the Clinton and Major cohort we had serious difficulties to attribute careers unambiguously to one of the two categories. As a consequence we decided to construct a three-fold classification, distinguishing post-ministerial careers in the politics/administration sector (without any noteworthy additional non-political occupation), from those in the non-political arena (without any noteworthy political/administrative occupation), but also from those post-ministerial careers that combine positions from both occupational arenas.

Table 5: Type of post-cabinet career (year of exit- 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Politics/Government</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Non-Political</th>
<th>Retired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td># 29</td>
<td>% 78.4</td>
<td># 5</td>
<td>% 13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td># 0</td>
<td>% 0</td>
<td># 4</td>
<td>% 14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in table 5 British cabinet ministers are much more likely to pursue a post-ministerial career in politics/administration than their US counterparts. This is mainly in line with our position based analysis. However, not all former ministers who have held a political position during their post-ministerial career have done so at the complete expense of non-political occupations. In fact, in the Clinton ministerial cohort 14.3% of cabinet ministers pursued (successfully) a post-ministerial career that combined both political and non-political occupations. And even in Britain, a surprising 10.8% display this characteristic. Some, like Chris Patten and Robert Cranborne serve as chancellors at different universities, while others, like Ian Lang and Michael Forsyth are pursuing business careers next to their position in the HoL (parallel careers). In the US on the other hand, periods of holding political positions are sequenced with periods when former cabinet members pursue non-political positions. Further

---

15 We do have people who pursue political and non-political positions – in the UK often simultaneously, while in the US mostly one after the other.
it is not uncommon to hold several positions at the same time.\textsuperscript{16} For instance, while Madeleine Albright founded her own consulting firm after her time as Secretary of State in the Clinton administration, she also held a professorship at Georgetown University. Larry Summers on the other hand is an example of sequenced positions – first after leaving the Clinton Administration he served as the president of Harvard from 2001 to 2006, followed by a position as professor at Harvard that he held parallel to a board position at a hedgefund before re-entering the executive branch as the director of the White House National Economic Council. While in the US this pattern reflects the smooth, mainly unrestricted transition between political and non-political arena, in Britain it is caused by the opportunity of HoL members to take on a private occupation while remaining part of professional politics.

\textit{Post-ministerial positions in non-political occupations}

Analysing post-ministerial positions and careers in non-political occupations the balance between our two cases turns into the reverse. Immediately after their spell in the cabinet only four British ministers (11 \%) took up a non-political position, while all of the 22 US ministers (100 \%) whose immediate post-cabinet position could be traced did so.

Table 6: immediate post-cabinet positions in non-political occupations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>political</th>
<th>non-political</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US (n=22)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain (n=37)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old job/sector</td>
<td>new job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US (n=22\textsuperscript{17})</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain (n=4)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Lobbying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{16} This in turn does make coding the individual members extremely difficult, especially when it comes to the decision of how much space each position occupied in the members weekly worktime as well as the part it contributed to the member’s income.

\textsuperscript{17} One member retired after serving the Clinton administration, while Ron Brown passed away while in office, information on the immediate positions the Clinton cabinet members took on are missing

\textsuperscript{18} two former cabinet member could not be clearly categorized as they held served several positions and are thus missing
Dividing non-political occupations into four sectors – law, business, education and lobbying – we further analysed whether these immediate post-cabinet positions matched the primary professional career (before politics) of ministers or their immediate or pre-political position. It is striking that in both countries about half of the former cabinet ministers who moved out of politics actually took up a post that was different both from their primary profession and their last job. This is particularly surprising in the US case, where almost half of the cabinet ministers had entered cabinet directly from a non-political/non-administrative occupation. The few years spent in cabinet have obviously changed opportunity structure and/or ambitions.

In both countries the business sector is the most attractive occupational arena for those who immediately switch their professional careers. After their exit from the Clinton administration ministers with no prior business experience have been able to gain “novice” employment as advisors, board members and even CEOs of major companies. Similarly in Britain, the two ministers moving directly into the business sector took up positions as Director of Corporate Finance in an investment banking firm (Forsyth) and one joined the Board of Directors of a financial company (Lang).

Two of the former US ministers took up a position that could unambiguously be coded as lobbyist (Albright and Cohen). While this may appear a rather low figure given the frequent claims of prevalence of lobbying by ex-government officials, it may not be the ultimate number as there is only limited information on what business recruits actually do for their salary. Taken together, though, the figures for business appointees and lobbyists clearly suggest that the “revolving doors” phenomenon between private business and politico-administrative elites does exist.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US (n=11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 Missing data due to unclear categorization
20 Different meaning in a different occupational sector (i.e. switching from an occupation in the business sector to one in the education sector would be considered different). Taking on a different position, but in the same occupational sector is not considered different
21 For instance, Federico Peña joined a venture capital firm upon leaving the Clinton administration, while William Daley and Henry Cisneros took up positions in the communication sector
22 For instance, Glickmann’s position as CEO at the Motion Picture Association of America could be understood as a lobbyist position
The tendency to move into business positions becomes even more pronounced in the long run. When looking at their over-all post-ministerial career, business positions are by far the most frequent non-political occupations of former US and UK cabinet ministers (multiple positions counted). 10 members of the Clinton cohort and 4 of Major’s cabinet ministers have taken up an occupation in the private business sector – at least once – since their cabinet exit, while law (6 in US and 1 in UK) and education (4 in US and 1 UK) are trailing far behind.

Conclusion

Confirming our expectations post-cabinet careers of ministers in the British parliamentary system of government and the presidential US system look rather different. In Britain almost all of them stay within the realm of professional politics, in the US only very few do so. This stark contrast somehow echoes the differences in pre-cabinet trajectories, yet it is even more pronounced. As our study was designed as a most-different case model, we cannot point to any particular institutional characteristic for an explanation. The different systems of government, though, parliamentary in the British case and presidential in the US, seem to facilitate this kind of divergence.

Our more detailed analysis of political positions taken up after cabinet-exit, shows for Britain an extreme fixation with Westminster, i.e. with the national parliament. This might be seen to reflect two other central structural features of the United Kingdom, its unitary character and its non-political public administration, but seems also related to a uniquely British institution: the House of Lords. With regard to the main career function of the cabinet office, our analysis confirms Blondel’s general finding: In Britain, too, the ministerial office is almost always the apex of a political career. A detailed analysis of post-ministerial careers, however, should warn us from restricting the cabinet office to this function. The high share of ministers remaining in front-line politics, the prominent role they played in parliament (as oppositional politicians) and the three ministers who actually did reappear in cabinet after more than a decade clearly suggest that many former ministers not only still nourish progressive ambitions but that they are also endowed with a realistic chance for a cabinet comeback. One of them is even most likely to become a future prime minister.
The few re-appearances of former cabinet ministers in US politics do not really constitute a clear-cut pattern, though the pursuit of governor posts and positions in the federal executive does confirm the importance of the legislative-executive divide for US political careers. As the highest executive office apart from the presidency, the cabinet office is the apex of the political career for most of its incumbents. For many of them, though, it is also the only front-line political office they will ever have taken up. Future research however needs to look further into other cohorts. As preliminary research has shown, the fixation of US post-cabinet careers to the executive branch might be specific to our cohort, but cabinet members of other administrations have held (Elizabeth Dole) or sought (Tommy Thompson) legislative office. The likelihood of a cabinet member to become a future President of the United States is rather low (no such case since 1945), however, we might be witnessing another attempt in two years’ time (Hilary Clinton).

One of the main similarities of our two cases is the role business positions take up in post-ministerial careers. In both countries they constitute an important part of the post-ministerial career of former cabinet members. In the US the so-called “revolving doors” phenomenon – a frequent interchange between political, administrative and private business positions – can be traced in the high number of cabinet ministers who have exchanged their political for a private business occupation. In Britain, however, the House of Lords allows former cabinet ministers to combine their political occupation with positions in the business sector, resulting in post-ministerial careers that consist of elements from both arenas, yet to a rather varying degree. Taking an ambition theory perspective this frequent interchange between the top echelons of politics, administration and private business is certainly a rather questionable feature of career patterns in both countries that needs further and more detailed investigation.

Taken together, our comparative case study of Britain and the US has shown that a comparison of post-ministerial career across different systems of government is possible. Instead of treating presidential and parliamentary systems as essentially different and thus analyzing post-ministerial careers with different conceptual lenses, we suggest to move up the ladder of abstraction in order to make them comparable. The results might be rather crude and intuitive in the first instance, but in contrast to hitherto studies they are based on a common analytical framework that could function as the basis for a much more comprehensive study of post-ministerial careers in modern democracies. The discussion of our empirical results has also shown that the system of government (parliamentary vs presidential) is not the only
serious contender to explain the divergence between the two most-different cases. Indeed we suspect that questions of territorial order (federal vs unitary), the role of political parties and the politicization of public administration might be important institutional variables in this respect. Future studies exploring the complex causal nexus between different institutional settings and (post-)ministerial careers would have to include many more country cases as well as cabinet cohorts using the general analytical framework presented here and specifying it along the way.
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